

48th GEF Council Meeting
June 02 – 04, 2015
Washington, D.C.

Agenda Item 09

**GEF AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH POLICIES ON ENVIRONMENTAL
AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS, GENDER, AND FIDUCIARY STANDARDS**

Recommended Council Decision

The Council has reviewed Document GEF/C.48/06, *GEF Agency Compliance with Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender, and Fiduciary Standards*, which indicates that all ten GEF Agencies¹ have satisfactorily met the requirements of the following Policies: (1) *Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*, and (2) the *Policy on Gender Mainstreaming*, and (3) *Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Partner Agencies*, and decides that that no further review is needed at this time.

¹. The ten GEF Agencies are: the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Status of Agency Compliance with Three Policies.....	2
Agency Progress on Environmental and Social Safeguards	3
African Development Bank	3
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.....	4
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	4
Inter-American Development Bank	4
International Fund for Agricultural Development	4
United Nations Development Programme	5
United Nations Environment Programme.....	5
United Nations Industrial Development Organization.....	5
World Bank.....	6
Agency Progress on Gender Mainstreaming	6
United Nations Environment Programme.....	6
United Nations Industrial Development Organization.....	6
Agency Progress on Fiduciary Standards	7
Annex I: Implementation Progress Reports on Environmental and Social Safeguards.....	9
Annex I-1: FAO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	9
Annex I-2: IDB Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	22
Annex I-3: IFAD Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	23
Annex I-4: UNEP Implementation Tracker – Safeguards	31
Annex I-5: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards.....	43
Annexes II: Implementation Progress Reports on Gender Mainstreaming.....	58
Annex II-1: UNEP Implementation Tracker – Gender Mainstreaming.....	58
Annex II-2: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Gender Mainstreaming.....	60

INTRODUCTION

1. The present document compiles reports submitted by the GEF Agencies¹ on the implementation of time-bound action plans, as required by the Council in November 2013, in order for them to come into compliance with two GEF Policies: [*Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*](#) (hereafter referred to as the Safeguards Policy) and the [*Policy on Gender Mainstreaming*](#) (hereafter referred to as the Gender Mainstreaming Policy). It also summarizes the results of previous actions by relevant GEF Agencies to come into compliance with the GEF Policy [*Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Partner Agencies*](#) (hereafter referred to as the Fiduciary Standards Policy).² Consistent with the Council's decision in 2011 to reference the Safeguards Policy "in relevant sections of the GEF Fiduciary Standards," this paper addresses the fiduciary and safeguard standards together as a whole.

BACKGROUND

2. In May 2011, the Council approved the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. In November of that year, it approved the Safeguards Policy. The Council agreed that the ten GEF Agencies would be assessed by experts as to whether they meet the requirements of both Policies.³

3. In November 2013, the Council reviewed Council Document GEF/C.45/10, *Review of GEF Agencies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming* (hereafter referred to as the 2013 Review) and its findings regarding the nine relevant GEF Agencies against the Safeguards Policy and all ten Agencies against the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. In this Review, one GEF Agency (the Asian Development Bank (ADB)) was found to fully meet the requirements of the Safeguards Policy. Eight GEF Agencies were found to fully meet the Gender Mainstreaming Policy⁴. The Council requested that (i) each GEF Agency that had not

¹ The term "GEF Agency" has been explicitly defined in previous Council Documents as follows: "Any of the 10 institutions that were entitled to request and receive GEF resources directly from the GEF Trustee for the design and implementation of GEF-financed projects and programs as of November 2010. They are: the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)."

² Originally approved in 2007, the updated Policy, [*Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Partner Agencies \(GEF Policy GA/PL/02\)*](#), includes amendments made by Council in 2011.

³ The Council had agreed that the World Bank would not be assessed against the GEF Safeguard standards because the GEF Safeguard standards were derived from the principles of the World Bank safeguard policies and because the World Bank had a best-practice accountability system (See Council Document GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1).

⁴ The only Agencies that had not met the Gender Mainstreaming Policies were the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

5. fully met the requirements of either Policy to submit, in December 2013, agreed, time-bound action plans explaining how it will come into compliance with those provisions not met; (ii) the GEF Secretariat compile these action plans and forward them to the GEF Council for information by December 31, 2013, and (ii) the Agencies 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.

6. In December 2013, the Secretariat compiled and submitted the action plans for the eight Agencies by mail and updated the Council on any changes in the Agencies' compliance status.⁵ In May and October 2014, the Secretariat compiled the remaining Agencies' progress reports towards fulfilling the outstanding action plans and reported to Council in Documents [GEF/C.46/Inf.06](#) and [GEF/C.47/Inf.04](#), both of which were titled: *Agency Progress on Meeting Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming*.

7. These reports were similar in approach and structure to earlier implementation progress reports that the GEF Secretariat and relevant GEF Agencies had prepared for Council on Agency progress in meeting the Fiduciary Standards Policy.⁶ In preparing these reports, as well as this final progress report, the Secretariat conducted a desk-based review of each Agency's self-reporting on its Action Plan implementation.⁷

STATUS OF AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH THREE POLICIES

8. This report indicates that all Agencies that had originally not been found to be in compliance with the three policies at the time of the first review⁸ have now completed their action plans to be in compliance with these policies. Table 1 below illustrates the dates when Agency compliance was, or is being, reported to the Council. In view of the above, it is recommended that the Council "decides that no further review is needed at this time."

