

JUST COOKING TRANSITIONS AND PARIS AGREEMENT ARTICLE 6

By Dr Chipo Mukonza and Dr Samir Thapa

Insights into Just Cooking Transitions - An Analysis of the provisions of Article 6.4 Paris Agreement Crediting Mechanism



Just Cooking Transitions and Article 6



Figure 1: Electric Cooking. Copyright of Centre for Research in Energy and Energy Conservation (CREEC), Uganda, 2022.



This briefing note is an attempt to relate the developments in Paris Agreement (PA) Article 6.4 Crediting Mechanism provisions with the just transition considerations in the clean and modern cooking space. In this, *firstly*, the different related tenets of energy justice are defined with examples of injustice and considerations that could address such injustices. *Secondly*, related Article 6.4 provisions and carbon market practices are analysed to explain existing provisions as well as recommend possible opportunities to enhance these identified justice considerations. Article 6.4 provisions are analysed as it seeks to develop reference conditions that are aligned with the Paris Agreement goals linked to Nationally Determined Conditions (NDCs), Long Term – Low Emission Development Strategies (LT-LEDS) and host party and internationally recognised Safeguards and Sustainable Development priorities.

As the world navigates the dual challenges of addressing climate change and striving for equitable development, the concept of [just transition](#) has been put under the spotlight and is gaining traction. A just transition entails a shift towards a low-carbon economy while ensuring that the social and economic impacts are distributed fairly and equitably, leaving no one behind. The notion of [just transition](#) has become of paramount importance in contemporary discourses, policies, and practices of energy transition. [Energy justice](#) seeks to embed principles of justice, fairness, and equity into energy systems and their transitions. The just transition concept sits at the intersection between [energy transition and energy justice](#) bodies of literature and establishes the importance of equity and justice in the planning, implementation, and assessment of [socio–energy](#) system changes. Just energy transition discourses are therefore crucial in today's world, where [production and consumption inequities](#) associated with energy systems are pervasive and long

standing. In this note, we explore the idea of just transition specifically in the context of promoting cooking transitions, presenting how carbon revenues can play a pivotal role in financing these transitions.

The principle of energy justice associated with cooking transitions is an issue of social and economic justice because those who are most vulnerable to the negative health and environmental outcomes from traditional biomass use are more likely to face barriers to accessing cleaner energy technologies. In fact, those who suffer the most because of the use of traditional energy are often those who spend the most time and money procuring and processing those fuels, typically rural and poor women. There is broad recognition that global efforts to end the dangerous and costly dependence on traditional fuels for cooking and heating will only be effective if responses are innovative, scalable, and designed with the direct involvement and consideration of needs of those affected. Table 1 identifies seven tenets of energy justice applicable for

Table 1: Tenets of Just Cooking Transitions

Tenets of energy justice	Definition	Example	Justice considerations in cooking transitions
Distributive	<p>The way that benefits and burdens are distributed across groups.</p> <p>Issues around transparent taxes, subsidies, revenues, and cost.</p>	<p>Market distortion and inequitable access to low carbon technologies with general subsidies due to unequal access to resources and services.</p>	<p>Offering smart and targeted subsidies or tax breaks for modern cooking & energy-efficient kitchen appliances.</p> <p>Harnessing and distributing carbon revenues equitably can address the financial barriers to accelerate clean cooking adoption.</p>
Procedural	<p>Meaningful participation in energy decision making, and access to legal procedures for obtaining redress or challenging decision-making processes.</p>	<p>Literature highlights gaps in clean fuel usage between social groups in most emerging nations. For example, unequal access to clean energy services, rooted in the broader social landscape characterized by discrimination, is a critical factor contributing to the energy justice dynamic among various caste and ethnic groups in India.</p>	<p>Transparent and accountable distribution of revenues to build trust among stakeholders. This includes disclosing the sources of funding, the allocation process, and the impact of the investments for different groups.</p> <p>Independent monitoring can help ensure that funds are used effectively and reach their intended beneficiaries.</p>
Recognition	<p>Recognition of the various needs of people, their rights, and experiences.</p> <p>An understanding of the past and present disparities within energy systems and the root causes thereof.</p>	<p>Use of solid fuels on open fires or inefficient stoves causes high levels of household air pollution (HAP), resulting in harm to health. Much of the burden falls on women and children.</p>	<p>Active involvement of affected communities in decision-making processes. Engaging with the community to understand their specific needs and challenges can help tailor solutions that are inclusive and address any barriers that certain groups may face.</p> <p>Establishing grievance mechanisms and independent oversight further enhances accountability and ensures that communities' concerns are addressed.</p>
Restorative	<p>A duty to rectify injustices arising from energy decision-making.</p>	<p>Traditional cooking practices are often deeply rooted in cultural norms and social identities. A sudden shift to modern cooking solutions without considering cultural sensitivities can disrupt social structures and traditions.</p>	<p>Collaborating with local organizations, governments, and stakeholders to design and implement programs that prioritize inclusivity and address the broader environmental, social, and economic needs and injustices associated with traditional cooking practices.</p>
Spatial	<p>Emphasises the geographic dimensions of inequality and inequity, both within and beyond nation states, highlighting, for instance, the clear geographic patterns associated with energy poverty, as well as the</p>	<p>Urban areas often have a wider range of options, such as electricity for cooking or access to liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). On the other hand, rural areas may still rely heavily on traditional</p>	<p>Enhancing affordability and accessibility regardless of geographic location or socioeconomic status. This may include targeted subsidies, microfinance schemes, and/or community-based</p>

