Unmet Gender Promises Infographic: 
Making IFI policies and projects deliver on gender equal rights

IFI Policies Analyzed: The box lists which International Financial Institution (IFI) gender policies and ESFs’ gender-sensitivity we analyzed and scored. The reason for including fewer IFI gender policies than ESFs is that two newer IFIs, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and New Development Bank (NDB), lack gender policies although civil society organizations (CSOs) have been pressuring both IFIs to adopt them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>Gender Policy</th>
<th>ESF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank (AfDB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank (ADB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West African Development Bank (BOAD)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Investment Bank (EIB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB Invest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Finance Corporation (IFC)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development Bank (NDB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Indicators: We developed and applied two sets of ecofeminist rights-based indicators to analyze and score the strength of IFI gender policies and gender-sensitivity of their ESFs.

How IFI gender policies and the gender-sensitivity of their ESFs scored

For details see report: Unmet Gender Promises. October 2020
Insights from Scoring Gender Policies and ESFs

On gender policies:

The ADB, AfDB and IDB have relatively stronger gender policies than do other IFIs. They commendably promote gender equal rights and women’s empowerment complementarily.

The IDB and EIB also laudably score strongly for mandating implementation of their gender policies.

On gender-sensitivity of ESFs:

A majority of IFIs received Weak ESF gender-sensitivity scores. EBRD scored strongest.

The strongest ESF gender-sensitivity scores was for Resettlement & Compensation, with half of ESFs scoring strongly on this indicator.

Almost no ESFs received Strong scores for mandating projects to address gender issues or requiring projects to intersectionally address gender dimensions together with environment and climate, consultation, consent, monitoring and evaluation, class, caste and SGM issues.

Missing SGMs

’Sexuality’ was included in some IFI definitions of vulnerability. However across all gender policies and ESFs, only the World Bank ESF provided explicit protection for SGMs.

SGBV

Nearly half of IFI gender policies scored Strong for their response to SGBV. In the ESFs, only 2 out of 12 scores Strong.

Gender Missing in E&S Risks

Not one IFI ESF required gender to be included in environmental and social risk assessments.
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Insights on Policy Violations from Case Studies

Nine citizen-led fieldwork cases demonstrate that while many IFIs tout adherence to their gender policies and ESFs, too often IFI investments harmfully impact people on the ground because IFIs breach their own policies as the cases below depict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Loss of women farmers’ land, livestock, water, and/or fisheries | - The AIIB-financed Bhola Integrated Power Plant project in Bangladesh  
- The AfDB-BOAD co-financed Senegal Sendou Power Plant project  
- The World Bank-financed Lagos Metropolitan Development and Governance project |
| Health deterioration due to project-related pollution | - The AIIB-financed Bhola Integrated Power Plant project in Bangladesh  
- The AfDB-BOAD co-financed Senegal Sendou Power Plant project |
| Lack of transparent information and inadequate or sham consultations | - The AIIB-financed Bhola Integrated Power Plant project in Bangladesh  
- The AfDB-BOAD co-financed Senegal Sendou Power Plant project  
- The World Bank-financed Lagos Metropolitan Development and Governance project  
- The IFC-AIIB co-financed Myanmar Myingyan Gas Power Plant project |
| Reoccurring sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) in IFI projects | - The World Bank-financed Lagos Metropolitan Development and Governance project  
- The IDB-financed Haiti Caracol Industrial Park project  
- The World Bank-financed Second Road Sector Development Programme in Uganda |
| Gender-unequal labor practices | - The AIIB-financed India Gujarat Rural Roads project |
| Lack of gender-sensitive outputs | - The AIIB-financed India Gujarat Rural Roads project |
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**Recommendations for IFIs**

**IFI policies must ensure that gender equal rights (GERs) complement their women’s economic empowerment agenda.**

Too many IFIs neglect GERs.

---

**All ESFs must address interrelated project gender, environment and climate impacts.**

ESFs hardly acknowledge or address women’s primary roles in protecting the environment and managing natural resources and biodiverse ecosystems. Our cases demonstrate that adverse climate and ecological effects especially undermine women’s livelihoods and health. Some ESFs consider gender-sensitive environmental assessments during resettlement, but rarely for environmental and climate problems.

---

**Gender policies and ESFs must collect gender-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data.** Half of IFI gender policies and no ESFs scored Strong for requiring baseline and subsequent M&E gender-disaggregated project data collection. Without these data IFIs cannot identify and apply lessons to strengthen GERs and prevent harm. IFIs must disclose these data publicly.

---

**ESFs must ensure full information disclosure and inclusive consultation in all projects.** Most ESFs scored Weak on gender-sensitive information disclosure and Adequate on promising gender-sensitive consultations, but in practice consultations are often held too late for affected people to consent to or refuse projects. The right to refuse could end the forced resettlement scourge described in this report’s cases.

---

**ESFs must strengthen the gender dimensions of their resettlement and compensation mechanisms.** Although ESF resettlement and compensation commitments are somewhat gender-sensitive, they neither target women- and girl-headed households nor require gender equal compensation.

---

**Gender policies must recognize and reward unpaid and underpaid care work.** Some policies recognize women’s unpaid care work and promote technologies to alleviate it, but none promote monetizing and remunerating its economic contributions and distributing it across genders.

---

**Gender policies and ESFs must rule out discrimination of sexual and gender minorities (SGMs).** Only a handful of IFIs have begun protecting SGMs. All must expand policies and staff training to counter project discrimination against LGBTQ+ people and ensure they benefit from projects.

---

**Gender policies and ESFs must ensure prevention of all forms of SGBV.** Only a few ESFs do so today. Cases repeatedly demonstrate SGBV’s detrimental impacts especially on women and girls.

---

**All IFIs must ensure coherence between gender policies and ESFs.** While the IDB has the strongest IFI gender policy, other IDB policies scored Weak on gender sensitivity. The reverse applies to the EBRD.

---

**All IFIs should require financial intermediaries (FIs) to adhere to gender policies and ESFs.** This includes disclosing all relevant information on FI-financed sub-projects, specifically identifying potential gender, other social and environmental impacts, to permit affected women, men and SGMs to accept or refuse sub-projects prior to approval, and/or seek remedy if harm occurs after granting consent.

---
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