



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Submission received on revisions to the
Green Climate Fund's Environmental and
Social Policy to reaffirm the Fund's
commitment to addressing Sexual
Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual
Harassment

I. Introduction

1. On 19 April 2021, the Green Climate Fund (GCF) published a call for public inputs inviting organizations and all entities involved and interested in climate mitigation and adaptation and SEAH issues to provide inputs to the proposed revisions to the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) of the GCF. These proposed revisions reaffirm the Fund's commitment to addressing Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual Harassment (SEAH).
2. The GCF Secretariat provided the draft revisions after initial consultations held prior to B.28 with the Board, accredited entities, active observers and accredited observer organizations. The draft revisions address SEAH matters at the project-level while the rest of the provisions in the ESP remain relatively unchanged.
3. The call for inputs was open for 30 days and closed on 19 May 2021. One submission was received and is presented in this document without editing or formatting.

II. Joint Submission of a Group of CSOs and Indigenous Peoples Active in the GCF with Comments on the Revisions to the Green Climate Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) to reaffirm the Fund's commitment to addressing Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual Harassment (SEAH)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to the Green Climate Fund's (GCF's) Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) in order to integrate the Fund's commitment to addressing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH) to apply it to GCF's implementation partners ("Counterparties"). It is critically important that the GCF's effort to address SEAH includes Counterparties as the risk of sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment extends beyond the Covered Individuals included in the SEAH policy itself as SEAH risks can occur during the implementation of GCF projects and programmes. As demonstrated by our engagement on the development of the ESP and the initial SEAH policy, among other related policies, the GCF Observer network of civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities ("the Observer network") has long advocated for a human rights-based Environmental and Social Management System. This includes advocating for a comprehensive SEAH policy and its application across GCF activities including at the project and programme levels. It is critical that the mandates of SEAH policy apply to projects and programmes to help ensure that Accredited Entities are thoroughly considering and taking steps to prevent and address SEAH risks.

Overarching Comments

Preventing SEAH and addressing it if and when it occurs is critical and should be a joint effort between the GCF and its partners, including the Accredited Entities. However, we have significant concerns about the policy vehicle suggested for the application of the prevention of SEAH in the context of GCF-funded activities, meaning the suitability of the GCF's ESP, and related policy changes proposed for the ESP.

First, we want to reiterate our procedural concern that the changes proposed initially to both the SEAH Policy and the ESP, which both went through lengthy consultations prior to adoption, were tabled for a consideration at B.28 without adequate consultation of observers and other key stakeholders from the local level. We appreciate that the non-consideration of the revised ESP policy at the last Board meeting, and the subsequent consultation process initiated for this policy, has given the Observer Network an opportunity for sharing our views. However, we remain concerned that the piecemeal approach to adopting interrelated policies has led to a process of changing certain parts of the ESP, which went through a comprehensive and lengthy process of development, including rounds of consultations. To that end we urge the GCF to continue its process of developing its own environmental and social safeguards (ESSs) and we look forward to remaining engaged in that process. All of these policies together (for example the ESP, Indigenous Peoples Policy, Gender Policy and Action Plan, SEAH, and ESSs, among others) should then form a comprehensive human rights-based approach to developing and implementing climate action.

Secondly, we do not agree with findings by the Secretariat (elaborated in document GCF/B.28/03/Rev.01) that seem to suggest that the integration with the ESP is the *only* or best way to make SEAH provisions implementable for counterparties. For example, SEAH could have remained as a stand-alone policy and additional work undertaken to implement it for counterparties or integrated in the Gender Policy. Even if other IFIs are integrating SEAH within ESS rather than dealing with it as a stand-alone policy, this does not mean that this is the best or most suitable way to operationalize the GCF SEAH Policy obligations for counterparties. A seeming lack of buy-in from many Accredited Entities, or constraints preventing the modification of their operational standards, should not be used as justification