	geographically embedded and contingent nature of its underlying causes.	biomass fuels like wood, charcoal, or animal dung for cooking. .	initiatives to promote the adoption. Additionally, investments in infrastructure, such as electricity grids or LPG distribution networks, to reach underserved areas.
Intergenerational	Is significant as consequences of decisions affect not only the present generation but also future generations .	Impacts of current cooking practices on future generations and promoting sustainable practices to meet both the present and future generation's needs.	Integrating clean cooking education into school curricula and community programs can foster a sense of responsibility and stewardship for the environment among youths and children.
Gender and social justice	The pursuit of fairness, equity, and inclusivity for all individuals . It involves addressing the intersection of gender dynamics with energy access, use, and decision-making, ensuring that the specific needs, experiences, and perspectives of women, men, and gender-diverse individuals are recognized and valued.	Women and girls disproportionately bear the burden of cooking with traditional fuels, which leads to health problems and restricts their opportunities for education and income generation.	Clean cooking technologies should be designed with women's needs and preferences in mind, considering factors like ease of use, safety, and cultural appropriateness.

just cooking transitions together with examples and related justice considerations.

As shown in Table 1, the elaboration of justice principles within cooking transitions influences several important just transition considerations. This then can serve as an important decision-making tool for policy makers, practitioners, financiers, manufacturers, suppliers, and end users. The aim of the note is, therefore, to also generate conversations and contribute to key insights on how the clean cooking related justice consideration are provisioned in the different domains of carbon financing, especially the Article 6.4 Paris Agreement Crediting Mechanism within its governance, methodologies, activity cycle standards, procedures, and relevant tools.

Attention to these different justice considerations would both improve the overall additionality of the cooking activities and improve their affordability, reliability, and sustainability, the central elements of both the SDG 7 and the climate integrity objectives. Table 2 therefore relates the seven tenets, and their clean cooking related just transition considerations with the provisions in the carbon financing space, especially with the Article 6.4 provisions. Article 6.4 mechanism is considered because of its relevance to the operationalisation of Article 6, with the possibility of Article 6.2 drawing on Article 6.4 best practices for its bilateral agreements, including also by the independent voluntary standards.

