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Introduction

My papers are based on GRB experience of nearly 20 years. However, I know very little about climate change.

The papers focus on GRB initiatives conducted from within government, as “duty-bearer”. Special emphasis is given to “gender budget statements” and “markers” for relevant expenditures.

The presentation focuses on “considerations” for those interested in climate change budget work that end each sub-section.
What is GRB?

GRB has been used in different ways, by different actors, using different approaches and tools, with varying real impact, probably in about 100 countries.

Unifying question:

*What is the impact of the government budget on women and men, girls and boys, and different subgroups of these categories?*

Within GRB, I cannot identify a single “best practice” or advice that will suit every situation.
CONSIDERATIONS
How did it all start?

*Climate change finance focus seems to have originated at international level while GRB began at the national level.*

*Climate change finance work has extended to domestic finances, but access to international funds, including private-sector investment, remains a major driver.*

Who leads?

“Clout” from leadership by the Ministry of Finance is likely to achieve greater compliance from other agencies and open the way for actual budget changes.

*Involvement of other actors can promote buy-in and bring in specific types of expertise and perspectives.*
When?
If a c.c. statement is drawn up after allocation decisions are made, the exercise is primarily about accountability. If a c.c. statement is drawn up as part of the budgeting process, there is greater potential for change if officials assessing the budgets see climate change as a priority.

Who does the detailed work?
Initiatives are more likely to be sustainable, sustained, and accepted as reflecting reality if done by govt officials. Capacity building needs to give officials the conceptual and analytical knowledge, practical skills, and experience to produce the statements.
What is produced?

C.c. statements that use concepts and formats already known to officials are more likely to be accepted, will reduce the burden, and will be better quality.

Who to involve beyond the executive?

Lengthy, detailed documents containing serious analysis will be useful and interesting to experts, but are less likely to be read by legislators, civil society & other officials. The challenge is to find format(s) that provide meaningful information and analysis rather than simply easy slogans, but that are nevertheless appealing to busy & less technical audiences.
CATEGORIZING EXPENDITURE
Targeted, dedicated versus “relevant” spending
A focus only on budget items that explicitly and primarily target c.c. will give an incomplete and misleading picture. A focus on c.c. could mean that some “climate-sensitive” expenditures will/should be excluded.

Beyond targeted spending
The extent to which, and accuracy with which, non-targeted/dedicated expenditures can be identified depends on the budgeting approach and level of detail used by the particular government.
Existing or new expenditure

Relabelling allocations as “climate change” is a problem if one wants to analyze trends over time.

Types of expenditure

A focus only on the amount, without considering the activities funded, is likely to overstate the impact of allocations.

Negative allocations

Negative allocations are important as the amounts spent in ways that have a negative impact may well outweigh those with a positive impact.
DETERMINING THE “NUMBER” ALLOCATED
Any single number estimate is likely to hide as much as it reveals, although it may seem to give an easily understandable story.

A more achievable and useful aim may be to come up with a set of numbers for different categories of expenditure.

Although identifying links with climate change in as many places as possible may help in in raising awareness and in showing the full extent of government efforts, it is less useful for identifying allocations likely to have real impact.
SOME FINAL PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS
Budget work requires substantial effort if it is done properly. The work is unlikely to have impact unless it is sustained over a number of years.

Overburdened government officials have many other demands on their time. They are more likely to devote the necessary time and energy if the climate change work is mainstreamed.

An exercise that is limited in scope might be of better quality and gain more commitment from the relevant government officials than one that is too wide ranging.