to change policies (i.e. not applying the SEAH policy to counterparties) nor to enact an SEAH “implementation lite” via the ESP. Lack of buy-in should not guide policymaking, but instead the Secretariat should work with AEs to build their capacity and create awareness to implement these critical policies. We are likewise concerned about some of the related argumentation in the above mentioned document that seems to indicate that the additional cost of implementing the SEAH provisions for counterparties (other than through integration in the ESP) and a related gap in subject matter expertise in the Secretariat means that this proposed approach (with changes to the SEAH policy and integration in the ESP) is the only way to apply the policy to prevent and address SEAH. The latter is particularly worrisome, as this then casts doubt on the ability of the Secretariat to assess and provide oversight over Accredited Entities suggested integration of SEAH risk in social risk assessment as part of the ESS requirements. This could expose the GCF to severe reputational and compliance risk and undermine the integrity of the institution. The SEAH policy and its full implementation can reduce both actual and reputational risk and, like other policies, should be embraced and fully integrated into GCF projects and programmes (with the requisite budget provided) by both the Secretariat and the Accredited Entities.

Thirdly, the proposed changes within the ESP related to SEAH appear to be rushed and slapdash rather than done in a comprehensive manner, which may lead to even more confusion and trouble for the Accredited Entities. For example, SEAH is incorporated in some instances as a separate point and in others it seems to be inferred that it is part of a social assessment. In reading the consultation text with proposed changes to the ESP, we have serious concerns about how and when SEAH risks will be screened, how these risks will relate to overall risk categorization, how and when SEAH assessments will be required (or if SEAH will be included in the environmental and social assessments), and how they will be considered in environmental and social management plans. We also have concerns about the lack of inclusion of SEAH in the GCF’s interim Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESSs). It is not even clear to what extent the existing GCF interim ESSs (the IFC Performance Standards) sufficiently acknowledge and cover risk related to SEAH. Relatedly, we wonder how any actions on updating the ESP now will impact the ongoing development process for the GCF’s own ESSs to replace the interim ones.

In this context, we are concerned that the proposed changes to the ESP is a missed opportunity to also include a reference to gender-based violence (GBV), as proposed in an earlier version for comments in paragraph 20. GBV is a much more encompassing and broader reference than SEAH and thus should be explicitly mentioned and included as part of necessary considerations under social risk assessments. We have also seen a significant number of funding proposals that highlight GBV as a critical issue in their gender assessments as well as proposed activities to address GBV in their gender action plans. We also noted that there is no mention of child-specific or child-sensitive safeguarding approaches to prevent and mitigate SEAH of children at project level. There needs to be greater clarity in the policy as to how and if the SEAH provisions apply to children especially as instances of GBV in development projects have negatively impacted and harmed children.

Lastly, if the updated ESP is approved, what does this mean for the necessary update of ESP implementation guidelines, training, guidance and tools, and communication materials for GCF Accredited Entities and other GCF partners (including NDAs in the context of Readiness and Preparatory Support) as well as required updates for the accreditation and re-accreditation process to reflect SEAH policy requirements for counterparties? These materials are an important piece of a comprehensive environmental and social management system and, if developed and used well, will help address concerns about the implementation ability of AEs. This is not addressed in the ESP itself and a description of further necessary updates and revisions to existing policies, guidelines and procedures (such as for readiness support or accreditation/re-accreditation) is missing.

Comments on Specific Sections and Paragraphs in the ESP

In the following section, we provide comments on the various sections, and respective paragraphs in the draft ESP presented to us as a draft for comments.

Section II: Definitions

Para. 2: Two general remarks: 1) definitions (x), (y), (z), (aa) are not integrated in alphabetical order. “SEAH,” currently (x) should come before “(v) Secretariat” and current subparagraphs (y), (z), and (aa) should follow after current “(v): Secretariat.” 2) This section should also include a definition on “Gender-based Violence” (GBV) as the broader category of which SEAH is a subset.

Related to the specific new definitions itself, we have the following concerns:

Para. 2 (q): This paragraph says ““GCF financed activities” means any Activities financed with GCF proceeds.” However, the SEAH Policy (final version GCF/BM-2021/06) includes the following definition, ““Fund-related Activity” means any activity which is financed, administered, or supported by the Fund, either with its own resources or those of others, or any activity that materially affects or may affect or otherwise be relevant to the Fund.” We are concerned and wonder why there is a marked difference in definition in the SEAH Policy and draft ESP? The narrow concentration on “GCF financed activities” vs. “GCF related activities, including GCF-financed activities” does not capture the full SEAH risk of Accredited Entities project/programme engagement. For example, early design consultations are not necessarily a “GCF financed activity” (unless they happen under the PPF), thus might presumably not be covered under the policy. It is unclear why the narrower definition would need to be used here instead of the broader definition in the SEAH Policy. Additionally, “financed with GCF proceeds” is a strange phrase as it is not clear what “GCF proceeds” are. We encourage a rethinking and widening of this reference, including to make it consistent with the SEAH Policy definitions. The definition should be elaborated and all commensurate references in the updated policy text should be changed accordingly (e.g., para. 3(c), para. 8 (k), para. 11 (h), para. 19, para. 20).