Table 2: Justice considerations and Article 6.4 provisions

Tenets of energy justice	Justice considerations in cooking transitions	Relevant provisions and experience of Article 6 (and carbon finance)	Opportunity for improved focus of Article 6 (and carbon finance)
Distributive	Offering smart and targeted subsidies or tax breaks to adopt modern cooking & energy-efficient kitchen appliances. Harnessing and distributing carbon revenues equitably can address the financial barriers to accelerate clean cooking adoption.	<p>Most ongoing projects offer subsidies against the right to the credits generated to reduce the upfront costs for consumers.</p> <p>In most instances, revenues are recycled to continue the subsidies which tends to continue/exacerbate the negative impacts of subsidy e.g. unfair market access. This also impacts the integrity of credits – since subsidies are upfront and not tied to the operation of the stoves, and especially when surveys are used to monitor the stove usage.</p> <p>The SD Tool adopted includes conditions on the fair distribution of development opportunities and benefits, as part of the safeguards against human rights. (See more below under restorative tenets)</p>	<p>A6.4 SB is preparing a concept note on the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits. The note is expected to highlight mitigation benefits that addresses the host party SD objectives, which tied together with the implementation of the SD Tool is expected to enhance the clean cooking credit value.</p> <p>The concept note should, however, also include principles on the distribution of revenues thus generated to enhance equity, transparency, fairness and efficiency of the activities. This could be built in relation to the relevant recommendation as per the standard for mechanism methodologies v1.0 (Para 32(b)) which states “Other approaches to fulfil the demonstration of equitable sharing of mitigation benefits”. This should emphasise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the revenue distribution could be linked to prove and enhance additionality • How the revenues could be tied with the other financing instruments rather than solely being used to subsidise upfront costs affecting market efficiency <p>These principles could lead to financing models that could be used by the participating parties while distributing carbon revenues.</p>
Procedural	Transparent and accountable distribution of revenues to build trust among stakeholders. This includes disclosing sources of carbon finance and/or other funding, the allocation process, and their impact on different groups.	<p>The carbon financing standards requires provisions that ensures the carbon credit rights – which in practise involves getting the waiver rights from the clean cooking consumers as part of project preparation during the initial phase of the project activity.</p> <p>CCA is developing a Code of Conduct on the responsible use of carbon financing – which proposes that the monetary and/or non-monetary benefits should be transparent within a given transaction.</p> <p>There are no existing provisions of expressly disclosing information on the sources and allocation of carbon revenues and the other fundings with the stakeholders – also not explicitly conducted during the mandatory stakeholder’s consultation processes.</p>	<p>A6.4 concept note on the equitable sharing of mitigation benefits is expected to shed insights on the procedural concerns related to the distribution of carbon revenues and the other benefits. These provisions together with the distribution (as above) will also tie with the expected financing models that participating parties can use.</p> <p>Procedures for distribution should be linked to stakeholders’ consultation at various levels and if the rights are waived it should</p>

Independent monitoring can help ensure that funds are used effectively and reach their intended beneficiaries.

be through their Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)¹. Local Stakeholders' Consultation (LSC) and FPIC should involve imparting information on funding, the process of allocation and their impact on different groups. FPIC should be broader and not only with the Indigenous peoples, as the [SD Tool](#) v1.0 recommends. It is important to consider the just transition tenets to be included in the FPIC– and SB should provide guidance on the FPIC. The planned Information Note on Engagement with the Local Communities and Indigenous People's Platform and its Facilitative Working Group as per Decision 3/CMA.3, para. 5(h) is expected to elaborate this and the other requirements.

Mandatory investment analysis for the clean cooking activities to ensure transparency of revenue allocation and funding sources as part of the additionality tests. The key would be to develop applicable indicators that could be used for monitoring such as the sources of funding e.g. domestic or international, bilateral or multilateral, overall percentage that is shared with the consumers/community etc.

Recognition

Active involvement of affected communities in decision-making processes.

Engaging with the community to understand their specific needs and challenges to help tailor solutions that are inclusive and address any barriers that certain groups may face.

A6.4 [activity standard for projects](#) v1.0 (As per section 6.9, para 66), participating parties must conduct a local, and where appropriate, subnational stakeholder consultation in accordance with applicable host Party rules, but also in line with the modalities contained in Appendix 2 to the A6.4 activity standard, and any additional elements for consultation required by the SD Tool, at minimum.

LSC is required by the other independent standards as well, during the early stages of the activity cycle – through project non-technical information. While this is the first avenue for grievances - however, there is no set protocol for the information to be disseminated, and often it is conducted as a token activity, most often even before the project documents are ready. The standard language is that the information to be appropriate (e.g. gender sensitive) wherein it is simplified to such an extent that crucial information such as on financing and revenues are avoided (e.g. investment analysis). Transparent dissemination of information as required within the scope of efficient implementation is required. This then will enrich the

Consumer oriented product design is currently being conducted only by a handful of large companies – following applicable standards ([BURN](#), [CLASP](#) standard), and often new products are pushed into markets by distributors leading onto issues e.g. early burn-out, repair and maintenance, and market failure.

Ensure provisions which require activity participants to consider product design or products that have followed design principles, ensuring users participation –as part of the mechanism/methodology requirements, which could be as part of the additionality test e.g. performance benchmarks.

