

GEF Council Meeting  
October 28 – 30, 2014  
Washington, D.C.

**AGENCY PROGRESS ON MEETING MINIMUM STANDARDS ON  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS AND GENDER  
MAINSTREAMING**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Agency Progress on Environmental and Social Safeguards .....	2
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development .....	2
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.....	3
Inter-American Development Bank.....	3
International Fund for Agricultural Development .....	4
United Nations Development Programme .....	4
United Nations Environment Programme.....	5
United Nations Industrial Development Organization .....	5
Agency Progress on Gender Mainstreaming .....	6
United Nations Environment Programme.....	6
United Nations Industrial Development Organization .....	7
Progress Update Overview .....	8
Annexes.....	9
Annex I: GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards .....	10
Annex I-1: EBRD Implementation Tracker – Safeguards .....	10
Annex I-2: FAO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	11
Annex I-3: IDB Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	18
Annex I-4: IFAD Implementation Tracker – SAFEGUARDS .....	19
Annex I-5: UNDP Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	28
Annex I-6: UNEP Implementation Tracker – Safeguards .....	41
Annex I-7: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	51
Annex II: GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming .....	67
Annex II-1: UNEP Implementation Tracker – Gender Mainstreaming.....	67
Annex II-2: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Gender Mainstreaming .....	69

## INTRODUCTION

1. In November 2011, the GEF Council underscored that the existing ten GEF Agencies would be required to meet the same standards that entities applying for accreditation as GEF Project Agencies would be required to meet.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Council requested that the ten GEF Agencies be assessed on whether they meet the eight Minimum Standards in the *Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*<sup>2</sup> (hereafter referred to as the Safeguards Policy) and whether they meet the Minimum Requirements of the *Policy on Gender Mainstreaming*<sup>3</sup> (hereafter referred to as the Gender Mainstreaming Policy).

2. As reported in Council Document GEF/C.45/10, *Review of GEF Agencies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming*, the Secretariat assessed the nine relevant GEF Agencies against the Safeguards Policy and assessed all ten Agencies against the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. The assessments found that:

- (a) the Asian Development Bank (ADB) fully met both policies;
- (b) the World Bank met the Gender Mainstreaming Policy;
- (c) the following six Agencies met the Gender Mainstreaming Policy but needed to make improvements in order to fully meet the Safeguards Policy: the African Development Bank (AfDB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); and
- (d) the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) needed to make improvements in order to fully meet both policies.

3. In November 2013, after reviewing the Secretariat's assessment, the Council requested each Agency that had not fully met the requirements of either Policy to: (i) submit, in December 2013, action plans explaining how it will come into compliance with those provisions not met; and (ii) to report to the Council at its Spring 2014 meeting (and Council Meetings thereafter) on the progress each has made towards fulfilling its action plans. As requested, the Secretariat

---

<sup>1</sup> GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1, *GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*.

<sup>2</sup> The Policy may be found at the following URL: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/environmental-and-social-safeguards-policy> ; The Council decided that because these Minimum Requirements of the Policy were derived from the World Bank policies, the World Bank safeguard system would not be assessed.

<sup>3</sup> This Policy may be found at the following URL: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gender-mainstreaming>

compiled and submitted the action plans or status updates for the eight concerned Agencies to the Council in December 2013.<sup>4</sup> In this report, the African Development Bank (AfDB) was assessed as fully meeting the requirements of the Safeguards Policy.

4. In May 2014, the Secretariat reported, in Council Document GEF/C.46/Inf.06, the implementation progress made by the remaining seven GEF Agencies – EBRD, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, and UNIDO – on safeguards and on progress made by UNEP and UNIDO on gender mainstreaming.

5. This document reports on the subsequent implementation progress of the above mentioned seven agencies on safeguards and the two agencies on gender mainstreaming and is based on the inputs of these same Agencies. As requested by the Council, all action plans are set to conclude by end-2014. The Secretariat will work with the Agencies to compile a further round of implementation progress reports from the Agencies and present them to Council at its Spring 2015 Meeting.

#### **AGENCY PROGRESS ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS**

6. Progress made by the seven Agencies on safeguards is summarized below. Implementation Trackers for these Agencies are included in Annex I, which provides more detailed updates as of end-August 2014 as well as planned activities to bring them into compliance with each Minimum Requirement of the Safeguards Policy.

#### **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development**

7. As of May 2014, EBRD had an outstanding action item concerning Involuntary Resettlement, Minimum Requirement 3.9. As an agreed action item, EBRD confirmed that it would consider revising the text of its *Environmental and Social Policy (ESP)* or that it would develop implementation guidelines so as to explicitly state the GEF requirements regarding the timing of compensation in cases of economic displacement or imposition of access restrictions.

8. EBRD reports that the revised ESP (available on its [website](#)) was approved by the Board on May 7, 2014 and that it will become effective on November 7, 2014. Performance Requirement 5 of the ESP, Land Acquisition, Involuntary Resettlement and Economic Displacement, paragraph 17 explicitly states compensation for displaced persons is to be provided *before* displacement or imposition of access restrictions. Further, EBRD plans to issue ESP Implementation Guidelines that will clearly address the timing of the compensation for

---

<sup>4</sup> These action plans may be found at the following URL: <http://www.thegef.org/documents/environmental-and-social-safeguards-policy>

displacement. The GEF Secretariat assesses that the revision of the ESP and Performance Requirement 5 brings EBRD into compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. Its action plan is therefore completed.

### **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

9. As of December 2013, FAO had outstanding action items regarding the following Standards: (a) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, (b) Protection of Natural Habitats, (c) Involuntary Resettlement, (d) Indigenous Peoples, (e) Pest Management, (f) Physical Cultural Resources, (g) Safety of Dams, and (h) Accountability and Grievance System. As agreed action items to address (a) through (g), FAO confirmed, among other things, that it will revise *Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Guidelines* and project cycle procedures to incorporate social assessment, establish an Environment and Social Safeguard unit/team to support project implementation, and implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of disclosure requirements. For (h), FAO will review other agencies' practices and proposals for compliance reviews, including UNDP's Proposal for Environmental and Social Compliance and Grievance Process.

10. FAO reports that its Corporate Programme Management Board (CPMB) approved the establishment of a technical network on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in April 2014. The main purpose of the network is to mainstream environmental and social considerations into the work of the organization and to build capacities, in particular in the Decentralized Offices. The network will provide technical support, capacity building and systematic knowledge sharing and reporting between HQs and Decentralized Offices. An e-based training module on ESIA has been developed and ready for field testing in mid-October in full collaboration with the Decentralized Offices and other divisions concerned. The final version will be launched on the ESIA website and available for internal use by November 2014, which will be one of the major products of the ESIA network and a concrete step forward in facilitating capacity building essential for enhancing compliance with FAO's environmental and social safeguard policies. FAO's focus to date has been on raising awareness, capacity building, developing the organizational structure and networks for environmental and social assessment. The inputs from the FAO-wide pilot process in development of e-based training module will also provide valuable inputs for updating and strengthening its EIA guidelines to be compliant with the GEF Safeguards Policy.

### **Inter-American Development Bank**

11. As of May 2014, IDB had an outstanding action item with regard to Pest Management, Minimum Requirement 5.4, relating to the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides*. IDB agreed that it will prepare a Guidance document on Application of Environmental Safeguard Policy Directive B.10 that covers the distribution and use of pesticides.

12. IDB reports that a Guidance document on Application of Environmental Safeguard Policy Directive B.10 which covers the distribution and use of pesticides is being prepared with a target completion date of November 15, 2014.

## **International Fund for Agricultural Development**

13. As of May 2014, IFAD had outstanding action items with regard to the following Standards: (a) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, (b) Protection of Natural Habitats, (c) Involuntary Resettlement, (d) Indigenous Peoples, (e) Pest Management, (f) Physical Cultural Resources, (g) Safety of Dams, and (h) Accountability and Grievance System. In order to address items (a) through (g), among other things, IFAD agreed that it would revise its *Environmental and Social Assessment Procedures (ESAP)* and the pertinent Operational Statements. For (h), IFAD confirmed that it will review the practices and proposals of agencies for Accountability and Grievance mechanisms (including ADB, IFC, UNDP and World Bank) and establish its own system.

14. IFAD reports that since May 2014 it launched a consultation process to receive staff and management feedback on the revised ESAP, which will be renamed as the *Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)*. The Operational Statements contained in the Procedures will now be referred to as “Guidance Statements.” The draft SECAP includes thirteen Guidance Statements and was posted on IFAD’s intranet for staff-wide feedback. IFAD also consulted the Multilateral Financial Institutions Working Group on Environment for input in May 2014. IFAD management will review the draft SECAP in October, after which it will be submitted to the IFAD Executive Board in mid-December 2014.

15. IFAD has drafted the SECAP so that it will bring IFAD into compliance with all outstanding items under GEF Minimum Standards 1 through 7 by end-2014. The thirteen Guidance Statements fully cover the missing elements under Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (e.g. rural finance activities), Physical and Cultural Resources, and Involuntary Resettlement and Safety of Dams. With regard to disclosure of draft ESIAs, Indigenous Peoples plans, and other draft plans and documents, IFAD has developed internal procedure templates so that they may be captured through the IFAD’s disclosure workflow and be posting on IFAD’s public website. (This happens at IFAD’s Quality Assurance stage).

16. IFAD has developed two options for establishing its own Accountability and Grievance system and drafted measures for receipt of and timely response to complaints concerning breaches of its environmental and social policies for consideration by its management in October, 2014.

## **United Nations Development Programme**

17. As of May 2014, UNDP had outstanding action items with regard to the following Standards: (a) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, (b) Protection of Natural Habitats, (c) Involuntary Resettlement, (d) Indigenous Peoples, (e) Pest Management, (f) Physical Cultural Resources, (g) Safety of Dams, and (h) Accountability and Grievance System. UNDP agreed that it would, among other things, revise its *Social and Environmental Standards (SES)* to address these issues.

18. UNDP reports that UNDP senior management approved the revised SES (available on its [website](#)) in June, 2014. UNDP confirmed that this SES meets all the outstanding requirements of the GEF Safeguards Policy as prescribed in the Implementation Tracker (see Annex I).

Additionally, UNDP is also revising its screening procedure to align with the new SES, and this will include an early screening for the presence of Indigenous Peoples in the project area. The revised SES indicates that UNDP's accountability mechanism has two key functions. First, a Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) will ensure that individuals, peoples, and communities affected by UNDP projects have access to appropriate procedures for hearing and addressing project-related grievances. Second, a Compliance Review process implemented through UNDP's Social and Environmental Compliance Unit in the Office of Audit and Investigation will investigate claims that UNDP is not in compliance with its own social and environmental policies.

19. The GEF Secretariat has reviewed UNDP's approved SES and the revised Standard Operating Procedures for its Social and Environmental Compliance Unit. The Secretariat assesses that UNDP has addressed the outstanding issues contained in its action plan and that it is now in compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy.

### **United Nations Environment Programme**

20. As of May 2014, UNEP had outstanding action items with regard to the following Standards: (a) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, (b) Protection of Natural Habitats, (c) Involuntary Resettlement, (d) Indigenous Peoples, (e) Pest Management, (f) Physical Cultural Resources, (g) Safety of Dams, and (h) Accountability and Grievance System. To address these issues, UNEP agreed that it would finalize and adopt its proposed *Environment, Social and Economic Sustainability (ESES) Framework*. Additionally, with regard to Indigenous Peoples, UNEP will finalize operational guidelines and develop an e-learning toolkit for its staff. With regard to (h), it would establish appropriate mechanisms that are consistent with those of UN Headquarters requirements, but are decentralized from the main UN Headquarters system. Design of the organizational structure of the grievance system will be finalized by end-2014, and the approval and implementation will be completed by end-2015. UNEP notes that an Interim Mechanism for Grievance has been in place and operational since September 2013, which includes an expert committee consisting of legal, technical, political, and outreach experts.

21. UNEP reports that it is continuing its work on developing the ESES Framework, including internal consultations. Efforts since May 2014 have focused on developing operational mechanisms for the ESES Framework, including screening tools, guidelines, institutional set up, and related training so that this comes into place in time for the official roll out of the ESES Framework. In addition, UNEP approved an Access to Information Policy (available at the following link:

<http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/UNEPsWork/AccessstoInformationPolicy/Revised2015/tabid/1060867/Default.aspx>) in June 2014. The GEF reviewed this policy and believes that UNEP now meets GEF Minimum Requirement 1.9.

### **United Nations Industrial Development Organization**

22. As of May 2014, UNIDO had outstanding action items with regard to the following Standards: (a) Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, (b) Protection of Natural Habitats, (c) Involuntary Resettlement, (d) Indigenous Peoples, (e) Pest Management, (f) Physical Cultural Resources, (g) Safety of Dams, and (h) Accountability and Grievance System. UNIDO

confirmed that it will develop appropriate policies and procedures to address all outstanding issues.

23. UNIDO reports that it has developed its draft *Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy and Procedures (ESSPP)* consisting of Part 1: Integrated Safeguard Policy Statement and Operational Safeguards and Part 2: Project Development Procedures and Environmental and Social Assessment Guidance Notes. The draft ESSPP is available at the following link: <http://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-%E2%80%93-safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents-0>). As the next step, UNIDO will subject the draft ESSPP documentation to final technical and editorial reviews and submit it for UNIDO management approval. UNIDO aims to submit the final draft ESSPP for management approval by November 2014.

#### **AGENCY PROGRESS ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING**

24. UNEP and UNIDO report progress in addressing outstanding action items on gender mainstreaming as summarized below. Implementation Trackers for these Agencies are included in Annex II which provides more detailed updates as of end-August 2014 as well as planned activities to bring them into compliance with the Gender Mainstreaming Policy.

#### **United Nations Environment Programme**

25. As of May 2014, UNEP had outstanding action items with regard to the Minimum Requirements contained in paragraphs 16 and 18 of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. These relate, respectively to (a) measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigation adverse gender impacts and (b) monitoring and evaluation of progress in gender mainstreaming. UNEP had agreed to address the first issue through the ESES Framework and the second issue through actions to strengthen its monitoring and evaluation framework as called for in its *Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment (Gender P&S)*.

26. UNEP reports that the draft ESES Framework has incorporated the requirements of Paragraph 16 of the *Policy on Gender Mainstreaming*. UNEP is working on developing the operational mechanisms to implement the ESES Framework. UNEP reports that it expects the UNEP Senior Management Team to approve its Gender P&S in September, 2014. UNEP is fully committed to the achievement of more gender-sensitive results in its programme performance as one important means of working towards environmental sustainability. In monitoring and evaluating progress made, this Gender P&S provides that a clear oversight framework will be designed and implemented in accordance with the *UNEG Gender Norms and Standards* and the *UNEG Guidance on Integration of Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*. In addition, an implementation plan for the Gender P&S will be presented to the senior management team and thereafter will be used to develop Division/Regional office level action plans by end-October 2014.