Para. 2 (x): “SEAH”: This definition should be maintained as it’s the same as the definition in the SEAH Policy.

Para. 2 (y): “Sexual Abuse”: This definition should be maintained as it’s the same as the definition in the SEAH Policy.

Para. 2 (z): “Sexual Exploitation”: This definition should be maintained as it’s the same as the definition in the SEAH Policy.

Para. 2 (aa): This paragraph includes the following definition: ““Sexual Harassment” - includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, that interferes with work, or is made a condition of employment, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment in connection with a GCF financed activity.” However, the SEAH Policy (final version GCF/BM-2021/06) states ““Sexual Harassment” includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, that interferes with work, or is made a condition of employment, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment in connection with a Fund-related activity.” Here we see the same issue as with para. 2(q) and the need to harmonize the definition in the ESP with the definition in the SEAH policy and to broaden from “GCF financed” to “GCF-related” activity.

Section III. Objectives and scope

Sub-section 3.1. Policy objectives

Para. 3: As SEAH is distinct from “environmental and social risks,” shouldn’t this paragraph include an explicit reference to SEAH be included there (for example as an added (d) that says “Avoid, and where avoidance is impossible, mitigate the risks of SEAH to people”). Additionally, the reference to “exploitation” under para. 3(c) is not sufficient to reflect the spectrum of SEAH.

Sub-section 3.2 Scope of Application

Para. 4 (a) and (c): We welcome the addition of a reference to “gender sensitive” and “intersectional” with regard to principles and ESMS as recommended by the consultant, but feel that this section could be strengthened by including additional references to diversity, equity and inclusion.

Para. 5 (c): A reference to SEAH is added, but only in the context of “alignment with the GCF ESS”. However, the current interim GCF ESS (the IFC Performance Standards) are largely silent on SEAH, so this reference is actually not clear. How can a SEAH risk assessment be aligned with ESS standards that do not mention or acknowledge SEAH risks? (see para. 8 (a) which acknowledges that SEAH risk mitigation is separate from ESS application in its wording). There is fundamental inconsistency here in the referencing of SEAH risk assessment to be in compliance with ESS. In the Secretariat’s response matrix to initial comments on these changes (Doc. GCF/B.28/03/Add.01), the Secretariat notes that the GCF requires that implementation of the interim ESSs includes being guided by the IFC Guidance Notes. We agree that the GCF does include this, however, in looking at the IFC Guidance Notes referenced, it only appears that reference to any of the SEAH concepts appear in regards to Performance Standard 2 on labor and working conditions and sexual abuse or harassment in the workplace, and sexual exploitation in regards to Performance Standard 4 and sexual exploitation related to travel and tourism. The Guidance Notes, nor the interim ESSs, cover SEAH in a comprehensive or sufficient manner.

Section IV: Guiding principles

Para. 8 (c) and (d): What does the scaled-risk approach and fit-for purpose approach to ESS -- for both project categorization and for accreditation fit-for purpose -- mean for SEAH minimum standards and risk assessment requirements? The assumption that a project has little environmental risk (Category C) is not the same as the risk for SEAH (which is more pervasive). As currently phrased, this is related to ESS standards (which in their current form do not sufficiently acknowledge or integrate SEAH risks). It is thus conceivable that a project is categorized as low-risk based on ESS, but could be higher risk based on SEAH. In this context, we are worried about a comment in the accompanying GCF document GCF/B.28/03/Rev.01 (<https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/gcf-b28-03-rev01.pdf>), para. 30 which states: “Similar to the Indigenous People’s Policy of the GCF, the explicit inclusion of SEAH considerations within the ES Policy would not directly impact the scope of the accreditation considerations.” This is very worrisome and a huge red flag for the unsuitability of the ESP for integrating SEAH provisions.