Activity standards and procedures should contain provisions to reduce the need for grievances handling – given the costs are high – (fees/bonds for grievance handling are high > \$2,500) and are conditional e.g. can be submitted only on the basis of adverse effects of a social, economic or environmental nature suffered by local individual. Relevant provisions should be incorporated e.g. in

¹ FPIC, is a principle that acknowledges Indigenous People's rights recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. FPIC allows Indigenous Peoples to engage in negotiations to shape the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the activity.

Establishing grievance mechanisms and independent oversight further enhances accountability and ensures that communities' concerns are addressed.

discussion and comments that will be received from the communities guiding the implementation of the projects.

As per the [draft appeals and grievance procedure](#) v4.0 - there are other avenues where stakeholders affected by A6.4 activity can raise issues e.g. global SH consultation, continuous engagement of SHs, unsolicited letters to the SB, assessment of safeguards and social and environmental impact as per the SD Tool. Communities can also raise concerns with the host Party DNA² and DOE³. However, these communities often do not have the resources to file complaints once the activity has started and make complaints to the DNA or the other entities. This is especially true with dispersed clean cooking consumers compared to other sectors such as forestry involving communities.

A6.4 methodologies principle requires setting the baselines based on e.g. the best available technologies and ambitious benchmark approach. This shows that the measures and technologies promoted previously are going to feature under these new requirements. However, so far projects have been promoting technologies/measures without engaging and recognising specific needs e.g. of women, children, and marginal communities, and then designing any tailored solutions for funding, financing and distribution or revenues.

As per Decision 3/CMA.3, para 7(a) host parties can elaborate and apply national arrangements for the mechanism under approval of the SB. As per its Annex 26 and 28, host parties can develop baseline approaches and other methodological requirements, including additionality, to be applied for A6.4 activities that it intends to host, with an explanation of how these approaches and requirements are aligned with its NDC and, if it has submitted one, its LT-LEDS⁴, and

the information notes being prepared on the special circumstances of the LDCs and SIDS and on the Engagement with the Local Communities and Indigenous People's Platform and its Facilitative Working Group - Decision 3/CMA.3, para. 5(h), and any subsequent documents.

Recognition of national/sub-national regulatory instruments – depending on the stringency of the instruments and monitoring. Currently, only credits above those required by regulations are additional, as part of the regulatory surplus. However, it is also the case that regulations are not abided by due to gaps between policy and practise. In this, if policy instruments are incentivised to meet the NDCs and further ambitions, then host parties can come up with innovative regulations that could scale up carbon financing.

Type of policies eligible in terms of scale, geography, stringency could be considered as part of additionality tests. This is already in practise for A5.2 of the PA which encourages parties to act and support policy approaches for activities relating to REDD+, both for the carbon and non-carbon benefits. A6.4 plans to prepare [concept note on large scale crediting programmes and on accounting of policies and measures](#), and relevant circumstances. Gold Standard (GS) has already initiated its intention to [pilot policy level activities](#).

Guidance and capacity building support to realise these host party roles and responsibilities in relation to

- Developing the NDCs across sectors and sub-sectors (e.g. cooking, mobility), and LT-LEDS, that aligns with the long-term temp goal of the PA.

² A designated national authority (DNA) is the organization granted responsibility by a Party to authorise and approve participation in A6.4 projects. Establishment of a DNA is one of the requirements for participation by a Party in the A6.4.

³ A designated operational entity (DOE) is an independent auditor accredited by the A6.4 SB to validate project proposals or verify whether implemented projects have achieved planned GHG reductions including required safeguards and SDG impacts.

⁴ In accordance with PA Article 4, para 19, all Parties should strive to formulate and communicate long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies (LT-LEDS), mindful of Article 2 considering their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances.