27. UNEP has completed the drafts of its gender mainstreaming training modules, initially to be pilot tested by Gender Coordinators by mid-October, and thereafter will be officially launched in November 2014. The gender training modules focus on gender sensitive project planning, implementation, and M&E, including step by step guidance on the M&E process. A gender



sensitive M&E Framework will thereafter be developed in collaboration with the Evaluation Office by end-December 2014.

### **United Nations Industrial Development Organization**

28. As of May 2014, UNIDO had outstanding action items with regard to the Minimum Requirements contained in paragraphs 13 and 16 of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. These relate, respectively, to (a) strengthening of its institutional framework for gender mainstreaming, and (b) measures to monitor and evaluate progress in gender mainstreaming. UNIDO had agreed to address the first issue through the issuance of relevant guidance and through the establishment of its new Office on Gender Mainstreaming and the provision of additional full-time staff. It agreed to address the second issue through actions to strengthen its monitoring and evaluation framework, including the development of indicators for project specific mainstreaming frameworks and integrating a gender perspective throughout its project cycle.

29. UNIDO has developed the following guidelines and tools on gender mainstreaming, which are available at the following link: <http://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-%E2%80%93safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents-0>.

- (a) Matrix on mainstreaming gender in project formulation implementation, monitoring and evaluation with gender mainstreaming examples
- (b) Gender relevance categorization and minimum requirements tool for project design and formulation
- (c) Gender mainstreaming checklist for projects
- (d) Gender analysis tool
- (e) Sample Draft Guide to Gender Mainstreaming for UNIDO Energy and Climate Change Branch
- (f) Energy and climate change and environmental management gender mainstreaming indicator frameworks to monitor gender-related impacts

30. These tools contribute to the key actions of the *Implementation Strategy and Action Plan of UNIDO's Gender Policy*. Specifically, it aims to support the integration of a gender perspective throughout the project cycle, including effective monitoring and evaluation of gender related impacts. UNIDO also conducts gender mainstreaming training for UNIDO staff. UNIDO is finalizing other actions to strengthen its institutional framework for gender mainstreaming, such as establishment of an Office of Gender Mainstreaming and providing additional staff working full time on gender.

31. With regard to strengthening of monitoring and evaluation, all of the tools mentioned above support the integration of gender into the monitoring and evaluation procedures of project impacts. Additionally, a Gender Advisor has been appointed, within UNIDO's project appraisal and approval process, with the role of reviewing project proposals and providing guidance on gender components, including on the formulation of meaningful gender responsive indicators and the collection of sex disaggregated data. Through mainstreaming the developed tools into UNIDO's appraisal and approval process and project results frameworks, gender can be assessed

in a more systematic and effective way via UNIDO's regular M&E processes. In addition, UNIDO is instituting a system to track gender related project funds and Gender Equality investments.

## PROGRESS UPDATE OVERVIEW

32. Table 1 shows the progress made by all ten Agencies as of end-September 2014 towards meeting the agency minimum standards of the GEF Safeguards Policy and Gender Mainstreaming Policy.

**Table 1: Status of Progress of GEF Agencies towards meeting GEF Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming Policies**

	<b>Environmental &amp; Social Safeguards Policy</b>	<b>Gender Mainstreaming Policy</b>
<b>Asian Development Bank</b>	Fully met	Fully met
<b>African Development Bank</b>	Fully met	Fully met
<b>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</b>	Fully met	Fully met
<b>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</b>	ESIA Guideline & Project Cycle Guide under revision (Target completion: end-2014)	Fully met
<b>Inter-American Development Bank</b>	One outstanding item (Target completion: mid-November)	Fully met
<b>International Fund for Agricultural Development</b>	Revised SECAP scheduled for approval in early October	Fully met
<b>United Nations Development Programme</b>	Fully met	Fully met
<b>United Nations Environment Programme</b>	ESES Framework under revision (Target completion: end-2014)	Two outstanding items (Target completion: end-2014)
<b>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</b>	ESSPP under development (Target completion: end-2014)	Two outstanding items (Target completion: end-2014)
<b>World Bank</b>	NA <sup>5</sup>	Fully met

---

<sup>5</sup> The World Bank was not assessed as the elements of the GEF Safeguards Policy are derived from World Bank Safeguards Policies

## **ANNEXES**

### **Annex I: GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards**

ANNEX I-1: EBRD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-3: IDB IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

### **Annex II: GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming**

ANNEX II-1: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

ANNEX II-2: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER

## ANNEX I: GEF POLICY ON AGENCY MINIMUM STANDARDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

### ANNEX I-1: EBRD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b>				
3.9	Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of access. For projects involving restriction of access, impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.	<p>EBRD does not consider resettlement projects complete until adverse impacts have been addressed consistent with its Performance Requirement 5 (PR5) and the project's resettlement plan. For physical displacement, PR5 requires that alternative housing and/or cash compensation be provided prior to relocation. For economic displacement due to loss of assets or access restrictions, PR5 calls for 'prompt' compensation but does not require that resettlement entitlements must be provided before displacement or imposition of access restrictions, as required by the GEF requirement.</p> <p>(EBRD Management Response: EBRD does not agree with this assessment as compensation is discussed without any differentiation between physical and economic in para. 30 of PR5. The same standards apply for both (as per subsequent paragraphs 34-40 of PR5.). The difference of course is that while a new building can be assessed straight away, for its acceptability, it takes a longer period of time to assess whether livelihoods have been restored.)</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> EBRD will consider stating this principle explicitly in the forthcoming review of its Environmental and Social Policy. EBRD is currently preparing implementation guidelines and will also ensure that they explicitly state this Minimum Requirement.</p>	<p>Revised <i>EBRD Environmental and Social Policy</i> (available at <a href="http://www.ebrd.com/pages/about/principles/sustainability/policies.shtml">http://www.ebrd.com/pages/about/principles/sustainability/policies.shtml</a>) was approved by the Board on May 7, 2014. This updated Policy will come into force on November 7, 2014.</p> <p>PR5, <i>Land Acquisition, Involuntary Resettlement and Economic Displacement</i>, mandates compensation for displaced persons to be provided <b>before</b> displacement or imposition of access restrictions (para. 17).</p>	Completed

# ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
1.7	Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;	<p>FAO guidelines do not require that independent experts conduct Category A assessments (although it does require site visits by an independent experts during preparation of EIAs for Category A projects. FAO requires that independent advisory panels be formed for highly risky projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO has initiated a process to enhance its system of environmental and social safeguards and ensure full implementation consistent with the GEF's Minimum Standards. As part of this initiative, FAO agrees to clarify its requirements regarding the use of independent expertise in the preparation of ESIA's.</p>	<p>The FAO Corporate Programme Management Board (CPMB) approved in April 2014 the establishment of a technical network on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA). The main purpose of the network is to mainstream environmental and social considerations into the work of the Organization and to build capacities throughout the house, and in particular in the Decentralized Offices. Under this TN on ESIA, FAO is developing an e-learning tool that provides a step-by-step approach on how to operationalize ESIA Guidelines approved in 2012. As of August 2014, following internal consultations with key stakeholders, the contents of the e-learning tool have been developed, approved and will be released by November 2014.</p> <p>Concerning the use of independent expertise, specific reference is made in the e-learning tool:</p> <p><i>... Category A projects in all cases require a site visit by an independent, qualified environmental and social assessment expert or team of expert depending on the key issues considered to pose risk.</i></p> <p><i>(FAO Procedural Requirements for Category A projects Pg 42). Annex 1</i></p> <p>“In addition, if the project is considered particularly sensitive or potentially controversial, FAO requires a small, independent advisory panel of experts to serve as peer review in those topics considered of particularly high risk.” (Module 8)</p> <p>The final version of the E-learning tool will be launched on an ESIA web site and shared widely throughout FAO by November 2014.</p>	End-2014

ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
1.9	Disclose draft environmental and social impact assessments in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft assessments in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO could not provide documentation that recorded the form and timing of disclosures.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	<p>In the past year FAO has improved and incorporated in the new Project Cycle Guide (2013) environmental and social sustainability aspects as part of the corporate Quality Appraisal Review checklist of project.</p> <p>The draft new project cycle guide (September 2014), which is currently circulating for internal review, includes Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) modules for the Programme and Project Review Committee (PPRC) that enables the systematic categorization of projects, an essential element for tracking. (See Annex 4, “Project Idea and Concept Note Template” under section 2)</p> <p>The project formulators, with the support of in-house and independent ESIA experts will generate key information identified during preparation in consultation in consultation with stakeholders, including modalities of disclosure, such as timing, venue and location of disclosure undertaken, as well as any other information that national or local legislation may specifically require. These aspects are further elaborated in Module 7 of the e-learning tool which will be included in the updating of the EIA Guidelines.</p> <p>For this information to be systematically and efficiently captured, action is underway to involve information technology experts who will closely work with the ESIA expert/team to develop a web-based system for public disclosure of draft environmental impact assessments, mitigation plans, and other related documentation.</p>	End-2014
<b>2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</b>				
2.10	Disclose draft mitigation plan in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft assessments and mitigation plans in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO could not provide documentation that recorded the form and timing of disclosures.	As discussed above in 1.9.	End-2014

## ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		<b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.		
<b>3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b>				
3	Established policies, procedures, and guidelines require the Agency to ensure that involuntary resettlement is avoided or minimized. Where this is not feasible, the Agency is required to ensure displaced persons are assisted in improving or at least restoring their livelihoods and standards of living in real terms relative to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher;	<p>FAO substantially meets this Minimum Standard. FAO has a clear policy prohibition against supporting projects that may involve involuntary physical relocation or economic displacement caused by land acquisition or loss of assets (including from access restrictions to protected areas). Given this prohibition, the GEF's requirements regarding involuntary physical relocation and economic displacement do not apply to FAO. FAO, however, does implement projects concerning the creation or expansion of protected areas, which may involve imposition of access restrictions that may result in loss of income and/or livelihood impacts. FAO's policy prohibitions indicate that it must pursue voluntary agreements for projects involving potential access restrictions; but, this approach is not reflected in FAO's requirements with sufficient clarity.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will codify its approach of ensuring that conservation agreements/legal ownership agreements are reached with affected communities for protected area projects that may involve access restrictions. This will be included in revisions to its Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines over the next year.</p>	FAO's approach to involuntary settlement, including agreements with affected communities, will be substantially enhanced in the revised ESIA guidelines.	End-2014
<b>4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES</b>				
4.8	For those projects where the environmental and social impact assessment identifies adverse	FAO requires development of an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) for projects that affect indigenous Peoples. The plan is to include measures	The FAO Indigenous Peoples focal point has been designated and started duties in June 2014. The UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples (UNPFII) designated their focal point for	End-2014

## ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	effects on Indigenous Peoples, Agency policies require that the project develop an Indigenous Peoples plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected Indigenous Peoples.	for provision of appropriate benefits. However, the trigger for requiring an IPP is not specified, and no generic outline of the content of an IPP is available.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO agrees to specify the generic content of and triggers for requiring and Indigenous Peoples Plan when it updates its EIA Guidelines.	collaboration with FAO in July 2014. Following the World Conference of Indigenous Peoples which will take place in September 2014, the two focal points will work on the way forward to implement the FAO Policy of Indigenous Peoples.  FAO has been working with Indigenous Peoples leaders on how best to implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the Governance of Tenure (VGGT) with respect to indigenous peoples. In addition, a Free Prior and Informed Consent manual has been prepared by IP and FAO experts to assist in the implementation of the VGGT. This work is forming the basis for incorporating VGGTs and FPIC into the FAO project cycle and Environmental Impact Assessment guidelines.  FAO has organized a meeting with indigenous peoples to take place in Cusco in November 2014 to discuss these and other matters.  The ESIA learning module has elaborated on the triggers for requiring an indigenous peoples' plan and on the generic outline.  The triggers and the generic content of Indigenous Peoples' Plan will also be included when updating the current EIA Guidelines.	
4.9	Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft mitigation plans, including Indigenous Peoples Plans, in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO does not have a tracking system to ensure requirements are addressed.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.	As discussed above in 1.9.	End-2014



ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>5. PEST MANAGEMENT</b>				
5.6	Disclose draft mitigation plans in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft mitigation plans, including Pest Management Plans, in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO does not have a tracking system to ensure requirements are addressed.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	<p>The ESIA e-learning tool recognizes pesticides as a special issue of concern in FAO.</p> <p>The development a web-based tracking tool system (discussed above in 1.9) will provide documentation that records the form, venue and timing of disclosure.</p>	End-2014
<b>6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
6.5	Disclose draft mitigation plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft mitigation plans, including plans to protect cultural heritage, in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO does not have a tracking system to ensure requirements are addressed.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	<p>FAO rarely gets involved in projects with impacts on physical and cultural resources (PCR) and the ESIA guidelines stipulate that this should be avoided (page 25 of the EIA Guidelines).</p> <p>In cases where there are impacts to PCR, the same information that records the form, venue and timing of disclosure to be recorded in the web based tracking tool system (discussed above in 1.9).</p>	End-2014
<b>7. SAFETY OF DAMS</b>				
7.6	Disclose draft plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>FAO guidelines require disclosure of draft mitigation plans, including dam safety plans, in an accessible form and language in a timely manner, before project appraisal. However, FAO does not have a tracking system to ensure requirements are addressed.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	As discussed above in 1.9.	End-2014

## ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS</b>				
8.1	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall have accountability systems or measures that are designed to ensure enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and related systems.</p> <p>GEF Partner Agencies' accountability systems shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Designed to address potential breaches of a GEF Partner Agency's policies and procedures;</li> <li>b. Independent, transparent, and effective;</li> <li>c. Accessible to project-affected people;</li> <li>d. Required to keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and</li> <li>e. Required to maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.</li> </ul>	<p>FAO does not currently have a system or mechanism for ensuring accountability/compliance for the enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies, including an accessible, transparent system for receiving, processing, and investigating external stakeholder complaints regarding breaches of such policies.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO is reviewing other agencies' practices and proposals for ensuring compliance review (including UNDP's Proposal for Environmental and Social Compliance and Grievance Processes and among UN-REDD agencies). FAO plans to meet the GEF requirements by the end of 2014.</p>	<p>FAO is fully committed in ensuring accountability and dispute resolution mechanism if stakeholders are affected by any adverse impact from FAO projects and programmes.</p> <p>As a result, it aims on an accountability and dispute resolution mechanisms that is light in procedures. In this regard, FAO has reviewed different options, including the practices of other Agencies.</p> <p>Within FAO structure proposals range from the Inspector General office, office of evaluation and most probable enhancement of the Environment Impact Unit.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Unit, which is in the process of being established within the appropriate structure in the Organization will also coordinate FAO's compliance with ESIA, and will serve as an entry point to receive any complaints from affected stakeholders. Discussion is under consideration on the role of the Office of Inspector General and the Heads of Regional and Sub-Regional Offices.</p> <p>These are currently with decision organs of the organization.</p>	End-2014
8.2	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall also have systems or measures for the receipt of and timely response to complaints from parties affected by the implementation of the Partner Agencies' projects and which seek resolution of such complaints. Such systems are not intended to substitute for the country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms.</p> <p>With regard to systems for the</p>	<p>FAO also does not currently have an agency-wide grievance redress system for receiving, processing, and addressing external stakeholder complaints regarding social and environmental issues of FAO supported projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> FAO is reviewing other agencies' practices and proposals for providing grievance redress mechanisms and systems (including UNDP's Proposal for Environmental and Social Compliance and Grievance Processes and among UN-REDD agencies). FAO plans to meet the GEF requirements by the end of 2014.</p>	See 8.1 above	End-2014

ANNEX I-2: FAO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	<p>receipt and response to complaints, GEF Partner Agencies shall:</p> <p>a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects.</p> <p>b. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing.</p> <p>c. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information.</p> <p>d. Publicly designate the contact information for the staff and/or division responsible for receiving and responding to complaints. This information should preferably be designated both on the Agency's website and on separate websites, if established, for specific projects. For individual projects, this information should be provided in local languages.</p> <p>e. Inform project stakeholders of the existence of the Agency's Accountability and Grievance Systems during consultations and inform stakeholders how they may file complaints, including provision of contact information for the responsible staff or division.</p>			

# ANNEX I-3: IDB IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>5. PEST MANAGEMENT</b>				
5.4	Follow the recommendations and minimum standards as described in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) <i>International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides</i> (Rome, 2003) and its associated technical guidelines and procure only pesticides, along with suitable protective and application equipment that will permit pest management actions to be carried out with well-defined and minimal risk to health, environment and livelihoods.	<p>Current guidelines do not require IDB projects to follow FAO's <i>International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides</i>.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IDB will prepare a guidance document on the application of its Environmental Safeguard Policy Directive B.10 that covers the distribution and use of pesticides, including the requirements of FAO's <i>International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides</i>. This document will be available for use during project preparation and implementation and will be published and available to the public.</p>	IDB is in the process of preparing a guidance document.	November 15, 2014

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
1.8	Provide for the application of the Minimum Requirements to subprojects under investment and rural finance (RF) activities;	<p>Neither the <i>Environmental and Social Assessment Procedures</i> (ESAP) nor the Guidance Statement 10 on Rural Finance (RF) provides clear guidance regarding what types of environmental and social due diligence IFAD will require of rural finance institutions executing IFAD financial intermediary projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will revise its Guidance Statement 10 to clarify environmental and social due diligence requirements to assess the potential environmental and social impacts and risks associated with rural financial institutions activities that receive IFAD support. All RF projects are currently treated as Category B. IFAD will support financial service providers (FSPs) to have in place or to establish an appropriate environmental and social management system commensurate with the nature and risks of the RFIs likely portfolio supported using IFAD finance.</p>	<p>Building on existing procedures and practices of selected international financing institutions and multilaterals, IFAD revised its draft Guidance Statement 12 on Rural Finance. The Statement clarifies the types of environmental and social due diligence needed for FSP activities supported by IFAD.</p> <p>The Guidance Statement is more prescriptive in terms of specific steps to reduce the potential adverse environmental or social risks to be followed by FSPs. This especially concerns all projects and programmes which include the support of FSPs through the provision of a line of credit that are classified as Category A or that implement credit operations specified in Category B.</p>	End-2014
1.9	Disclose draft environmental and social impact assessments in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>Neither the ESAP nor IFAD's Disclosure Policy requires draft environmental impact assessments to be disclosed "before project appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them".</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will revise its ESAP to ensure that all relevant documentation (ESIAs, draft resettlement plans, draft mitigation plans and frameworks, documentation of the IP Consultation process) is disclosed in a timely manner prior to Appraisal, in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to affected persons and key</p>	<p>IFAD launched a consultation process to receive staff and management feedback on the revised ESAP (new title 'Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures' -SECAP). The draft SECAP includes thirteen Guidance Statements and was posted on intranet for wide staff feedback by 4 September. In addition, IFAD consulted the Multilateral Financial Institutions/Working group on Environment in May 2014.</p> <p>IFAD developed internal procedure and templates for ESIA, Resettlement, and</p>	End-2014

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		stakeholders. This action will fulfill the following safeguard requirements: 2.10, 3.8, 4.9, 5.6, 6.5, and 7.6 below.	Indigenous Peoples Framework/Plans. As a result, these documents can now be captured through the disclosure workflow for posting on IFAD's public website thus meeting the required project milestone (IFAD Quality Assurance stage). These actions fulfill requirements 2.10, 3.8, 4.9, 5.6, 6.5 and 7.6 below.  IFAD will submit the draft SECAP to its Executive Board in mid-December; this would enable the completion of all outstanding GEF requirements by end-2014.	
<b>2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</b>				
2.10	Disclose draft mitigation plan in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	Neither the ESAP nor IFAD's Disclosure Policy requires relevant draft mitigation plans to be disclosed "before project appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them".  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will revise its ESAP to ensure that all relevant documentation (ESIAs, draft resettlement plans, draft mitigation plans and frameworks, documentation of the IP Consultation process) is disclosed in a timely manner prior to Appraisal, in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to affected persons and key stakeholders. This action will fulfill the following safeguard requirements: 2.10, 3.8, 4.9, 5.6, 6.5, and 7.6 below.	See 1.9 above.	End-2014
<b>3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b>				
3.1	Agency policies require the assessment of all viable alternative project designs to avoid, where feasible, or minimize involuntary resettlement;	IFAD's "Land Policy" - Improving Access to Land and Tenure Security - articulates several important guiding principles that minimize the risk of negative	IFAD finalized the review of: (i) relevant policies and procedural documents of other international development agencies; (ii)	End-2014

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
3.2	Through census and socio-economic surveys of the affected population, the Agency identifies, assesses, and addresses the potential economic and social impacts of the project that are caused by involuntary taking of land (e.g. relocation or loss of shelter, loss of assets or access to assets, loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location) or involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas;	economic or social impacts arising from “involuntary resettlement,” as defined under the GEF Policy. IFAD’s Land Policy requires “adherence of a ‘do-no-harm’ principle at all times” and “adherence to the principle of free, prior, and informed consent” (FPIC) for “any development intervention that might affect the land access and use rights of communities.”  The Policy states that IFAD “will ensure that their free, prior, and informed consent has been solicited through inclusive consultations based on full disclosure of the intent and scope of the activities planned and their implications.”	relevant cross-cutting IFAD policies; and (iii) past and on-going IFAD-supported projects and programmes to draw on experiences and emerging issues pertaining to involuntary resettlement.  IFAD developed a draft Guidance Statement (proportionate to the range of risk of IFAD’s operations) to identify and address risks on resettlement. IFAD held discussions with selected staff who contributed towards the development of the overall framework.	
3.3	The Agency identifies and addresses impacts, also if they result from other activities that are (a) directly and significantly related to the proposed GEF-financed project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives, and (c) carried out or planned to be carried out contemporaneously with the project. The Agency consults project-affected persons, host communities and local CSOs, as appropriate.	IFAD has explained that this policy is enforced through its Quality Assurance Process.  While the risk of involuntary resettlement in the context of IFAD projects is quite low, it is not non-existent. IFAD’s policies and procedures are not presently fully adequate for identifying and addressing such risks should they occur, including in terms of determining any needed compensation for such individuals.	The final GS will fulfill requirements 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.10. Also see 1.9 above.	
3.5	If resettlement is required, provide persons to be resettled with opportunities to participate in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the resettlement program- especially in the process of developing and implementing the procedures for determining eligibility for compensation benefits and development assistance (as documented in a resettlement plan), and for establishing appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms. Pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, Indigenous Peoples, ethnic minorities, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation;	<b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will: (i) include in its revised ESAP, a clear statement on avoidance of involuntary taking or restrictions on use of land that result in physical displacement (relocation, loss of land, or loss of shelter) and economic displacement (loss of assets, access to assets, income sources, or means of livelihood); and (ii) develop operational guidelines and decision tools ‘foreseen under its <i>Land Policy</i> to cover Minimum Requirements 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.10, as appropriate for IFAD operations. Also see Action 1.9 above.		
3.6	Inform persons to be resettled of their rights, consult them on options, and provide them with			

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives and assistance. For example (a) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributable to the project; (b) if there is relocation, assistance during relocation, and residential housing, or housing sites, or agricultural sites of equivalent productive potential, as required; (c) transitional support and development assistance, such as land preparation, credit facilities, training or job opportunities as required, in addition to compensation measures; (d) cash compensation of land when impact of land acquisitions on livelihoods is minor; (e) provision of civic infrastructure and community services; and (f) give preference to land-based resettlement strategies for persons whose livelihoods are land-based;			
3.7	For those without formal legal rights to lands or claims to such land that could be recognized under the laws of the country, provide resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land to help improve or at least restore their livelihoods;			
3.8	Disclose draft resettlement plans and/or plans to address involuntary restriction on access to protected areas, including documentation of the consultation process, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them. Apply these Minimum Requirements described in the involuntary resettlement section, as applicable and relevant, to subprojects requiring land acquisition.			
3.9	Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of			



# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	access. For projects involving restriction of access, impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.			
3.10	Upon completion of the project, the Agency assesses whether the objectives of the project resettlement plan have been achieved, taking account the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring.			
<b>4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES</b>				
4.9	Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>Neither the ESAP nor IFAD's Disclosure Policy require relevant documents to be disclosed "before project appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them".</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will revise its ESAP to ensure that all relevant documentation (ESIAs, draft resettlement plans, draft mitigation plans and frameworks, documentation of the IP Consultation process) is disclosed in a timely manner prior to appraisal, in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to affected persons and key stakeholders. This action will fulfill the following safeguard requirements: 2.10, 3.8, 4.9, 5.6, 6.5, and 7.6 below.</p>	See 1.9 above.	End-2014
<b>5. PEST MANAGEMENT</b>				
5.6	Disclose draft mitigation plans in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>Neither the ESAP nor IFAD's Disclosure Policy require relevant draft mitigation plans to be disclosed "before project appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them".</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will revise its ESAP to ensure that all relevant documentation (ESIAs, draft</p>	See 1.9 above.	End-2014

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		resettlement plans, draft mitigation plans and frameworks, documentation of the IP Consultation process) is disclosed in a timely manner prior to Appraisal, in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to affected persons and key stakeholders. This action will fulfill the following safeguard requirements: 2.10, 3.8, 4.9, 5.6, 6.5, and 7.6 below.		
6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
6.1	Analyze feasible project alternatives to prevent or minimize or compensate for adverse impacts and enhance positive impacts on PCR, through site selection and design.	IFAD does not have systems or policies for ensuring the protection of physical cultural resources in its projects.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP to include adherence to national laws and regulations pertaining to cultural resources; and (ii) develop a Guidance Statement to promote avoidance and, where not possible, conservation and protection of such resources through assessments and minimization of impacts and risks throughout the course of project design and implementation. The Guidance Statement will seek to meet requirements 6.1 to 6.4 below.	Building on best practice of selected agencies in Physical cultural resources, IFAD developed a new draft Guidance Statement on Physical Cultural Resources 9 and revised its SECAP accordingly. The Guidance Statement emphasizes the use of a precautionary approach, and addresses “chance find”. The final Statement will fulfil requirements 6.1 to 6.4.  For item 6.5 on disclosure, see 1.9 above.	End-2014
6.2	If possible, avoid financing projects that could significantly damage PCR. As appropriate, conduct field-based surveys using qualified specialists to evaluate PCR.			
6.4	Provide for the use of “chance find” procedures that include a pre-approved management and conservation approach for materials that may be discovered during project implementation.			
6.5	Disclose draft mitigation plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.			
7. SAFETY OF DAMS				
7.2	Develop plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.	IFAD addresses the safety of small dams and other rural infrastructure in the context of ESAs performed under its Environmental and Social Assessment Procedures (ESAP). IFAD has experience implementing projects with small dams, including ensuring their safety, and has demonstrated capacity for ensuring dam safety in its projects. However, IFAD does not meet Minimum Requirements 7.2, 7.5, and 7.6, as noted below. IFAD does not develop	IFAD finalized the review of existing procedures and practices of selected agencies on assessing the environmental and social risk associated with safety of small dams. IFAD developed a new draft Guidance Statement on the <i>Safety of Small Dams</i> which is now subject to technical review. The final GS will fulfil requirements 7.2, 7.5 and 7.6 below.	End-2014

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		<p>safety plans for the small dams in its projects, including for construction supervision, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP to include requirements for assessing the potential environmental and social impacts and risks of small dam projects; (ii) develop an Guidance Statement to address the general risk assessment and supervision requirements to apply to construction of new small dams or rehabilitation of existing ones. The Guidance Statement will address the requirements of 7.2, 7.5 and 7.6 below.</p>	For item 7.6 on disclosure, see 1.9 above.	
7.5	Carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated dams after completion of construction/rehabilitation, review/monitor implementation of detailed plans and take appropriate action as needed.	<p>IFAD does not have policies or procedures specifically requiring safety inspections of small dams supported through its projects, but it indicates that safety inspections of dams are part of IFAD project supervision and implementation support missions.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP to include requirements for assessing the potential environmental and social impacts and risks of small dam projects; (ii) develop a Guidance Statement to address the general risk assessment and supervision requirements to apply to construction of new small dams or rehabilitation of existing ones. The Guidance Statement will address the requirements of 7.2, 7.5 and 7.6 below.</p>		
7.6	Disclose draft plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>Neither the ESAP nor IFAD's Disclosure Policy require relevant draft plans to be disclosed "before project appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them".</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP</p>		

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		to include requirements for assessing the potential environmental and social impacts and risks of small dam projects; (ii) develop a Guidance Statement to address the general risk assessment and supervision requirements to apply to construction of new small dams or rehabilitation of existing ones. The Operational Statement will address the requirements of 7.2, 7.5 and 7.6 below.		
<b>8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS</b>				
8.1	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall have accountability systems or measures that are designed to ensure enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and related systems.</p> <p>GEF Partner Agencies' accountability systems shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Designed to address potential breaches of a GEF Partner Agency's policies and procedures;</li> <li>b. Independent, transparent, and effective;</li> <li>c. Accessible to project-affected people;</li> <li>d. Required to keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and</li> <li>e. Required to maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.</li> </ul>	<p>IFAD's Office of Audit and Oversight does not have authority to investigate and enforce compliance with IFAD's environmental and social safeguard policies.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will review other agencies (including Asian Development Bank, International Finance Corporation, United Nations Development Programme and World Bank) practices and proposals for accountability and grievance and draw from their experiences. IFAD will establish an Accountability and Grievance System to receive and facilitate resolution of affected people's concerns and complaints regarding breaches of its environmental and social policies. IFAD will also seek to meet all the requirements mentioned in section 8.2 below.</p>	<p>IFAD evaluated various options for establishing an Accountability and Grievance system, while taking into account its special status and mandate. IFAD proposed two options for consideration by its management.</p>	End-2014
8.2	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall also have systems or measures for the receipt of and timely response to complaints from parties affected by the implementation of the Partner Agencies' projects and which seek resolution of such complaints. Such systems are not intended to substitute for the country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms.</p> <p>With regard to systems for the receipt and response to complaints, GEF Partner Agencies shall:</p>	<p>IFAD's Office of Audit and Oversight does not have authority to investigate and respond to complaints arising from IFAD's projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> IFAD will review other agencies' practices and proposals for accountability and grievances, including Asian Development Bank, International Finance Corporation, United Nations Development Programme and World Bank, and draw from their experiences. IFAD will establish an Accountability and Grievance System to receive and facilitate resolution of affected people's concerns and</p>	<p>IFAD developed measures for the receipt of and timely response to complaints regarding breaches of its environmental and social policies for consideration by its management.</p>	

# ANNEX I-4: IFAD IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	<p>a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects.</p> <p>b. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing.</p> <p>c. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information.</p>	complaints regarding breaches of its environmental and social policies. IFAD will also seek to meet all the requirements mentioned in section 8.2 below.		

ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
1.4	Feasible investment, technical, and siting alternatives, including the “no action” alternative, are assessed, as well as potential impacts, feasibility of mitigating these impacts, their capital and recurrent costs, their suitability under local conditions, and the institutional, training and monitoring requirements associated with them;	<p>UNDP requirements for alternatives assessment are comprehensive, but the ESSP does not specifically require that the “no action” scenario be included as part of the alternatives analysis although UNDP staff consider it to be an assumed option.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will require that the “no action” scenario is an element of the alternatives analysis for projects that require full ESIA.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES “Policy Delivery Process and Accountability” Section.</p>	Completed
1.7	Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;	<p>External experts typically prepare assessments for GEF-financed projects. UNDP recommends but does not require that independent experts conduct assessments for high-risk projects. For very high-risk projects, ESSP calls for consideration of forming an independent advisory panel but does not require it. External experts are to verify monitoring information for projects with significant impacts (i.e., diverse, irreversible or unprecedented).</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will (a) require that independent experts conduct assessments for projects with significant impacts (Cat. 3b); (b) require use of independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or involve serious multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns.</p>		
1.9	Disclose draft environmental and social impact assessments in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	ESSP requires that all relevant information be disclosed, including assessments and management plans. Disclosure is to occur early and on an ongoing basis. However, requirements do not mention disclosure of <u>draft</u> assessments or mitigation plans nor do they address issues of accessibility, form, or language of disclosures.		

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
		<b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will clarify that draft assessments and mitigation plans will be disclosed in a timely manner, before appraisal, in accessible place and in a form and language understandable to project affected groups and CSOs.		
<b>2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</b>				
2.3	Avoid significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those habitats that are: a) Legally protected, b) Officially proposed for protection, c) Identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or d) Recognized as protected by traditional local communities.	POPP states that UNDP “shall strive to ensure” to avoid the “conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those that are (a) legally protected, (b) officially proposed for protection, (c) identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or (d) recognized as protected by traditional communities.” ESSP calls for identification of projects that may convert or degrade critical natural habitats, but does not repeat the POPP standard nor provide standards for addressing potential conversion or degradation.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will clarify requirements that prohibit financing for projects that involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats during its review of its ESSP and policy framework.	UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a>  See SES Standard 1 “Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management”.	Completed
2.6	Do not finance projects that will involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including forests, or that will contravene applicable international environmental agreements.	POPP states that UNDP “shall strive to ensure” to avoid the “conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those that are (a) legally protected, (b) officially proposed for protection, (c) identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or (d) recognized as protected by traditional communities.” ESSP calls for identification of projects that may convert or degrade critical natural habitats, but does not repeat the POPP standard nor provide standards for addressing potential conversion or degradation.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will clarify requirements that prohibit financing of natural forest harvesting or plantation development that will involve conversion or degradation of		

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
		critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats.		
2.7	Do not finance natural forest harvesting or plantation development that will involve conversion or degradation of critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats.	<p>POPP states that UNDP “shall strive to ensure” avoidance of conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats. For other natural habitats, it promotes application of sustainable management and conservation measures. But it does not appear to meet fully the GEF Minimum Requirement that <u>prohibits</u> forest harvesting or plantation development that may convert or degrade critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will clarify that it will not finance natural forest harvesting or plantation development that will involve conversion or degradation of critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats.</p>		
2.8	Ensure that forest restoration projects maintain or enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality and that all plantation projects are environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable.	<p>UNDP does not appear to have specific standards regarding forest restoration and plantation development. The POPP’s call to promote sustainable management of natural habitats would apply to these activities.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will adopt a requirement for forest restoration projects to maintain or enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality and that all plantation projects be environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable.</p>		
2.10	Disclose draft mitigation plan in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>ESSP requires that all relevant mitigation plans be disclosed early and on an ongoing basis, disclosure of draft mitigation plans is not mentioned. Nor do does it address issues of accessibility, form, or language of disclosures.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will clarify that draft mitigation plans will be disclosed in a timely manner, before appraisal, in accessible place and in a form and language understandable to project affected groups and CSOs.</p>		



## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
<b>3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b>				
3.1	Agency policies require it to assess all viable alternative project designs to avoid, where feasible, or minimize involuntary resettlement;	<p>UNDP supports a human rights approach to development. The POPP states that UNDP “shall strive to ensure” involuntary resettlement is avoided. If unavoidable, UNDP shall strive to ensure that displaced persons are informed of their rights, consulted on options, and offered technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives or fair and adequate compensation. However, the ESSP does not provide additional standards or guidance beyond screening for projects that may involve resettlement. Economic and livelihood impacts from resettlement or access restrictions to protected areas are not specifically addressed. GEF criteria for improving or at least restoring standards of living of resettled persons are not addressed. Current UNDP operational policies, procedures, and guidelines do not fully address Minimum Requirements 3.1 through 3.10.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDPs will develop a Social and Environmental Quality Standard on displacement and resettlement and will revise the ESSP to align with the standard to address Minimum Requirements 3.1 through 3.10. UNDP will address Minimum Requirements 3.1 through 3.10 through the quality standard on displacement and resettlement to be developed and related revisions to its ESSP.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES Standard 5 “Displacement and Resettlement” and “Policy Delivery Process and Accountability” Section</p>	Completed
3.2	Through census and socio-economic surveys of the affected population, the Agency identifies, assesses, and addresses the potential economic and social impacts of the project that are caused by involuntary taking of land (e.g. relocation or loss of shelter, loss of assets or access to assets, loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location) or involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas;			
3.3	The Agency identifies and addresses impacts, also if they result from other activities that are (a) directly and significantly related to the proposed GEF-financed project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives, and (c) carried out or planned to be carried out contemporaneously with the project. The Agency consults project-affected persons, host communities and local CSOs, as appropriate.			
3.4	For projects that involve the involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas, policies require the Agency to design, document and disclose before appraisal a participatory process for: (a) preparing and implementing project components; (b) establishing eligibility criteria; (c) agreeing on mitigation measures that help improve or restore livelihoods in a manner that maintains the sustainability of the park or protected area; (d) resolving conflicts; and (e) monitoring implementation.			
3.5	If resettlement is required, provide persons to be resettled with opportunities to participate in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the resettlement program, especially in the process of			

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	developing and implementing the procedures for determining eligibility for compensation benefits and development assistance (as documented in a resettlement plan), and for establishing appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms. Pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, Indigenous Peoples, ethnic minorities, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation;			
3.6	Inform persons to be resettled of their rights, consult them on options, and provide them with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives and assistance. For example (a) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributable to the project; (b) if there is relocation, assistance during relocation, and residential housing, or housing sites, or agricultural sites of equivalent productive potential, as required; (c) transitional support and development assistance, such as land preparation, credit facilities, training or job opportunities as required, in addition to compensation measures; (d) cash compensation of land when impact of land acquisitions on livelihoods is minor; (e) provision of civic infrastructure and community services; and (f) give preference to land-based resettlement strategies for persons whose livelihoods are land-based;			
3.7	For those without formal legal rights to lands or claims to such land that could be recognized under the laws of the country, provide resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land to help improve or at least restore their livelihoods;			
3.8	Disclose draft resettlement plans and/or plans to address involuntary restriction on access to protected areas, including documentation of the			

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	consultation process, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them. Apply these Minimum Requirements described in the involuntary resettlement section, as applicable and relevant, to subprojects requiring land acquisition.			
3.9	Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of access. For projects involving restriction of access, impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.			
3.10	Upon completion of the project, the Agency assesses whether the objectives of the project resettlement plan have been achieved, taking account the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring.			
4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES				
4.1	Screen early for the presence of Indigenous Peoples in the project area, who are identified through criteria that reflect their social and cultural distinctiveness. Such criteria may include: self-identification and identification by others as Indigenous Peoples, collective attachment to land, presence of customary institutions, indigenous language, and primarily subsistence-oriented production.	<p>UNDP screens for potential adverse impacts on Indigenous Peoples or other vulnerable groups. However, the screening procedure does not require screening for presence of Indigenous Peoples in the project area (who may or may not be adversely affected) and it does not contain criteria for the identification of Indigenous Peoples. UNDP's Policy on Engagement with Indigenous Peoples provides criteria for identification, but these are not reflected in the screening procedure.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will screen for presence of Indigenous Peoples in potential project areas and provide criteria for assisting in</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES Standard 6 “Indigenous Peoples”</p> <p>In addition, the UNDP screening procedure is being updated to align with the approved SES. The screening procedure will ensure early screening for the presence of</p>	Completed

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
		identification of Indigenous Peoples.	IPs in the project area.	
4.5	Make provisions in plans, where appropriate, to support activities to establish legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure and management systems and collective rights used by project affected Indigenous Peoples.	<p>UNDG Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples Issues provides a guiding principle that “Indigenous Peoples’ lands and territories should be legally recognized, demarcated, and protected from outside pressures.” However, this guideline does not appear to translate into a requirement for UNDP to promote, where appropriate, legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure systems of Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will support activities to establish legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure and management systems of Indigenous Peoples.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES Standard 6 “Indigenous Peoples”</p>	Completed
4.6	Where restriction of access of Indigenous Peoples to parks and protected areas is not avoidable, ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples fully and effectively participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such parks, protected areas, and species and share equitably in benefits from the parks and protected areas.	<p>Application of the FPIC standard addresses GEF’s Minimum Requirement of full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such areas and would most likely address equitable benefit sharing from such areas. However, UNDP’s policies and/or procedures should clearly address this issue to ensure implementation.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will put in place requirements and procedures for addressing the issue of involuntary restrictions of access of Indigenous Peoples to legally designated parks and protected areas.</p>		
4.8	For those projects where the environmental and	UNDP’s screening procedure refers to the development of		

## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	social impact assessment identifies adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples, Agency policies require that the project develop an Indigenous Peoples plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected Indigenous Peoples.	<p>Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPP), but does not refer to the trigger for requiring such a plan nor does it provide an outline of an IPP and its required elements.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will clarify the trigger for requiring an IPP and outline the required generic content of such plans.</p>		
4.9	Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>UNDP's procedures do not refer to disclosure of draft IPPs nor does it address issues regarding accessibility, form, or language of disclosed plans.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will clarify that draft mitigation plans will be disclosed in a timely manner, before appraisal, in accessible place and in a form and language understandable to project affected groups and CSOs.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES Standard 6 "Indigenous Peoples" and "Policy Delivery Process and Accountability" Section</p>	Completed
4.10	Monitor, by experienced social scientists, the implementation of the project (and any required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework) and its benefits as well as challenging or negative impacts on Indigenous Peoples and address possible mitigation measures in a participatory manner.	<p>UNDP's procedures include detailed monitoring requirements for implementation of environmental and social management plans, which would include an IPP. However, evidence of monitoring reports on implementation of an IPP could not be provided.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will further develop its standards</p>		

# ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
		<p>regarding projects that affect Indigenous Peoples and update its Environmental and Social Screening Procedure to address issues as described below.</p> <p>UNDP will include monitoring on the implementation of an IPP in the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and other UNDP reporting tools as appropriate.</p>		
<b>5. PEST MANAGEMENT</b>				
5.1	Promote the use of demand driven, ecologically-based biological or environmental pest management practices (referred to as Integrated Pest Management [IPM] in agricultural projects and Integrated Vector Management [IVM] in public health projects) and reduce reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides. Include assessment of pest management issues, impacts and risks in the EA process.	<p>UNDP's policy states that it shall strive to ensure minimization of use of harmful chemicals and pesticides and promote a precautionary approach to potential risks. The screening procedure includes questions for identification of projects that may release pollutants or involve use of hazardous pesticides. However, UNDP does not have detailed policy requirements regarding management of pesticides and promotion of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and Integrated Vector Management (IVM) (although project examples demonstrated capacity to address requirements)</p> <p>Current UNDP operational policies, procedures, and guidelines do not fully address Minimum Requirements 5.1 through 5.6.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will address Minimum Requirements 5.1 through 5.6 by updating its policy framework and procedures related to pest management.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at:  <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES Standard 7 "Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency" and "Policy Delivery Process and Accountability" Section</p>	Completed
5.2	The Agency requires that, in the context of projects that it supports, pesticides are procured contingent on an assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users. The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use of formulated products that are in World Health Organization (WHO) Classes IA and IB, or formulations of products in Class II unless there are restrictions that are likely to deny use or access to lay personnel and others without training or proper equipment.			
5.3	The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use in its projects pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants identified under the Stockholm convention.			
5.4	Follow the recommendations and Minimum Standards as described in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of			

# ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	Pesticides (Rome, 2003) and its associated technical guidelines and procure only pesticides, along with suitable protective and application equipment that will permit pest management actions to be carried out with well-defined and minimal risk to health, environment and livelihoods.			
5.5	Support policy reform and institutional capacity development to (a) enhance implementation of IPM- and IVM-based pest management, and (b) regulate and monitor the distribution and use of pesticides.			
5.6	Disclose draft mitigation plans in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.			
6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
6.1	Analyze feasible project alternatives to prevent or minimize or compensate for adverse impacts and enhance positive impacts on PCR, through site selection and design.	UNDP’s policy states that UNDP “shall strive to ensure” that programmes and projects “conserve physical cultural resources and avoid the alteration, damage or removal of any physical cultural resources.” Screening procedure contains questions for identification of projects that may affect areas of “known” physical or cultural significance." However, UNDP's operational guidelines do not reflect UNDP's policy language and does not contain more specific standards regarding physical cultural resources. Current UNDP operational policies, procedures, and guidelines do not fully address Minimum Requirements 6.1 through 6.5 (except 6.3).  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will address Minimum Requirements 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5 in the Social and Environmental quality standards and updated ESSP.	UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a>  See SES Standard 4 “Cultural Heritage” and “Policy Delivery Process and Accountability” Section	Completed
6.2	If possible, avoid financing projects that could significantly damage PCR. As appropriate, conduct field-based surveys using qualified specialists to evaluate PCR.			
6.4	Provide for the use of “chance find” procedures that include a pre-approved management and conservation approach for materials that may be discovered during project implementation.			
6.5	Disclose draft mitigation plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.			
7. SAFETY OF DAMS				
7.1	Use experienced and competent professionals to	UNDP typically only supports small dams and applies its	UNDP senior management	Completed



# ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	design and supervise the construction, operation, and maintenance of dams and associated works.	general environmental and social screening, assessment, and risk management procedures to projects involving dams. However, UNDP's guidelines do not contain more specific standards regarding dam safety that address GEF's Minimum Requirements. Current UNDP operational policies, procedures, and guidelines do not fully address Minimum Requirements 7.1 through 7.6.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP will address Minimum Requirements 7.1 through 7.6 in a quality standard on community health and safety.	approved UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a>  See SES Standard 3 "Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions" and "Policy Delivery Process and Accountability" Section	
7.2	Develop plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.			
7.3	Use independent advice on the verification of design, construction, and operational procedures.			
7.4	Use contractors that are qualified and experienced to undertake planned construction activities.			
7.5	Carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated dams after completion of construction/rehabilitation, review/monitor implementation of detailed plans and take appropriate action as needed.			
7.6	Disclose draft plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.			
8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS				
8.1	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall have accountability systems or measures that are designed to ensure enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and related systems.</p> <p>GEF Partner Agencies' accountability systems shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Designed to address potential breaches of a GEF Partner Agency's policies and procedures;</li><li>b. Independent, transparent, and effective;</li><li>c. Accessible to project-affected people;</li><li>d. Required to keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and</li><li>e. Required to maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.</li></ul>	<p>UNDP is currently piloting the implementation of an agency accountability mechanism and dispute resolution processes. The Charter of the Office of Audit and Investigation (OAI) has been revised to include compliance reviews for UNDP's social and environmental policies and procedures. Compliance review experts have been working with OAI since early 2013. UNDP has agreed to implement an interim compliance review and dispute resolution process for those pilot countries UNDP is supporting under the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and with GEF-financed projects, and intends to set up these pilots in late 2013 and the first half of 2014. The interim approach is designed and implemented partly with the goal of providing lessons and expertise that will assist in the development and implementation of the permanent compliance review and dispute resolution processes. UNDP's piloted compliance and grievance systems are based on UNDP's "Proposal for Environmental</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES "Policy Delivery Process and Accountability" Section and draft Standard Operating Procedures for UNDP's Social and Environmental Compliance Unit available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p>	Completed



## ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
		and Social Compliance Review and Dispute Resolution Processes” (July 2013) which, if adopted, would address requirements GEF Minimum Standards 8: Accountability and Grievance systems.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP’s plans to meet this standard are outlined in the adjacent description of the outstanding items.	<a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a>	
8.2	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall also have systems or measures for the receipt of and timely response to complaints from parties affected by the implementation of the Partner Agencies’ projects and which seek resolution of such complaints. Such systems are not intended to substitute for the country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms.</p> <p>With regard to systems for the receipt and response to complaints, GEF Partner Agencies shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects.</li> <li>b. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing.</li> <li>c. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information.</li> <li>d. Publicly designate the contact information for the staff and/or division responsible for receiving and responding to complaints. This information should preferably be designated both on the Agency’s website and on separate websites, if established, for specific projects. For individual projects, this information should be provided in local languages.</li> <li>e. Inform project stakeholders of the existence of the Agency’s Accountability and Grievance</li> </ul>	<p>See above (8.1).</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNDP’s plans to meet this standard are outlined in the adjacent description of outstanding items under 8.1.</p>	<p>UNDP senior management approved UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p> <p>See SES “Policy Delivery Process and Accountability” Section and “UNDPs Stakeholder Response Mechanism: Overview and Guidance” available at: <a href="http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html">http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/social-and-environmental-sustainability-in-undp/feedback.html</a></p>	Completed

# ANNEX I-5: UNDP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end- August, 2014	Timeline
	Systems during consultations and inform stakeholders how they may file complaints, including provision of contact information for the responsible staff or division.			

# ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
1.1	The Agency uses a screening process for each proposed project, as early as possible, to determine the appropriate extent and type of environmental and social impact assessment required of the project so that appropriate studies are undertaken proportional to potential risks and to direct, and, as relevant, indirect, cumulative, and associated impacts. The Agency also uses strategic, sectoral or regional environmental assessment, when appropriate.	<p>UNEP's mission and business model are dedicated to environmental protection and it has various environmental programmes, safeguards, and checklists in place. But, it was assessed as not having sufficiently detailed operational policies, procedures, or guidelines needed to meet the Minimum Requirements.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the needed improvements to its environmental and social impact assessment framework through the adoption of its <i>Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability (ESSP) Framework</i> and related guidelines. UNEP will also update its ESIA training manual for use by project staff.</p>	After consultations among staff and senior management bodies, the ESES Framework is under final revisions for the ED's approval. UNEP is working, in parallel, on the operational mechanism--e.g., screening tools, guidelines, institutional setup and related training—in preparation of the official roll-out.	End-2014
1.2	Assesses potential impacts of the proposed project to physical, biological, socioeconomic, cultural, and physical cultural resources, including transboundary concerns, and potential impacts on human health and safety;			
1.3	Assesses the adequacy of the applicable legal and institutional framework, including applicable international environmental agreements, and confirms that project activities that will contravene such international obligations are not financed;			
1.4	Feasible investment, technical, and siting alternatives, including the “no action” alternative, are assessed, as well as potential impacts, feasibility of mitigating these impacts, their capital and recurrent costs, their suitability under local conditions, and the institutional, training and monitoring requirements associated with them;			
1.5	Agency policy requires executors of projects receiving GEF funds to place a priority on the prevention of harmful social and environmental impacts. And where not possible to prevent such impacts, project executors are required to at least minimize, or compensate adverse project impacts and enhance positive impacts through environmental planning and management that includes the proposed mitigation measures, monitoring, institutional capacity development and training measures, an implementation schedule, and cost estimates			

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
1.6	Involve stakeholders, including project-affected groups, indigenous peoples, and local CSOs, as early as possible, in the preparation process and ensure that their views and concerns are made known to decision makers and taken into account. Continue consultations throughout project implementation as necessary to address environmental and social impact assessment-related issues that affect them; Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;			
1.7	Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;			
1.9	Disclose draft environmental and social impact assessments in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.		UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP's commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans.	Completed
<b>2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</b>				
2.2	Give preference to siting physical infrastructure investments on lands where natural habitats have already been converted to other land uses;	UNEP's mission and business model are dedicated to conservation of biodiversity and protection of natural habitat, but it was assessed as not having sufficiently detailed operational policies, procedures, or guidelines needed to meet the relevant Minimum Requirements.  Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make the needed improvements to its natural habitat protection	UNEP's draft ESES Framework includes a proposed "Safeguard Policy on Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Habitat, and Sustainable Management of Living Resources", which captures the GEF minimum requirements.	End-2014
2.3	Avoid significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those habitats that are: a) Legally protected, b) Officially proposed for protection, c) Identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or			

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	d) Recognized as protected by traditional local communities.	safeguards operational policies in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.	The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.  UNEP will mandate “ESES Management Plan” for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.  UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP’s commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans. This policy is applicable in UNEP’s handling of natural habitat.	
2.4	Where projects adversely affect non-critical natural habitats, proceed only if viable alternatives are not available, and if appropriate conservation and mitigation measures, including those required to maintain ecological services they provide, are in place. Include also mitigation measures that minimize habitat loss and establish and maintain an ecologically similar protected area.			
2.6	Do not finance projects that will involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including forests, or that will contravene applicable international environmental agreements.			
2.8	Ensure that forest restoration projects maintain or enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality and that all plantation projects are environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable.			
2.9	Consult appropriate experts and key stakeholders, including local nongovernmental organizations and local communities, and involve such people in design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of projects, including mitigation planning.			
2.10	Disclose draft mitigation plan in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.			
3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT				
3.1	Agency policies require it to assess all viable alternative project designs to avoid, where feasible, or minimize involuntary resettlement;	In accordance with paragraph 3.11 of the Policy, this standard was assessed as applying to UNEP given that it implements projects “concerning the creation or expansion of protected areas. “ It does not, however, appear that UNEP projects pose a significant risk in terms of causing the physical relocation of people. All requirements under the standard related to restriction of access to protected areas apply to UNEP.	UNEP’s draft ESES Framework includes a proposed “Safeguard Policy on involuntary settlement” which captures the GEF minimum requirements.  The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce	End-2014
3.2	Through census and socio-economic surveys of the affected population, the Agency identifies, assesses, and addresses the potential economic and social impacts of the project that are caused by involuntary taking of land (e.g. relocation or loss of shelter, loss of assets or access to assets, loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location) or involuntary restriction of access to legally			

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	designated parks and protected areas;	<p>UNEP was assessed as not having sufficient operational policies, procedures, or guidelines that specifically address relevant resettlement issues in its projects, including economic displacement or livelihood impacts caused by restrictions on access to protected areas.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the needed improvements to address resettlement issues in its projects in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework. This will also be tied to the development of UNEP's Grievance mechanism.</p>	<p>potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.</p> <p>UNEP will mandate “ESES Management Plan” for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.</p> <p>UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP’s commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans. This policy is applicable in UNEP’s handling of involuntary settlement issues.</p>	
3.3	The Agency identifies and addresses impacts, also if they result from other activities that are (a) directly and significantly related to the proposed GEF-financed project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives, and (c) carried out or planned to be carried out contemporaneously with the project. The Agency consults project-affected persons, host communities and local CSOs, as appropriate.			
3.4	For projects that involve the involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas, policies require the Agency to design, document and disclose before appraisal a participatory process for: (a) preparing and implementing project components; (b) establishing eligibility criteria; (c) agreeing on mitigation measures that help improve or restore livelihoods in a manner that maintains the sustainability of the park or protected area; (d) resolving conflicts; and (e) monitoring implementation.			
3.5	If resettlement is required, provide persons to be resettled with opportunities to participate in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the resettlement program, especially in the process of developing and implementing the procedures for determining eligibility for compensation benefits and development assistance (as documented in a resettlement plan), and for establishing appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms. Pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, Indigenous Peoples, ethnic minorities, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation;			
3.6	Inform persons to be resettled of their rights, consult them on options, and provide them with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives and assistance. For example (a) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributable to the project; (b) if there is relocation, assistance during relocation, and residential housing, or housing sites, or			

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	agricultural sites of equivalent productive potential, as required; (c) transitional support and development assistance, such as land preparation, credit facilities, training or job opportunities as required, in addition to compensation measures; (d) cash compensation of land when impact of land acquisitions on livelihoods is minor; (e) provision of civic infrastructure and community services; and (f) give preference to land-based resettlement strategies for persons whose livelihoods are land-based;			
3.7	For those without formal legal rights to lands or claims to such land that could be recognized under the laws of the country, provide resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land to help improve or at least restore their livelihoods;			
3.8	Disclose draft resettlement plans and/or plans to address involuntary restriction on access to protected areas, including documentation of the consultation process, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them. Apply these Minimum Requirements described in the involuntary resettlement section, as applicable and relevant, to subprojects requiring land acquisition.			
3.9	Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of access. For projects involving restriction of access, impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.			
3.10	Upon completion of the project, the Agency assesses whether the objectives of the project resettlement plan have been achieved, taking account the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring.			
4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES				
4.3	Undertake the environmental and social impact assessment, with involvement of Indigenous Peoples, to assess potential impacts and risks when a project may have adverse impacts. Identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse impacts.	UNEP has adopted a new Indigenous Peoples (IP) Policy Guidance document (2012) and is preparing operational guidelines, an IP checklist, and training toolkit to facilitate its	UNEP’s draft ESES Framework includes a proposed “Safeguard Policy on Indigenous People”, which captures the GEF	End-2014



## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
4.4	Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally appropriate, and gender and generationally inclusive. Full consideration should be given to options preferred by the affected Indigenous Peoples for provision of benefits and mitigation measures.	<p>full implementation (by-end 2013). In practice, UNEP has demonstrated its capacity for dealing with IP in its projects in the past but will need to expand its capacity for implementing the IP Policy Guidance and operational guidelines in the future.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the needed improvements to address Indigenous Peoples issues in its projects in its operational guidelines for the Indigenous Peoples Guidance document. The IP Policy Guidance and operational guidelines are intended to ensure UNEP's engagement with IP in its policies and projects. UNEP will also produce an e-learning Toolkit for staff.</p>	<p>minimum requirements.</p> <p>The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.</p> <p>UNEP will mandate "ESES Management Plan" for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.</p> <p>UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP's commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans. This policy is applicable in UNEP's dealing of indigenous peoples.</p>	
4.5	Make provisions in plans, where appropriate, to support activities to establish legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure and management systems and collective rights used by project affected Indigenous Peoples.			
4.6	Where restriction of access of Indigenous Peoples to parks and protected areas is not avoidable, ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples fully and effectively participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such parks, protected areas, and species and share equitably in benefits from the parks and protected areas.			
4.8	For those projects where the environmental and social impact assessment identifies adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples, Agency policies require that the project develop an Indigenous Peoples plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected Indigenous Peoples.			
4.9	Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.			
4.10	Monitor, by experienced social scientists, the implementation of the project (and any required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework) and its benefits as well as challenging or negative impacts on Indigenous Peoples and address possible mitigation			



## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	measures in a participatory manner.			
5. PEST MANAGEMENT				
5.1	Promote the use of demand driven, ecologically-based biological or environmental pest management practices (referred to as Integrated Pest Management [IPM] in agricultural projects and Integrated Vector Management [IVM] in public health projects) and reduce reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides. Include assessment of pest management issues, impacts and risks in the EA process.	UNEP hosts a number of conventions addressing hazardous chemicals, including pesticides, and its Programme of Work 2012-2-13 includes a sub-programme on Harmful Substances and Hazardous Waste that works to minimize the use of harmful chemicals and pesticides and promotes a precautionary approach to potential risks. However, UNEP does not have sufficient operational policies, procedures, or guidelines in place for ensuring safe pest management in its own projects. UNEP has demonstrated capacity with IVM projects (e.g. particularly concerning the phase-out of DDT) but lacks experience with IPM projects.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make needed improvements to its safeguards operational policies, guidelines, and procedures to meet the outstanding Minimum Requirements listed in column 2 to the left.	UNEP’s draft ESES Framework includes a proposed “Safeguard policy on pollution prevention and management of chemicals and wastes”, which captures the GEF minimum requirements.  The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.  UNEP will mandate “ESES Management Plan” for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.  UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP’s commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans.	End-2014
5.2	The Agency requires that, in the context of projects that it supports, pesticides are procured contingent on an assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users. The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use of formulated products that are in World Health Organization (WHO) Classes IA and IB, or formulations of products in Class II unless there are restrictions that are likely to deny use or access to lay personnel and others without training or proper equipment.			
5.3	The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use in its projects pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants identified under the Stockholm convention.			
5.4	Follow the recommendations and Minimum Standards as described in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides (Rome, 2003) and its associated technical guidelines and procure only pesticides, along with suitable protective and application equipment that will permit pest management actions to be carried out with well-defined and minimal risk to health, environment and livelihoods.			
5.6	Disclose draft mitigation plans in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.			
6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
6.1	Analyze feasible project alternatives to prevent or minimize or	UNEP does not have sufficiently detailed	UNEP’s draft ESES Framework	End-2014

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	compensate for adverse impacts and enhance positive impacts on PCR, through site selection and design.	operational policies, procedures, or guidelines for dealing with physical cultural resources in its projects.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the needed improvements to address physical cultural resources in its projects in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.	includes a proposed “Safeguard policy on Protection of tangible cultural heritage”, which captures the GEF minimum requirements.  The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.  UNEP will mandate “ESES Management Plan” for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.  UNEP <a href="#">approved Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP’s commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans.	
6.2	If possible, avoid financing projects that could significantly damage PCR. As appropriate, conduct field-based surveys using qualified specialists to evaluate PCR.			
6.3	Consult local people and other relevant stakeholders in documenting the presence and significance of PCR, assessing the nature and extent of potential impacts on these resources, and designing and implementing mitigation plans.			
6.4	Provide for the use of “chance find” procedures that include a pre-approved management and conservation approach for materials that may be discovered during project implementation.			
6.5	Disclose draft mitigation plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.			
7. SAFETY OF DAMS				
7.1	Use experienced and competent professionals to design and supervise the construction, operation, and maintenance of dams and associated works.	UNEP does not have sufficiently detailed operational policies, procedures, or guidelines for ensuring the safety of small dams in its projects.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the	UNEP’s draft ESES Framework includes a proposed “Safeguard policy on Safety of dams”, which captures the GEF minimum requirements.	End-2014
7.2	Develop plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.			

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
7.4	Use contractors that are qualified and experienced to undertake planned construction activities.	needed improvements to its operational procedures to address the safety of small dams in its projects.	The screening tool will also incorporate these minimum requirements and demonstrate efforts to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks from the early stage of project preparation.  UNEP will mandate “ESES Management Plan” for medium and high risk projects, which requires regular reporting during the project implementation period.  UNEP approved <a href="#">Access to Information Policy</a> in June 2014. Para. 7 of the policy states UNEP’s commitment to disclose a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans. This policy is applicable in UNEP’s handling of issues related to the safety of dam.	
7.5	Carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated dams after completion of construction/rehabilitation, review/monitor implementation of detailed plans and take appropriate action as needed.			
7.6	Disclose draft plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.			
8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS				
8.1	GEF Partner Agencies shall have accountability systems or measures that are designed to ensure enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and related systems.  GEF Partner Agencies’ accountability systems shall be: a. Designed to address potential breaches of a GEF Partner Agency’s policies and procedures; b. Independent, transparent, and effective; c. Accessible to project-affected people;	UNEP does not have a system or mechanism for ensuring accountability/compliance for the enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies, including an accessible, transparent system for receiving, processing, and investigating external stakeholder complaints regarding breaches of such policies.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the	UNEP is currently working on the accountability and grievance mechanism with the help of a consultant with legal background.	End-2014

## ANNEX I-6: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
	<p>d. Required to keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and</p> <p>e. Required to maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.</p>	<p>needed improvements to meet the accountability system requirements in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.</p>		
8.2	<p>GEF Partner Agencies shall also have systems or measures for the receipt of and timely response to complaints from parties affected by the implementation of the Partner Agencies' projects and which seek resolution of such complaints. Such systems are not intended to substitute for the country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms.</p> <p>With regard to systems for the receipt and response to complaints, GEF Partner Agencies shall:</p> <p>a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects.</p> <p>b. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing.</p> <p>c. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information.</p> <p>d. Publicly designate the contact information for the staff and/or division responsible for receiving and responding to complaints. This information should preferably be designated both on the Agency's website and on separate websites, if established, for specific projects. For individual projects, this information should be provided in local languages.</p> <p>e. Inform project stakeholders of the existence of the Agency's Accountability and Grievance Systems during consultations and inform stakeholders how they may file complaints, including provision of contact information for the responsible staff or division.</p>	<p>UNEP also does not currently have an agency-wide grievance redress system for receiving, processing, and addressing external stakeholder complaints regarding social and environmental issues of FAO supported projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNEP will make the needed improvements to meet the grievance system requirements in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework. Furthermore, UNEP will design a Grievance Mechanism (for receiving, processing, investigating and addressing complaints) consistent with UN HQ requirements, but decentralized from the main UN HQ system. The design of the system is expected by end 2014; however, its approval and subsequent implementation is subject to review by UN HQ which will aim for end 2015. In the meantime, UNEP has already put into place an Interim Mechanism for Grievance, which includes an expert committee consisting of staff experienced in legal, technical, political, and outreach matters. This Interim Mechanism, housed in the Office for Operations, is sufficiently firewalled, and is now operational.</p>	<p>UNEP is currently working on the accountability and grievance mechanism with the help of a consultant with legal background. This mechanism will include the modality required to meet minimum standard of GEF.</p>	End-2014

ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
<b>1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>				
1.1	The Agency uses a screening process for each proposed project, as early as possible, to determine the appropriate extent and type of environmental and social impact assessment required of the project so that appropriate studies are undertaken proportional to potential risks and to direct, and, as relevant, indirect, cumulative, and associated impacts. The Agency also uses strategic, sectoral or regional environmental assessment, when appropriate.	<p>UNIDO's DGB.120 requires early screening of all technical cooperation projects using a quality review checklist to trigger consideration of environmental and social issues. The screening process and criteria are being updated to include standards for assigning proposed projects an environmental category for determining the type and extent of ESIA required.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that its project screening process has criteria based on which proposed projects can be assigned an environmental category for determining the type and extent of ESIA required.</p>	<p>UNIDO reports that it has developed draft <i>Environmental and Social Policy and Procedures</i> (ESSPP), which can be found at the following link: <a href="http://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-%E2%80%93safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents-0">http://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-%E2%80%93safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents-0</a>.</p> <p>As the next step, in September 2014, UNIDO will subject the draft ESSPP to final technical and editorial reviews and submit the final draft ESSPP to its management for final approval in November 2014.</p> <p>The draft ESSPP consists of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Policy documentation:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. An overarching Integrated Safeguards Policy;</li> <li>b. Operational Safeguards (OS): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- OS1: Environmental and Social Assessment</li> <li>- OS2: Protection of Natural Habitats</li> <li>- OS3: Involuntary Resettlement</li> <li>- OS4: Indigenous People</li> <li>- OS5: Pest Management</li> <li>- OS6: Physical Cultural Resources</li> <li>- OS7: Safety of Dams</li> <li>- OS8: Information Disclosure</li> <li>- OS9: Accountability and Grievance System;</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> <li><b>2. Guidelines documentation:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. <i>Project Development Procedures</i>; and,</li> <li>d. Environmental and Social (E&amp;S) Assessment Guidance Notes.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
			<p><b>Note:</b> Operational Safeguard 1 (OS1), <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>, includes an early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects and employs a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation, <i>Project Cycle Guidance and E&amp;S Assessment Guidance Notes</i> (referred to as “Guidelines documentation” hereinafter), further elaborates on this approach.</p>	
1.2	Assesses potential impacts of the proposed project to physical, biological, socioeconomic, cultural, and physical cultural resources, including transboundary concerns, and potential impacts on human health and safety;	<p>UNIDO has extensive experience performing technical environmental studies and ESIAAs, as evidenced in a number of its project documents provided to the GEF Secretariat. However, UNIDO has to codify policies and guidelines for assessing the full range of potential impacts (e.g. biological, physical, socio-economic, etc.) of its projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that assessments for the full range of potential impacts of its projects are conducted as part of the official project assessment process.</p>	<p>The draft Integrated Safeguard Policy incorporates the concept of prior assessment. OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) mandates an environmental and social assessment procedure. It includes an early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects and employs a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.</p>	End-2014
1.3	Assesses the adequacy of the applicable legal and institutional framework, including applicable international environmental agreements, and confirm that project activities that will contravene such international obligations are not financed;	<p>UNIDO routinely assesses national legal and institutional frameworks in its project preparation and is fully knowledgeable of the GEF conventions. However, the requirement for assessment of the legal and institutional framework is not reflected in UNIDO DGB.120 or other guidelines.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that assessments of national legal and institutional</p>	<p>OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) requires the assessment of the adequacy of applicable legal and institutional frameworks.</p> <p>Upon UNIDO management approval of the overall ESSPP package, it will also demonstrate that its organizational structure and internal capacity is sufficient to ensure the adequacy of applicable legal and institutional frameworks in recipient countries.</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		frameworks are undertaken during preparation of its projects, as well as demonstrate that its organizational structure and internal capacity ensure the adequacy of applicable legal and institutional frameworks in recipient countries.		
1.4	Feasible investment, technical, and siting alternatives, including the “no action” alternative, are assessed, as well as potential impacts, feasibility of mitigating these impacts, their capital and recurrent costs, their suitability under local conditions, and the institutional, training and monitoring requirements associated with them;	UNIDO needs to develop written operational policies or guidelines regarding the analysis of project alternatives.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure analysis of viable project alternatives.	OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) requires the analysis of alternatives. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.	End-2014
1.5	Agency policy requires executors of projects receiving GEF funds to place a priority on the prevention of harmful social and environmental impacts. And where not possible to prevent such impacts, project executors are required to at least minimize, or compensate adverse project impacts and enhance positive impacts through environmental planning and management that includes the proposed mitigation measures, monitoring, institutional capacity development and training measures, an implementation schedule, and cost estimates	UNIDO needs to codify written operational policies or guidelines establishing a mitigation hierarchy (i.e. prevention, minimization, compensation) in the assessment of its projects or that requires preparation of environmental and social management plans (ESMPs) to ensure implementation of mitigation measures, monitoring, and capacity development.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of introducing additional provisions to its contractual arrangements with project executing partners to ensure the use of the mitigation hierarchy (i.e. prevention, minimization, compensation) in assessment of its projects and the preparation of ESMPs.	<i>Integrated Safeguard Policy</i> and OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) introduce the concept of “mitigation hierarchy”, and the need for ESIAAs and ESMPs. The Guidelines documentation further details specific requirements for ESIAAs and ESMPs.  Furthermore, UNIDO is in the process of updating its contractual arrangement modalities with project executing partners. The updated arrangements will, among other, make sure that UNIDO’s executing partners receiving GEF funds place a priority on prevention of harmful social and environmental impacts.	End-2014
1.6	Involve stakeholders, including project-affected groups, indigenous peoples, and local CSOs, as early as possible, in the preparation process and ensure that their views and concerns are made known to decision makers and taken into account. Continue consultations throughout project	UNIDO’s provisions for identification of and consultation with stakeholders are contained in its project template and the quality review checklists of DGB.120, as well as in the <i>Guidelines on Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects</i> (2006). These consultation provisions should be strengthened with regard to environmental assessments.	OS7 ( <i>Information Disclosure</i> ) presents UNIDO’s Information Disclosure Policy.  Additionally, OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) requires: (a) consultation during environmental and social impact assessments;	End-2014



## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
	implementation as necessary to address environmental and social impact assessment-related issues that affect them; Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;	<b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of further strengthening the relevant provisions for stakeholder engagement.	(b) use of independent expertise in preparations of ESIA's; and (c) use of independent advisory panels for contentious projects.  The Guidelines documentation includes further clarifications on the approach of continued consultation throughout project implementation.	
1.7	Use independent expertise in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments, where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;	UNIDO has demonstrated the use of independent ESIA experts (national and international) in the preparation and review of ESIA reports for its projects; however, UNIDO needs to develop formal guidelines requiring the use of such experts.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring the use of independent ESIA expertise in the preparation, review and implementation of ESIA's for projects with significant risk as per categorization system (see 1.1).	OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) and the Guidelines documentation specify the requirement to: (a) use independent expertise in preparation of ESIA; (b) use independent advisory panels for contentious projects.	End-2014
1.9	Disclose draft environmental and social impact assessments in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders including project affected groups and CSOs in a form and language understandable to them.	UNIDO discloses ESIA's with project stakeholders as early in the process as possible, during project preparation before appraisal, but there are no clear operational policies or guidelines to this effect.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring disclosure of draft ESIA's (and other types of documents required by following requirements listed below - 2.10, 4.9, and 7.6) in a timely manner (before appraisal formally begins) in a place, form and language accessible to key stakeholders.	OS8 ( <i>Information Disclosure</i> ) presents UNIDO Information Disclosure policy.  Additionally, OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) requires disclosure of draft impact assessment documentation. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on the disclosure procedures.	End-2014



## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
<b>2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</b>				
2.1	Use a precautionary and ecosystem approach to natural resource conservation and management to ensure opportunities for environmentally sustainable development. Determine if project benefits substantially outweigh potential environmental costs;	<p>As a matter of practice, UNIDO employs a precautionary approach to natural resources management in all of its technical assistance projects, but it needs to codify policies or guidelines promoting the precautionary and ecosystem approach for management of natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its project screening and appraisal system an early screening step employing a precautionary and ecosystem approach. This will ensure that projects that do not comply with this specific requirement either: (i) employ an alternative design/siting arrangement in order to avoid any conflict with the requirement or (ii) fail to get approved for further development.</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p><i>Integrated Safeguard Policy</i> and OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) introduce the concept of precautionary approach.</p> <p>The concept of precautionary approach includes an early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects and ensures that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.</p>	End-2014
2.2	Give preference to siting physical infrastructure investments on lands where natural habitats have already been converted to other land uses;	<p>UNIDO does not finance large-scale infrastructure/investment projects that might require siting in natural habitats and thus does not have corresponding policies for siting such infrastructure. However, UNIDO does finance small-scale infrastructure projects that may involve trade-offs with natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that its projects give preference</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p>OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>), and OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) elaborate on the concept of giving preference to the siting of projects on already converted land. This concept is also considered during the early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects as a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.</p>	End-2014

ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		to siting physical infrastructure on lands where natural habitats have already been converted to other land uses.		
2.3	Avoid significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those habitats that are: a) Legally protected, b) Officially proposed for protection, c) Identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or d) Recognized as protected by traditional local communities.	<p>As a matter of practice, UNIDO avoids significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats in its work, since UNIDO's projects are of a nature where such conversion would not generally occur. UNIDO needs to codify written operational policies or guidelines to ensure that its projects comply with this statement.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its project screening and appraisal system an early screening step that would ensure that projects that do not comply with this specific requirement either: (i) employ an alternative design/siting arrangement in order to avoid any conflict with the requirement or (ii) fail to get approved for further development.</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p>OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) elaborate on the concept of avoiding significant conversion of critical natural habitats. This concept is also considered during the early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects as a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.</p>	End-2014
2.4	Where projects adversely affect non-critical natural habitats, proceed only if viable alternatives are not available, and if appropriate conservation and mitigation measures, including those required to maintain ecological services they provide, are in place. Include also mitigation measures that minimize habitat loss and establish and maintain an ecologically similar protected area.	<p>UNIDO needs to come up with written operational policies or guidelines to ensure that its projects avoid adverse impacts on non-critical habitats.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its Project Screening and Appraisal System an early screening step employing a precautionary approach that would ensure that projects non-compliant with this specific</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p>OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) elaborate on the concept of requiring mitigation measures where non-critical habitats are adversely affected. This concept is also considered during the early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects as a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		standard either: (i) consider alternative designs/siting arrangements to avoid any conflict with the standard or (ii) are not approved for further development.	Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.	
2.5	Screen as early as possible for potential impacts on health and quality of important ecosystems including forests, and on the rights and welfare of the people who depend on them.	<p>UNIDO needs to develop screening procedures to assess potential project impacts on the quality and health of important ecosystems.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its Project Screening and Appraisal System an early screening step employing a precautionary approach that would screen for potential impacts on important ecosystems and the people who depend on them.</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p>Screening for impacts on ecosystem health and quality is considered during the early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects as a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.</p>	End-2014
2.6	Do not finance projects that will involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including forests, or that will contravene applicable international environmental agreements.	<p>See 2.3 above.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include a general policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, on protection of natural habitats, with a statement that it will not engage in any projects dealing with critical habitats.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its project screening and appraisal system an early screening step that would ensure that projects that do not comply with this specific requirement either: (i) employ an alternative design/siting arrangement in order to avoid any conflict with the requirement or (ii) fail to get approved for further development.</p>	<p>OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>) presents UNIDO policy on Protection of Natural Habitats.</p> <p>Specifically, the overarching <i>Integrated Safeguards Policy</i> includes a statement confirming that UNIDO does not finance projects that involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats or that contravene applicable international environmental agreements.</p> <p>This is ensured during the early screening and categorization procedure which applies to all projects as a precautionary approach to ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborate on this approach.</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
2.9	Consult appropriate experts and key stakeholders, including local nongovernmental organizations and local communities, and involve such people in design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of projects, including mitigation planning.	See 1.6 above.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of further strengthening the relevant provisions for stakeholder engagement.	OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) and the Guidelines documentation include specifications on the concept of wide consultation at all stages of project design and implementation.  Also see 1.6.	End-2014
2.10	Disclose draft mitigation plan in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	See 1.9 above.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring disclosure of draft ESAs (and other types of documents required by following requirements listed below - 2.10, 4.9, and 7.6) in a timely manner (before appraisal formally begins) in a place, form and language accessible to key stakeholders.	OS8 ( <i>Information Disclosure</i> ) presents UNIDO overarching Information Disclosure policy.  OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) requires disclosure of draft mitigation plan documentation. . Additionally, the Guidelines documentation further elaborates on the disclosure procedures.  Also see 1.9.	End-2014
<b>3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b>				
3	<i>Established policies, procedures, and guidelines require the Agency to ensure that involuntary resettlement is avoided or minimized. Where this is not feasible, the Agency is required to ensure displaced persons are assisted in improving or at least restoring their livelihoods and standards of living in real terms relative to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher;</i>	UNIDO's agreed comparative advantage in the GEF is that it implements technical assistance and capacity-building projects, not investment projects. UNIDO does not implement investment projects; therefore, the risk that involuntary resettlement impacts would arise from UNIDO projects is extremely low. Because of this, and consistent with guidance contained in the Safeguards Policy, this minimum standard largely does not apply to UNIDO.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> In order to ensure that no involuntary resettlement actually occurs in its projects in the future, UNIDO will put in place a policy statement banning projects that would result in involuntary resettlement. Furthermore, to enforce this policy statement, UNIDO is in the process of introducing into its Project Screening and Appraisal System an early screening process to screen projects	OS3 ( <i>Involuntary Resettlement</i> ) and the <i>Integrated Safeguards Policy</i> state UNIDO's commitment not to involuntarily resettle anyone affected by a project. The early screening and categorization procedure ensures compliance with this statement. The Guidelines documentation further reinforces this commitment.	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		for such potential impacts.		
<b>4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES</b>				
4.1	Screen early for the presence of Indigenous Peoples in the project area, who are identified through criteria that reflect their social and cultural distinctiveness. Such criteria may include: self-identification and identification by others as Indigenous Peoples, collective attachment to land, presence of customary institutions, indigenous language, and primarily subsistence-oriented production.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing IP in its projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure early screening of its projects for the presence of IP in project areas.</p>	<p>OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy.</p> <p>Additionally, the overarching <i>Integrated Safeguard Policy</i> includes the concept of free prior and informed consent (FPIC), which is also a requirement of OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>).</p> <p>The early screening and categorization procedure, which applies to all projects, ensures that screening for the presence of Indigenous People and their interests is done. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.</p>	End-2014
4.2	Undertake free, prior, and informed consultations with affected Indigenous Peoples to ascertain their broad community support for projects affecting them and to solicit their full and effective participation in designing, implementing, and monitoring measures to (a) ensure a positive engagement in the project (b) avoid adverse impacts, or when avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects; and (c) tailor benefits in a culturally appropriate way.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed operational policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. In further strengthening the relevant provisions for stakeholder engagement, UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure free, prior and informed consultations with IP to ascertain their broad community support for projects affecting them and solicit their participation in project preparation and implementation.</p>	<p>OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy.</p> <p>The overarching <i>Integrated Safeguard Policy</i> includes the concept of FPIC which is also a requirement of OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>). The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
4.3	Undertake the environmental and social impact assessment, with involvement of Indigenous Peoples, to assess potential impacts and risks when a project may have adverse impacts. Identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse impacts.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for performing social assessments for projects involving indigenous peoples.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that its projects perform appropriate ESIA with the involvement of IP to assess potential impacts and identify appropriate measures.</p>	<p>OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy.</p> <p>Section 1 above (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) describes the procedures and the implementation steps to be undertaken to ensure that UNIDO projects perform appropriate ESIA, if Indigenous Peoples are involved in projects, assess potential project impacts and identify appropriate measures.</p>	End-2014
4.4	Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally appropriate, and gender and generationally inclusive. Full consideration should be given to options preferred by the affected Indigenous Peoples for provision of benefits and mitigation measures.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects and thus has not yet developed requirements for preparing indigenous peoples plans.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that the benefits of its projects are appropriate for IP and reflect their preferred options.</p>	OS4 ( <i>Indigenous People</i> ) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy and includes the concept of culturally appropriate benefit sharing.	End-2014
4.5	Make provisions in plans, where appropriate, to support activities to establish legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure and management systems and collective rights used by project affected Indigenous Peoples.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects. Thus, it has not yet developed provisions supporting legal recognition of customary or traditional land tenure systems.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA</p>	OS4 ( <i>Indigenous People</i> ) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy and includes the concept of supporting legal recognition of customary rights.	End-2014



## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. Where applicable, UNIDO will support activities for recognition of traditional land tenure systems used by Indigenous Peoples.		
4.7	Refrain from utilizing the cultural resources or knowledge of Indigenous Peoples without obtaining their prior agreement to such use.	UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects and thus has not yet developed provisions regarding the use of cultural resources or knowledge of IP.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples. UNIDO will make sure that appropriate reference is introduced in the policy documentation ensuring that agreement by Indigenous Peoples is obtained prior to any use of their cultural resources or knowledge.	OS4 ( <i>Indigenous People</i> ) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy and includes the requirement for obtaining prior consent for use of cultural resource and knowledge, as part of UNIDO's approach to FPIC.	End-2014
4.8	For those projects where the environmental and social impact assessment identifies adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples, Agency policies require that the project develop an Indigenous Peoples plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should	UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples.  UNIDO is in the process of introducing in its Project Screening and Appraisal System an early screening step employing a precautionary approach that would ensure that projects non-compliant with this specific standard either: (i) consider alternative designs/siting arrangements to avoid any conflict with the standard or (ii) not be approved for further development.	OS4 ( <i>Indigenous People</i> ) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy. The early screening and categorization procedure ensures that, whenever adverse effects on Indigenous People are identified, an Indigenous People's plan will be required as part of the ESIA or ESMP. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.	End-2014

ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
	draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected Indigenous Peoples.			
4.9	Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	<p>See 1.9 above.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring disclosure of draft ESIA's (and other types of documents required by following requirements listed below - 2.10, 4.9, and 7.6) in a timely manner (before appraisal formally begins) in a place, form and language accessible to key stakeholders.</p>	<p>OS8 (<i>Information Disclosure</i>) presents UNIDO Information Disclosure policy.</p> <p>OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) also requires disclosure of documentation. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on the disclosure procedures.</p> <p>Also see 1.9.</p>	End-2014
4.10	Monitor, by experienced social scientists, the implementation of the project (and any required Indigenous Peoples plan or framework) and its benefits as well as challenging or negative impacts on Indigenous Peoples and address possible mitigation measures in a participatory manner.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects and therefore needs to come up with specific monitoring requirements for projects involving indigenous peoples.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will include an Indigenous Peoples policy, in the overarching ESIA policy, with corresponding guidelines to ensure that its projects are designed and implemented to foster full respect for Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to monitor the implementation and adherence to the recommendations provided in the Project Approval and Appraisal process by its projects involving IP. This would include a requirement that individual projects recruit experienced social science experts to monitor compliance with this standard.</p>	OS4 ( <i>Indigenous People</i> ) presents the UNIDO Indigenous Peoples policy. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on the concept of third-party monitoring by experienced social scientists.	End-2014
<b>5. PEST MANAGEMENT</b>				



## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
5.2	The Agency requires that, in the context of projects that it supports, pesticides are procured contingent on an assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users. The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use of formulated products that are in World Health Organization (WHO) Classes IA and IB, or formulations of products in Class II unless there are restrictions that are likely to deny use or access to lay personnel and others without training or proper equipment.	UNIDO does not implement projects involving sustainable land or forest management, agricultural production, or pest management. As such, the minimum standard largely does not apply to UNIDO. Only parts of Minimum Requirements 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 apply to UNIDO.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will develop guidelines to add to its Procurement Manual and/or other relevant documentation: to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>to ensure that any procurement of pesticides in its projects complies with WHO regulations;</li><li>banning procurement in its projects of any persistent organic pollutants (POPs) identified by the Stockholm Convention; and,</li><li>to ensure that any management and disposal of pesticides in its projects complies with the FAO Code of Conduct.</li></ul>	OS5 ( <i>Pest Management</i> ) and the <i>Integrated Safeguards Policy</i> state UNIDO’s commitment to ensure that environmental and health risks associated with pesticide use are minimized and managed, and that safe, effective, and environmentally sound pest management is promoted and supported. To ensure this projects are subjected to OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) screening and categorization procedure.  Additionally, UNIDO Procurement Manual will be amended with appropriate changes.	End-2014
5.3	The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use in its projects pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants identified under the Stockholm convention.			
5.4	Follow the recommendations and minimum standards as described in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) <i>International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides</i> (Rome, 2003) and its associated technical guidelines and procure only pesticides, along with suitable protective and application equipment that will permit pest management actions to be carried out with well-defined and minimal risk to health, environment and livelihoods.			
6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
6	<i>Established policies, procedures, and guidelines require the Agency to ensure physical cultural resources (PCR) are appropriately preserved and their destruction or damage is appropriately avoided. PCR includes archaeological,</i>	Given its mandate and agreed comparative advantage in the GEF (i.e. it implements only technical assistance and capacity-building projects, not investment projects) UNIDO is not likely to implement projects that would have potential adverse effects on physical cultural resources. For this reason,	OS6 ( <i>Physical Cultural Resources</i> ) includes a policy statement and a commitment to banning projects that adversely affect physical and cultural resources. To ensure this projects are subjected to OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) screening and categorization procedure. The Guidelines	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
	<i>paleontological, historical, architectural, and sacred sites including graveyards, burial sites, and unique natural values. The impacts on physical cultural resources resulting from project activities, including mitigating measures, may not contravene either the recipient country's national legislation or its obligations under relevant international environmental treaties and agreements.</i>	<p>this minimum standard largely does not apply to UNIDO.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> In order to ensure that its projects do not adversely impact physical cultural resources, UNIDO will adopt a policy banning projects that adversely impact such resources, including procedures in case chance finds occur. UNIDO will also introduce into its Project Screening and Appraisal System an early screening step employing a precautionary approach to ensure enforcement of this policy.</p>	documentation further elaborates on this approach.	
<b>7. SAFETY OF DAMS</b>				
7.2	Develop plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.	<p>UNIDO has a Small Hydropower Strategy that addresses the environmental and social considerations involved in constructing micro dams and uses Guidelines for SHP Systems developed by UNEP to assess and mitigate the environmental and social risks, however, UNIDO needs to have dam safety guidelines that apply to its micro hydropower dams and require appropriate safety measures in its project environmental management or other plans.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will develop appropriate requirements for environmental management plans (EMPs), environment and social management frameworks (ESMFs) or similar plans. These would include appropriate safety measures for the operation and maintenance of micro dams that UNIDO finances.</p>	<p>OS7 (<i>Safety of Dams</i>) includes a commitment to dam design quality and safety.</p> <p><i>Integrated Safeguard Policy</i> and OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) require an early screening and categorization procedure to be applied to all projects and ensure that any potential adverse impacts and risks from projects are avoided or minimized where possible, and mitigated, where not. The Guidelines documentation further elaborates on this approach.</p> <p>Additionally, UNIDO is in the process of developing guidelines for construction, supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness of small and micro dams to be applied to projects which deal with small and micro hydropower dams.</p>	End-2014
7.5	Carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated dams after completion of construction/rehabilitation, review/monitor implementation of detailed plans and take appropriate action as needed.	UNIDO performs safety inspections after construction of its micro dams and has demonstrated capacity in this area, but UNIDO needs to codify guidelines requiring periodic safety inspections of its micro dams.	<p>OS7 (<i>Safety of Dams</i>) includes a commitment to dam design quality and safety.</p> <p>Additionally, UNIDO is in the process of developing guidelines for periodic safety inspections of</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
		<b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will develop guidelines requiring individual projects to carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated small dams after completion of construction/remediation activities and take appropriate action as needed.	new/rehabilitated small and micro dams to be applied to projects which deal with small and micro hydropower dams.	
7.6	Disclose draft plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them.	See 1.9 above.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring disclosure of draft ESIA's (and other types of documents required by following requirements listed below - 2.10, 4.9, and 7.6) in a timely manner (before appraisal formally begins) in a place, form and language accessible to key stakeholders.	OS8 ( <i>Information Disclosure</i> ) presents UNIDO Information Disclosure policy.  OS1 ( <i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i> ) also requires disclosure of documentation. Guidelines documentation further elaborates on the disclosure procedures.  Also see 1.9.	End-2014
<b>8. ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS</b>				
8.1	GEF Partner Agencies shall have accountability systems or measures that are designed to ensure enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies and related systems.  GEF Partner Agencies' accountability systems shall be: a. Designed to address potential breaches of a GEF Partner Agency's policies and procedures; b. Independent, transparent, and effective; c. Accessible to project-affected people; d. Required to keep complainants abreast of progress with cases brought forward; and e. Required to maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.	UNIDO needs to develop an ESS-specific mechanism for ensuring accountability/compliance for the enforcement of its environmental and social safeguard policies, including an accessible, transparent system for receiving, processing, and investigating external stakeholder complaints regarding breaches of such policies.  <b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will adopt a mechanism for ensuring accountability for and enforcement of its environmental and social safeguards.	OS9 ( <i>Accountability and Grievance Systems</i> ) includes requirements for dealing with policy non-compliance and project-level grievances based on existing UNIDO Internal Oversight mechanisms.	End-2014
8.2	GEF Partner Agencies shall also have systems or measures for the receipt of and	UNIDO does not currently have an ESS-specific mechanism for receiving and responding to	OS9 ( <i>Accountability and Grievance Systems</i> ) includes requirements for dealing with policy non-	End-2014

ANNEX I-7: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – SAFEGUARDS

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August 2014	Timeline
	<p>timely response to complaints from parties affected by the implementation of the Partner Agencies' projects and which seek resolution of such complaints. Such systems are not intended to substitute for the country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms.</p> <p>With regard to systems for the receipt and response to complaints, GEF Partner Agencies shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects.</li> <li>Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing.</li> <li>Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information.</li> <li>Publicly designate the contact information for the staff and/or division responsible for receiving and responding to complaints. This information should preferably be designated both on the Agency's website and on separate websites, if established, for specific projects. For individual projects, this information should be provided in local languages.</li> <li>Inform project stakeholders of the existence of the Agency's Accountability and Grievance Systems during consultations and inform stakeholders how they may file complaints, including provision of contact information for the responsible staff or division.</li> </ol>	<p>complaints from parties affected by implementation of its projects.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> As noted above, UNIDO will adopt a mechanism to address complaints from parties affected by implementation of its projects, along with a system for receiving and responding to complaints from parties affected by implementation of its projects.</p>	<p>compliance and project-level grievances based on existing UNIDO Internal Oversight mechanisms.</p>	

## ANNEX II: GEF POLICY ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING

### ANNEX II-1: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – GENDER MAINSTREAMING

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
1	The GEF Agency has established either a policy (or policies), a strategy, or an action plan that requires it to design and implement projects in such a way that both women and men (a) receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits, (b) do not suffer adverse effects during the development process; and that (c) fosters full respect for their dignity and human rights.	<p>UNEP was assessed as fully meeting the Minimum Requirements of the Policy except with regards to the Minimum Requirements listed in Paragraphs 16 and 18 of the Policy.</p> <p><b>Agreed Actions:</b> UNEP will take the actions listed for #16 and 18 below to make improvements in these areas, as noted below.</p>	See below.	End-2014
16	The Agency is required to identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse gender impacts.	<p>UNEP was assessed as not fully meeting this requirement because it has not yet implemented sufficient institutional measures or a methodology that require it to “avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate adverse gender impacts” in the context of its projects. The reviewer could not find sufficient evidence of implementation of such measures in project examples submitted.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action:</b> UNEP’s proposed Environmental, Social, and Economic Sustainability Framework will institutionalize the mechanisms necessary to avoid and mitigate potentially adverse impacts, in terms of gender and other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups in the context of its projects.</p>	The draft Environmental, Social, and Economic Sustainability (ESES) Framework is under final revision for the ED’s approval. It includes mechanisms necessary to avoid and mitigate potentially adverse impacts, in terms of gender and other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups in the context of its projects. UNEP is working, in parallel, on the operational mechanism--e.g., screening tools, guidelines, institutional setup and related training—in preparation of the official roll-out.	End-2014

## ANNEX II-1: UNEP IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – GENDER MAINSTREAMING

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
18	The Agency has a system for monitoring and evaluating progress in gender mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators.	<p>UNEP was assessed as not fully meeting this Minimum Requirement because gaps remained in how the Agency monitors and evaluates its progress in terms of gender issues. Moreover, UNEP is finalizing how it monitors and evaluates progress on gender mainstreaming institution wide through its previously agreed Gender Policy and Action Plan. Once that is completed, UNEP will undertake regular monitoring.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action:</b> UNEP will complete implementation of its Policy and Strategy on Gender and the Environment to strengthen its framework for monitoring and evaluating progress on gender mainstreaming. UNEP has already enhanced the staffing in its Gender Unit, and is undertaking a series of gender mainstreaming training modules for HQ-based and regional staff. UNEP will finalize its plans for M&amp;E of gender mainstreaming by end-2014.</p>	<p>The UNEP Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment is fully aligned with the UN SWAP requirements and will be presented to the SMT for approval in September. The institutional structures to implement the Policy and Strategy are now in place with the Gender and Social Safeguards Unit (GSSU) taking the lead. The GSSU has been carrying out knowledge enhancement sessions for the staff to strengthen their capacity to implement the new Policy and Strategy.</p> <p>The Policy and strategy provides that a clear oversight framework will be designed and implemented in accordance with the <i>UNEG Gender Norms and Standards</i> and the <i>UNEG Guidance on Integration of Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations</i>. The institutional structures to undertake the oversight role include the Gender Steering Board – which will sit at the level of the SMT; Gender and Social Safeguards Unit, the evaluation office, and the office of internal oversight. A gender sensitive oversight (including M &amp; E) framework will be developed by end of December 2014.</p> <p>Gender mainstreaming training modules, developed in collaboration with the UN staff colleagues, are in the final stage of preparation. These will be pilot tested by mid-October by all the UNEP gender coordinators and thereafter rolled to the rest of the organization by November. The gender modules focus on gender sensitive project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Step by step guidance on monitoring and evaluation is provided by the modules.</p> <p>Additional thematic modules on gender (e.g., gender and water, gender and climate change) will be developed in the 2014-2015 biennium in collaboration with the divisions and regional offices.</p>	End-2014

## ANNEX II-2: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – GENDER MAINSTREAMING

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
13	The Agency has instituted measures to strengthen its institutional framework for gender mainstreaming, for example, by having a focal point for gender, or other staff, to support the development, implementation, monitoring, and provision of guidance on gender mainstreaming.	<p>UNIDO has made considerable progress on gender mainstreaming in recent years. However, UNIDO was assessed as needing some further strengthening with regard to this Minimum Requirement. Specifically, it was agreed that UNIDO is on the right track in terms of the planned establishment of a Gender Office. It was found that additional gender experts should be assigned to this office.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO is strengthening its institutional framework and capacity to implement the UNIDO Gender Policy and Action Plan. UNIDO will report to the GEF Council on the progress it makes in strengthening its institutional framework by supporting the development, implementation, monitoring, and provision of guidance on gender mainstreaming. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of its new Office for Gender mainstreaming</li> <li>• Providing additional staff working full time on gender</li> </ul>	<p>UNIDO is progressing as planned and expects full compliance with the agreed actions by the end of 2014. Since the last reporting period, UNIDO has achieved the following with regard to provision of guidance on gender mainstreaming:</p> <p>Gender mainstreaming guidelines and tools have been further developed and updated, including the documents below, which can all be found at:  <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents">https://www.thegef.org/documents/unido-safeguards-gender-mainstreaming-progress-report-supporting-documents</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matrix on mainstreaming gender in project formulation implementation, monitoring and evaluation with gender mainstreaming examples.</li> <li>• Gender relevance categorization and minimum requirements tool for project design and formulation</li> <li>• Gender mainstreaming checklist for projects</li> <li>• Gender analysis tool</li> <li>• Branch-specific Guides to Gender Mainstreaming. (As an example the Draft Guide to Gender Mainstreaming for UNIDO Energy and Climate Change Branch, including energy and climate change indicator framework to monitor gender-related impacts, has been provided)</li> </ul> <p>These tools contribute to the actions of the Implementation Strategy and Action Plan of UNIDO's Gender Policy. Specifically, the tools further support the integration of a gender perspective throughout the project cycle. In addition, UNIDO conducts gender mainstreaming training on continuous basis. Sample documents are included under the above link.</p>	End-2014



## ANNEX II-2: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – GENDER MAINSTREAMING

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
			<p>With regard to further strengthening the institutional framework, UNIDO is currently in the process of drafting a Gender Strategy for the period 2015-2017, that will include gender targets and indicators for each of UNIDO's thematic areas as well as input for the Organization's strategic planning documents.</p> <p>Actions on the establishment of the Office for Gender Mainstreaming and providing additional staff working full-time on gender are still being finalized. In this respect, specific options have been developed and presented to UNIDO management for decision by the end of the year.</p> <p>In the interim, steps are being taken to establish a Gender Focal Point (GFP) Network. This entails identification and appointment of GFPs from all levels and areas of work within the Organization. Currently, the Terms of Reference for GFPs is being developed and will be presented to the UNIDO Gender Mainstreaming Steering Committee for endorsement.</p>	
16	The Agency has a system for monitoring and evaluating progress in gender mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators.	UNIDO was assessed as not fully meeting this Minimum Requirement. UNIDO has developed written strategies, implementation plans, and has developed some guidance material on theme specific gender analyses and gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation, but based on the evidence submitted, it was recommended that UNIDO further strengthen its performance in this area. UNIDO's Gender Policy states that the "continuous monitoring of progress towards results on gender equality and the empowerment of women in UNIDO's policies and substantive programs and projects" will be ensured through its Implementation Strategy and Action Plan (ISAP). The 2011-2013 (ISAP) for UNIDO's Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women provides strategic objectives and actions to ensure oversight through monitoring and evaluation. Further, guidance is extended to project managers on a practical level in gender	<p>All tools above support the integration of gender into the monitoring and evaluation procedures of project impacts, and the following targeted tools below have been especially developed to enhance effective monitoring and evaluation of gender-related impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matrix on mainstreaming gender in project formulation implementation, monitoring and evaluation for all Branches that includes specific example activities to establish a gender responsive M&amp;E system</li> <li>• Gender mainstreaming checklist for projects that includes specific requirements for M&amp;E</li> <li>• Branch-specific gender mainstreaming Indicator Frameworks that provide typical performance indicators specific to branches' interventions for</li> </ul>	End-2014



ANNEX II-2: UNIDO IMPLEMENTATION TRACKER – GENDER MAINSTREAMING

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of May 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken as of end-August, 2014	Timeline
		<p>analysis frameworks. The gender analysis frameworks include operational input on how to formulate sex-disaggregated performance indicators, but UNIDO is just at the beginning of this process. Due to gender architecture that needs strengthening, the assessment found that there is not sufficiently strong evidence that UNIDO is fully able to monitor and evaluate progress in gender mainstreaming.</p> <p><b>Agreed Action(s):</b> UNIDO will continue to implement the ISAP, which will be updated for the 2014-2015 biennium, to further strengthen its policies and practices with regard to monitoring and evaluation of gender-related impacts. Specifically, it will develop indicators for project specific gender mainstreaming frameworks, integrating a gender perspective throughout the project cycle, to enable effective monitoring and evaluation of gender mainstreaming in UNIDO projects and programmes.</p>	<p>monitoring and evaluating gender-related impacts. As examples the Energy and Climate Change Branch and the Environmental Management Branch Indicator Frameworks have been provided</p> <p>Additionally, a gender advisor has been appointed, within UNIDO's project appraisal and approval process, with the role of reviewing project proposals and providing guidance on gender components, including on the formulation of meaningful gender responsive indicators and the collection of sex disaggregated data. This ensures that UNIDO projects have robust gender responsive results frameworks. Through mainstreaming the developed gender tools into UNIDO's appraisal and approval process and project results frameworks, gender can be assessed in a more systematic and effective way via UNIDO's regular M&amp;E processes.</p> <p>Finally, UNIDO is also progressing with establishing a system that tracks project funds that are allocated and disbursed for gender related activities. This gender tracking system will serve as another mechanism to monitor to what extent projects contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment through quantifying the financial resources dedicated to and spent towards gender related activities. All requirements related to tracking gender equality investments have been developed and are ready for testing.</p> <p>The final draft of the ISAP for the 2014-2015 has been completed and is currently being implemented.</p>	