Para. 8 (g): As this policy is an update to the prior ESP, we would like to point out an earlier omission and with respect to the “coherence with relevant policies and practices.” An explicit reference to the GCF Indigenous Peoples Policy should be added here. [see also related concerns under para. 8 (c) and (d)]

Para. 8 (k): While adding the sub-paragraph on “Zero-tolerance of SEAH” is good, wording in this paragraph could be improved to indicate and include a focus on taking a “survivor centred, gender-responsive” approach. Thus, it should instead say: “... GCF recognises the imperative for AEs and GCF

financed activities to prevent and respond effectively to SEAH in a survivor-centred and gender-responsive way and to protect persons.....”

Section V: Overview of roles and responsibilities

Sub-section 5.1: Overview of GCF roles and responsibilities

Para. 10: An explicit reference to SEAH should also be added here as part of the consideration of the adequacy of applicant entities capacity to manage environmental and social risks and including SEAH risks (which is currently not assessed by the Secretariat nor the Accreditation Panel as part of the accreditation application due diligence).

Para. 11: In our opinion it is not enough to include some reference to SEAH risk assessment related requirements for Accredited Entities as an “add-on” to this para. Instead it should be referenced explicitly in the chapeau of para. 11 as “Managing environmental and social risks, including SEAH risks, throughout the life cycle of GCF-financed activities.”

Para. 11(h) & (i): The language here seems insufficient and inconsistent with the explanations provided that SEAH is part of “social” risk. These inconsistencies risk SEAH concerns being overlooked. While these added sub-paragraphs state how GCF will operationalize the SEAH Action Plan, and that GCF will work to develop a SEAH risk assessment tool (which should be consulted with a wide range of stakeholders, including civil society as well as SEAH experts and survivors), there is nothing included that seems to require the AEs to do something with regards to “managing” SEAH risks. This seems to be counter to what was explained in the introduction about how the SEAH considerations are part of “social” risk. Will the AEs develop SEAH Action Plans to address risks identified in the SEAH risk assessment or will it be part of a broader plan and therefore mainstreamed?

There should also be more explicit details about what the nature of the SEAH risk assessment entails, namely, is this to be considered as part of the overall ESS assessment (as we think the current ESS are ill-equipped to guide and compel this) or as a separate required risk assessment, in line with those mandated via the GCF’s Gender and Indigenous Peoples policies and thus complementary to the ESS risk assessment?

Para. 12: Given the sensitivity of dealing with survivors of SEAH, there should be an explicit reference to “survivor-centred gender-responsive” provisions needing to be followed in this elaboration on requirements for “activity-specific grievance redress mechanisms”. As experience has shown, the way existing project/program-level grievance mechanisms are handled is very deficient (e.g., sometimes only a phone number provided). How would, without even acknowledging that this is a particular concern, issues of sensitivity, anonymity, confidentiality, etc. for SEAH survivors or whistleblowers under such circumstances be secured? Language in this paragraph needs to be strengthened to acknowledge the added sensibilities and requirements due to possible SEAH-related complaints.

Sub-section 5.2: Overview of roles and responsibilities with respect to the accredited entities

Para. 15: An explicit reference to SEAH should be included as this relates to contractual obligations between AEs and EEs.

Para. 19: Reference in this overarching paragraph/chapeau is too weak as it just indicates that activities financed by the GCF are developed and implemented in a manner that “considers” potential SEAH. The language should be much stronger and more forceful with words indicating that the responsiveness and commensurate action to “prevent, address and eliminate” is what is required. Likewise “(or the similar

terms employed by Accredited Entities that are equivalent to those of the GCF in all material aspects) should be stricken. The terms SEAH are defined in the SEAH policy and the ESP. Compliance is with the definition/obligation conferred by the terms, not the terms itself.

Para. 19 (a) (i): A CORE CONCERN: While we appreciate the inclusion of a reference to “enhance gender equality, and to prevent, address and eliminate SEAH” here, procedurally this passage is very problematic. Tying SEAH risk assessments to relevant safeguard instruments such as an ESIA and ESMP risks SEAH not being specifically considered in all projects and programmes. For example, this would presumably not apply (meaning SEAH would not be specifically addressed) in Category C projects/programs which require neither an ESIA or ESMP. There has to be a clear formulation that makes it mandatory that an SEAH risk assessment is in addition to and irrespective of the requirement for the ESIA and ESMP and that an SEAH assessment (and similarly, an SEAH action plan) is always required independent of “other” ESS risks, similar to the need to always have a project/program-specific gender assessment (and action plan) irrespective of risk category. We would instead propose to include language that makes it clear that an SEAH assessment and a commensurate SEAH Action Plan are additional to, not part of the ESS assessment and that any SEAH action measures must be consulted with key stakeholders, including the CSOs, from its design stage.

