

CARIAA’s revised gender assessment framework

	<b>Unacceptable (Gender Blind)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good (Gender Transformative)</b>
<b>Intersectional perspective</b>	There is no evidence that gender was considered when designing and/or implementing the research.	Insufficient integration of the intersectional perspective: discussions on the factors that are potentially producing vulnerabilities or creating resilience or growth are limited to binary mentions of male/female, rich/poor, urban/ rural.	The intersectional perspective is present but not fully explored, therefore the paper risks reproducing gendered stereotypes such as women being the most vulnerable and the poorest of the poor, etc.	The intersectional perspective is present but the complex interactions between potentially oppressive and privileging factors in the context of climate change could have been highlighted in a more nuanced way.	The paper adopts an intersectional perspective that allows for highlighting in a nuanced way the complex interactions between potentially oppressive and privileging factors in the context of climate change.
<b>Conceptual approach to vulnerability resilience, migration and/or adaptation</b>		Insufficient reliance on the most recent understanding of vulnerability, resilience and/or climate change related migrations, which makes it difficult to integrate concerns for gender and equity.	Insufficient reliance on the most recent understanding of vulnerability, resilience and/or climate change related migrations, which makes it difficult to integrate concerns for gender and equity.	The paper builds on the latest scholarly developments on (climate) vulnerability, resilience and/or adaptation.	The paper builds on the latest scholarly developments on (climate) vulnerability, resilience and/or adaptation.
<b>Masculinities</b>		Men’s issues and /or masculinities are not integrated in discussions on gender.	Men’s issues and /or masculinities are not integrated in discussions on gender.	Men’s issues and /or masculinities are insufficiently integrated in discussions on gender.	Men’s issues and /or masculinities are integrated in discussions on gender.

	<b>Unacceptable (Gender Blind)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very Good (Gender Transformative)</b>
<b>Data</b>		Insufficient reliance on gender-disaggregated data.	Insufficient reliance on gender-disaggregated data.	The findings rely on gender-disaggregated data and gender differentiated contextual analysis of vulnerability, adaptation or resilience.	The findings rely on gender -disaggregated data and gender differentiated contextual analysis of vulnerability, adaptation or resilience.
<b>Scale</b>		Gendered discussions are weak – they do not cover gender issues at all scale.	Gendered discussions are present but the analysis does not cover gender issues at all scale.	Gendered discussions are present but the analysis does not cover gender issues at all scale.	The analysis bridges scales (from the household level to the international spheres).
<b>Research methods</b>		Research methods are insufficiently gender and socially sensitive.	Research methods are insufficiently gender and socially sensitive.	Evidence for gender and socially sensitive research methods are insufficiently highlighted.	The research adopts gender and socially sensitive research methodologies that are sufficiently highlighted.