⁵ As noted below, the December 2013 compilation of Agency action plans noted that the AfDB had come into compliance with the Safeguards Policy.

⁶ All progress reports to fiduciary standards can be found at the following link:
<http://www.thegef.org/documents/fiduciary-standards-gef-partner-agencies>

⁷ The Secretariat did not, however, conduct any on-the-ground visits to verify each Agencies' actual implementation of relevant policies, procedures, or guidelines for these reports.

⁸ The assessment of the GEF Agencies on fiduciary standards was delivered to Council in May 2009 in Council Document [GEF/C.35/5, Status of the GEF Agencies with Respect to Minimum Fiduciary Standards](#), for discussion at the June Council Meeting. See: https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies_guidelines/fiduciary_standards.

Table 1: Dates of Reported GEF Agency Compliance with Policies on Safeguards, Gender Mainstreaming, and Fiduciary Standards⁹

GEF Agency	Safeguards	Gender Mainstreaming	Fiduciary Standards
African Development Bank	December 2013	October 2013	June 2010
Asian Development Bank	October 2013	October 2013	November 2010
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	October 2014	October 2013	May 2009
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	May 2015	October 2013	May 2014
Inter-American Development Bank	May 2015	October 2013	May 2009
International Fund for Agricultural Development	May 2015	October 2013	November 2010
United Nations Development Programme	October 2014	October 2013	May 2012
United Nations Environment Programme	May 2015	May 2015	May 2014
United Nations Industrial Development Organization	May 2015	May 2015	October 2013
World Bank	NA ¹⁰	October 2013	May 2009

AGENCY PROGRESS ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

9. The sections below describe the progress of all nine GEF Agencies that had not been found to be in compliance with the policy as of October 2013, as reported in Council Document GEF/C.45/10.

African Development Bank

10. As reported in GEF/C.45/10 and the [December 2013 Agency action plan document](#), the AfDB Board approved the [Integrated Safeguards System \(ISS\) – Policy Statement and Operational Safeguards](#) on December 17, 2013. The 2013 Review found that adoption of the ISS by the AfDB Board would enable the AfDB to meet all GEF safeguard requirements. In the December 2013 Action Plans document reported that the AfDB had addressed all the outstanding issues in its action plan in order to come into compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. The 2013 Review had already found that the [AfDB's Independent Review Mechanism](#) (IRM) as meeting the GEF standard on Accountability and Grievance Systems.

⁹ The dates in this table refer to the date of the relevant document that was posted on the GEF website or delivered electronically to the Council.

¹⁰ The Council decided the World Bank would not be assessed against the GEF Safeguard standards because the GEF Safeguard standards were derived from World Bank safeguard policies, and the World Bank had a best-practice accountability system. (See Council Document [GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1](#))

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

11. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, EBRD had two outstanding action items regarding (a) Involuntary Resettlement and (b) Indigenous Peoples. Its [Project Complaint Mechanism \(PCM\)](#) was assessed as meeting the GEF standard on Accountability and Grievance Systems. As reported in the May 2014 and October 2014 Progress Reports, EBRD's Board approved in May 2014 its revised [Environmental and Social Policy \(ESP\)](#) and issued additional guidance on Indigenous Peoples. EBRD confirmed that it had completed all the agreed action items, and thus met the GEF Safeguards Policy.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

12. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, 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.

13. FAO reports that the Director-General approved FAO's [Environmental and Social Management Guidelines \(ESMG\)](#), available on its [Environmental and Social Standards website](#). FAO Director-General also approved [Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards](#), available on the website of [The Office of the Inspector General](#) which is mandated to review such complaints.

14. FAO has published, via its external website, all the documentation cited above and necessary information to substantiate their meeting their action plan requirement. FAO reports that it has completed all the agreed action items and confirms its full compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. (Refer to Annex I for the detailed progress report.)

Inter-American Development Bank

15. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, IDB had an outstanding action item with regard to Pest Management, relating to the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides*. IDB reports that [Guidance on the Implementation of Directive B.10: Pest and Pesticide Management](#) was issued in December 2014, and has published via its external website the Guidance document. (Refer to Annex I for the detailed progress report.)

International Fund for Agricultural Development

16. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, 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.

17. IFAD reports that IFAD senior management approved on December 16, 2014 [IFAD's Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures \(SECAP\)](#), available on its [SECAP website](#). IFAD has operationalized and strengthened SECAP project document disclosure requirements in accordance with [IFAD's Policy on the Disclosure of Documents](#). SECAP

Complaints Procedures were approved in October 2014 and published on the [SECAP Accountability and Complaints Procedure website](#).

18. IFAD has published via its internal and external websites all the documentation cited above and necessary information, including the responsible departments or units in charge of the relevant functions. IFAD reports that it has completed all the agreed action items and confirms its full compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. (Refer to Annex I for the detailed progress report.)