		<p>the long-term temp goal of the PA. The Information Note Roles and responsibilities of host Parties, elaborates these different host party responsibilities.</p> <p>Recognition of the host Parties role and responsibilities, allows parties to set their commitment and contributions and provide authorisations often against the contributions to climate and SD objectives. Substantial responsibilities with respect to activity cycle processes beyond e.g. only inclusion of new participants. Host party can initiate setting ambitious baselines in relation to additionality and for just transition e.g. for equitable revenue sharing and related to safeguards and SD impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorisation of activities and entities – linking with the just transition considerations. • Activity implementation to minimize delays and improve efficiency, especially for the LDCs and developing countries. • Monitoring that includes validation/verification of activities related to SD Tool requirements (see below) – linking with the just transition considerations.
<p>Restorative</p>	<p>Collaborating with local organisation, government, and stakeholders to design and implement activities that prioritize inclusivity and address the broader environmental, social, and economic needs and injustices associated with traditional cooking practices.</p>	<p>A6.4 has adopted its SD Tool, developed based on the industry best practices (e.g. GS SD Tool) – which is a mandatory tool to be used by the activity developers. The Tool is regulatory with its provisions reflected across A6.4 mechanism procedures and standards, compared to the earlier optional CDM SD tool used to develop SDG co-benefit reports.</p> <p>As per the Tool, activity participants need to 1) Conduct an assessment to identify risks and potential impacts, evaluate and avoid them. When avoidance is not feasible, minimize impacts as much as possible and, finally, to mitigate any remaining negative impacts and risks by establishing activity-level indicators; and 2) Identify and assess potential positive and negative impacts on the 17 SDGs and host Party SD priorities and establish activity level SD quant/qual monitoring indicators; and 3) Monitor and verify the activity through third parties against the established environmental and social indicators and SD indicators – at the activity level.</p> <p>The identified risks and their management plan and the SD impacts measuring, monitoring and reporting methodology are shared during the LSC based on info collected through three forms 1) Safeguards Risk Assessment 2) Management Plan and 3) SD impact form.</p>	<p>The SD Tool is comprehensively restorative in its outreach with respect to addressing the environmental (Energy, Air, land and water, and Ecological and natural resources) and Social (Human rights, Labour, Health and safety, Gender equality) elements together with the impacts on SDGs, and their monitoring as part of the activity cycle.</p> <p>Guidance, methodologies and tools should be developed to account for the different SDG impacts of the cooking activities (e.g. health impacts through ADALYS) linking them to the restoration of the environmental (e.g. biodiversity) and social (distribution/allocation of revenues) elements. In this, use of high-end digital tools, measures and AI should be promoted to enhance the integrity in the accounting of impacts and distribution of revenues.</p>
<p>Spatial</p>	<p>Enhancing affordability and accessibility regardless of geographic location or socioeconomic</p>	<p>Carbon financing is expected to enhance affordability of clean cooking solutions; however, this is not specifically considered in relation to differences across geographic locations and socio-economic status. E.g. in relation to mini grids in off-grid rural areas that would cost more compared to projects promoting other solutions.</p>	<p>Carbon project activities that increase renewable energy generation through grid and off-grid solutions, and that addresses the spatial and relevant socio-economic conditions should be specifically tied to just cooking transitions.</p>

<p>status. This may include targeted subsidies, microfinance schemes, and/or community-based initiatives to promote the adoption.</p> <p>Additionally, investments in infrastructure, such as electricity grids or LPG distribution networks, to reach underserved areas.</p>	<p>Financing schemes focusing on spatial and socio-economic considerations are available (e.g. Nepal's subsidy policy) but as mentioned (as part of the distributive tenets) tying up carbon financing with innovative sustainable financing through mainstream debt and equity markets has not been considered.</p> <p>Lack of investment in electricity grids has affected, especially eCooking solutions, also because eCooking adds to the peaking demand contrary to the other sector such as irrigation or mobility.</p>	<p>Standards on additionality test can encourage provisions to promote activities that considers spatial and relevant socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>The planned concept note on equitable sharing of mitigation benefits should consider the spatial realities that hinders the equitable promotion. For example, cross subsidisation from areas of high fNRB to areas of lower fNRB.</p> <p>Mechanism methodologies should consider mandatory inclusion of upstream and downstream emissions as part of the carbon accounting for clean cooking project activities.</p>
<p>Intergenerational</p> <p>Integrating clean cooking education into school curricula and community programs, can foster a sense of responsibility and stewardship for the environment among youths and children.</p>	<p>The PA in itself is a global vehicle that brings together broad stakeholders to restore climate through mitigation while adapting to its influences towards net-zero emissions and towards 2 to 1.5°C temperature above pre-industrial level. The A6.4 mechanism expeditiously seeks to develop methodologies and activities that result in emission reductions and removals to achieve the PA long-term intergenerational temperature goals.</p> <p>Para 33 and 36 of the RMP's – Decision3/CMA3 ensures the development of methodologies that result in crediting baselines that are below Business-as-Usual scenario, and then further consider ambitions through downward adjustment with the use of factors or quantification methods. This adjustment however needs to consider economic viability of critical mitigation activities, large-scale transformation and decarbonization technologies, negative emission approaches while ensuring that activities are aligned with the PA long-term temperature goal. For example, electric cooking carbon project activities for schools and other commercial and public institutions and enterprises, where the crediting baselines would normally be LPG resulting in lower emissions reductions.</p>	<p>Provision incentives for ambitions in the NDCs and LT-LEDS to align with the long-term temp goal of the PA. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include specific cooking sector targets in the design and development of the NDCs and LT-LEDS. • Integrate electric cooking within the national electricity access planning – that supports enhancing the generation, transmission and distribution capacity of the utilities. • Linking cooking transition with the national carbon pricing and trading schemes (e.g. India). <p>A6 should consider developing policy-based approaches for the scale of emission reductions required, especially for activities with high aggregation possibilities such as clean cooking, mobility and forestry where influence of policies on adoption can be reasoned through use of digital technologies and platforms. Policy instruments such as eCooking and eMobility tariff for specific cases such as for schools with digital monitoring of impacts, could be pilots for these policy level carbon financing approaches. The planned A6.4 Concept note on Taking account of policies and measures, and</p>