Para. 19 (b) (i) & (ii): We support these paragraphs that explicitly mention survivor-centred reporting and response protocols. We hope to see “survivor-centered gender-responsive” mainstreamed in this policy and not only explicitly mentioned in para. 19 (see also our earlier comment in para. 12).

Para. 20: We welcome the addition of this paragraph on requiring Accredited Entities to undertake all necessary measures to ensure that the grievance redress mechanisms established by the Accredited Entities and/or Executing Entities, address SEAH in addition to other environmental and social impacts of the activities. However we note that in contrast to an earlier version that we saw a reference to “address GBV” was stricken. The requirement for gender-responsive grievance redress mechanisms should include GBV as the much broader term as well and read: “to address SEAH and wider forms of GBV in addition to other environmental and social impacts of the activities.” Accordingly, a commensurate definition of “GBV” should be included in the definitions section).

We appreciate the cross-reference with para. 81 as it is essential that accredited entities and executing entities’ grievance redress mechanisms, in addition to the IRM, are able to address complaints related to SEAH.

Section VI. General requirements for environmental and social risk management

Sub-section 6.3: Screening and risk categories

In the entire section (paras. 25 to 32) there is not one reference to SEAH or any indication that this is a consideration in risk screening and risk categorization (see for example in comparison the mention of “transboundary risk”).

In contrast, section **6.4 Environmental and social due diligence (para. 36)** mentions SEAH risks in line with “transboundary risks” and para. 40 explicitly mentions “SEAH due diligence”. As elaborated currently, there is a lack of consistency in explicit mention of and reference to SEAH in Sections 6.3 and 6.4.

Sub-section 6.4.: Environmental and social due diligence

Para. 36: reads “GCF will conduct its environmental and social due diligence as part of its assessment of activities proposed for funding consideration. The purpose of GCF due diligence is to understand and evaluate how the environmental and social, including transboundary and SEAH risks and impacts are screened, assessed and planned to be mitigated and managed by the accredited entities. The due diligence of GCF will verify consistency of the assessments and proposed management measures by the accredited entities with the ESS standards and this policy and recommend to the Board for GCF financing only those proposed activities that meets the requirements for managing environmental and social risks and impacts, pursuant to the ESS standards and this policy.”

Similar to our comment earlier related to para. 19(a)(i), we would also like to see similar language in this paragraph with regard to SEAH risks and impacts screening/ assessment. There has to be a clear formulation that makes clear that an SEAH risk assessment is in addition to and irrespective of the requirement for the ESIA and ESMP and that an SEAH assessment (and similarly, an SEAH action plan) is always required independent of “other” ESS risks, similar to the need to always have a project/program-specific gender assessment (and action plan) irrespective of risk category.

Para. 40: The added reference to “SEAH due diligence ...” is welcome here. However it appears to be in the wrong place in the first sentence and should follow “social due diligence” so that the sentence reads “GCF will require the accredited entities to undertake environmental and social due diligence, including SEAH due diligence, on all the activities proposed for GCF financing.”

Sub-section 6.5: Environmental and social assessment

Para. 41: This paragraph mentions “environmental and social risk” as well as “transboundary risk” but not SEAH risks. Again there is an issue of consistency across screening, due diligence, and assessment with respect to SEAH risks that is currently not included sufficiently in the policy. By sometimes singling out SEAH and sometimes not it remains unclear as to whether SEAH is always included in social risks or if it should, instead, be singled out every time. If the latter, then that must be done systematically.

Para. 43: It is still not clear how a SEAH risk assessment is supposed to fit in with the ESS assessment. What happens with Category C projects, will there be SEAH risk assessment? Conversely, will the potential for SEAH risk be taken seriously enough to push projects formerly considered C into the B category? This is not made clear and this lack of clarity is very concerning.