Gender and social justice

Clean cooking technologies and projects should be designed with women's needs and preferences in mind, considering factors like ease of use, safety, and cultural appropriateness.

The IPCC In its Sixth Assessment Report, noted a growing scientific consensus about the differentiated impacts of climate change owing to the interaction and intersection of discrimination based on gender, and other social factors such as ethnicity, age, class or (dis)ability.

Clean cooking carbon financing have emphasised gender dimensions, especially through time saved due to improved cooking. GS requires projects to follow its [Gender Equality Requirements and Guidelines](#) - through this while activities must be 'Gender sensitive', they can be 'gender responsive', by seeking deeper impacts e.g. time savings. Project participants can also use the [W* Standard](#), which is a specific framework to quantify the social capital created by/for women in six domains: Time, Income & Assets, Health, Leadership, Education & Knowledge, and Food Security. An example of this for a domestic biogas project is available [here](#). Verra has also developed its [Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard \(SD VISta\)](#) program which is a flexible framework for assessing and reporting the SD benefits, within which [Methodology for Time Savings from Improved Cookstoves \(ICS\)](#) can be used to measure time savings.

A6.4 has released a Concept Note on its [Gender Action Plan \(GAP\)](#), which considers enhanced [Lima work programme on gender and its gender action plan](#) (Decision3/COP25), to promote a systematic approach to mainstream gender to foster gender-responsiveness, e.g. when establishing the requirements and processes necessary to operate the mechanism (as listed in decision 3/CMA.3, Annex, para 24), which includes; a) development and/or approval of methodologies and standardized baselines; b) approval and supervision of host Party national arrangements; c) application of robust social and environmental safeguards; d) development of approaches to assess and report SD impacts. A6.4 SD Tool has one of the elements of gender equality as part of the social risks that requires A6.4 activities to eliminate the possibility of reinforcing - existing inequalities and/or creating new ones.

GS policy level procedures should consider these niche possibilities.

While cooking solutions inherently benefit women and children in relation to their kitchen environments and its management through health and time improvements, often as mentioned above, product and project design is not based on the recognition of their needs and preferences. Activities that consider product design could lead to enhanced gender responsiveness.

In terms of the benefits, the indicators used to measure gender responsiveness to SD is through indicators e.g. time savings that do not consider subsequent agency and empowerment.

A6.4 needs to consider frameworks and indicators within the implementation of its SD Tool that can improve agency and empowerment to enhance just transition considerations. This could draw from existing [gender framework](#) that also considers intersectionality with themes and sub-themes that assess and monitor progress in equality, equity and empowerment. Considerations for impact due to the other social factors e.g. ethnicity, class and their intersections will be important.

Specific provisions can be included in the standards on Additionality to promote gender and social inclusion. For example,

- Activities on Transgender community, Displacement setting considered as the first of its kind.
- Activities that promote financing models that provides subsidies and tax breaks to vulnerable communities as part of the larger scaling up program.

Cooking activities embedded within such broader but specific contexts will increase the pace, depth, and breadth of emissions reductions.

This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies.



Figure 2: Cooking with Electric Pressure Cooker. Copyright of Centre for Research in Energy and Energy Conservation (CREEC), Uganda, 2022.