Sub-section 6.6: Environmental and social management plan

Paras. 48 - 52: Currently, these paragraphs use a similar style to list in individual paragraphs requirements related to screening that must take place in regard to all GCF activities, including subprojects and activities requiring financial intermediation. This formulations says that the “GCF will require and ensure that activities are screened and assessed, including component subprojects..., for any potential impacts...” related to numerous specific topics, including individual paragraphs on biodiversity, the Gender policy and gender action plan, fulfilment of human rights, and the ESS standards. Given that the SEAH risks are not included in the ESSs, a new paragraph, written in the same manner, should be added that highlights the obligation to screen and assess against SEAH risks.

Section VII. Information disclosure, stakeholder engagement, and grievance redress

Sub-section 7.1: Information disclosure

Para. 66: This paragraph should specifically mention that “SEAH risk assessments” must be disclosed. We suggest changing the paragraph to read: “GCF will require that all additional environmental and social safeguards documents be disclosed. These documents will include a suite of assessment and management instruments, such as resettlement action plans and policy frameworks, indigenous peoples plans and planning frameworks, gender assessments and gender action plans, *SEAH risk assessments* and environmental and social due diligence and audit reports. These ...” (emphasis added to show addition).

Sub-section 7.3 on Grievance Redress Mechanisms

The section overall needs to include a reference to SEAH, as dealing with and the capacity to address SEAH risks is a highly sensitive and specialized capability. Possible inclusion of a reference would be suitable for para. 77 and/or para. 81.

Para. 77: A reference to “SEAH” should be included here to read: “... to receive and facilitate the resolution of concerns and grievances about the environmental and social performance and addressing incidences of SEAH of GCF-financed activities. These mechanisms will seek to resolve complaints in a manner that is satisfactory to the complainants and other parties and survivor-centred in the case of SEAH, that will be identified, depending on the nature of the complaint.”

Para. 81: a reference to “SEAH” and a survivor-centred process should be added here to read: “The mechanism will facilitate the resolution of grievances, including those concerning SEAH, promptly through an accessible, fair, transparent, constructive and survivor-centred process.”

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to the ESP and for your consideration of the concerns and suggested changes and improvements submitted by the GCF Observer Network. Preventing and addressing SEAH in GCF projects and programmes is critical. We look forward to continuing to engage with the GCF on the development and implementation of critical parts of the Environmental and Social Management System, including the GCF’s own ESSs and exploring ways to integrate SEAH in those as well. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to us.

Submitted on May 19, 2021 by:

Erika Lennon

GCF CSO Active Observer for Developed Countries on behalf of the Observer Network

Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)

elennon@ciel.org

+1-202-742-5856

Liane Schalatek

Alternate CSO Active Observer for Developed Countries

Heinrich Böll Stiftung Washington, DC

liane.schalatek@us.boell.org

+1-202-290-0956

This submission was compiled and written by Erika Lennon, Liane Schalatek, and Hwei Mian Lim based on input and contributions provided by the following civil society organization (CSO) in support of this submission:

- Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)
- Heinrich Böll Stiftung Washington, DC
- Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)

Additionally, the following civil society organizations (CSOs) have signed on in support of this submission (in alphabetical order):

- Aksi for gender, social and ecological justice
 - Bank Information Center (BIC)
 - Both ENDS – the Netherlands
 - CARE International – Climate Change and Resilience Platform
 - Center for Participatory Research and Development (CPRD) – Dhaka, Bangladesh
 - Centro de Estudios de Derecho, Justicia y Sociedad (Dejusticia) – Colombia
 - Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas (CADPI) - Nicaragua
 - Climate Watch Thailand – Thailand
 - EnGen Collaborative
 - Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM) Argentina
 - GenderCC (Women for Climate Justice), Germany
 - GenderCC SA - Women for Climate Justice, South Africa
 - GenDev Centre for research and Innovation, India
 - Global Forest Coalition (GFC) - Global
 - Indigenous Environmental Network - United States
 - Indigenous Peoples International Centre for Policy Research and Education (Tebtebba)- Philippines
 - Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense (AIDA) - Latinamerica
 - International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
 - Murna Foundation, Nigeria
 - Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN)
 - Transparency International-Korea Chapter
- WOMENVAI (Women & Men in Environment and Artificial Intelligence), France