United Nations Development Programme

19. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, UNDP had outstanding action items with regard to (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.

20. As reported in October 2014 Progress Report, UNDP senior management approved in June 2014 the revised [Social and Environmental Standards \(SES\)](#), available on its [website dedicated to these standards and their implementation](#). UNDP confirmed that it had completed all the agreed action items, thus fully meeting the GEF Safeguards Policy.

United Nations Environment Programme

21. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, 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.

22. As reported in October 2014 Progress Report, UNEP approved in June 2014 an [Access to Information Policy](#) and published on the UNEP website. UNEP reports that the Executive Director approved on December 31, 2014 [Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguard \(ESES\) Framework](#), available on its [ESES website](#). The ESES Framework generally describes UNEP's *Stakeholder Response Mechanism*, with a more detailed description in [UNEP's Stakeholder Response Mechanism: Operating Procedures](#).

23. UNEP has published via its external website all the documentation cited above and necessary information, including the responsible departments or units in charge of the relevant functions. UNEP reports that it has completed all agreed action items and confirms its full compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. (Refer to Annex I for the detailed progress report.)

United Nations Industrial Development Organization

24. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, 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.

25. UNIDO reports that the Executive Board approved on December 18, 2014 [*UNIDO Environmental and Social Policy and Procedures \(ESSPP\)*](#), available on the [UNIDO website](#). As described in the ESSPP, the associated ESSPP Accountability and Grievance Mechanism guarantees enforcement of UNIDO's environmental and social safeguard policies and procedures. This Mechanism and is operationalized through the UNIDO Office of Internal Oversight Services, independent and transparent in its nature.

26. UNIDO has published via its external website all the documentations cited above and necessary information, including the responsible departments or units in charge of the relevant functions. UNIDO reports that it has completed all the agreed action items and confirms its full compliance with the GEF Safeguards Policy. (Refer to Annex I for the detailed progress report.)

World Bank

27. When the Council approved the Safeguards Policy in November 2011, it also approved provisions contained in the explanatory section of the Council Document how the policy should be applied to the original GEF Agencies. This included the following statement: "because the GEF's minimum safeguard standards are derived from World Bank safeguard policies, and the World Bank already has a best-practice accountability system, the Secretariat recommends that the Council note that the Bank already meets the proposed minimum standards" and therefore, "will not be assessed according to the minimum standards in this Policy."

AGENCY PROGRESS ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING

28. As reported in GEF/C.45/10, the following agencies were assessed as fully meeting the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy: AfDB, ADB, EBRD, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNDP, and World Bank.

United Nations Environment Programme

29. As reported in GEF/C.45/10 and December 2013 Action Plans, UNEP had outstanding action items with regard to the paragraphs 16 and 18 of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. These outstanding items relate, to (a) measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse gender impacts, and (b) monitoring and evaluation of progress in gender mainstreaming. UNEP 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).

30. UNEP reports, and has provided evidence that it has completed agreed items with regards to both paragraphs.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization

31. As reported in GEF/C.45/10 and December 2013 Action Plans, UNIDO had outstanding action items with regard to the paragraphs 13 and 18 of the Gender Mainstreaming Policy. These outstanding items relate to (a) strengthening of its institutional framework for gender mainstreaming, and (b) monitoring and evaluation of progress in gender mainstreaming.

32. UNIDO reports that the Executive Board approved on December 17, 2014 the revised UNIDO Policy on [Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women](#), available on the UNIDO external [Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women website](#). UNIDO has significantly strengthened its institutional framework and capacity for gender mainstreaming, especially with (i) the establishment of the Office for Gender Mainstreaming, Ethics and Accountability within the Office of the Director General, (ii) the assignment of additional full-time staff working on gender; (iii) the establishment of the Gender Mainstreaming Steering Board led by the Director General and consisting of Managing Directors, and (iv) the assignment of over 20 Gender Focal Points throughout all Headquarters Branches of the Organization and a representative of its Staff Association. The Gender Focal Points will support the development, implementation, monitoring, and provision of guidance on gender mainstreaming within the Organization. Additionally, to develop systematic monitoring and evaluation capability and integrate gender throughout the project cycle, UNIDO has developed various guidelines and tools (examples of such guidelines and tools are available in the implementation tracker, Annex II-2), available on the [UNIDO Gender website](#).

33. UNIDO has published via its external website all the documentation cited above and necessary information, and has been actively working to strengthen institutional capacity and to implement its gender strategy and action plan. UNIDO is now pleased to report that it has completed all the agreed action items and confirms its full compliance with the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy. (Refer to Annex II for the detailed progress report.)

AGENCY PROGRESS ON FIDUCIARY STANDARDS

34. In June 2007, the GEF Council approved a set of Minimum Fiduciary Standards recommended by the Trustee, which were presented in Council document GEF/C.31/6, [Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies](#). According to [Council Document GEF/C.35/5](#) (June 2009), the following three Agencies were found to fully meet the standards: EBRD, IDB, and the World Bank. The Council requested each GEF Agency that had not fully met the Fiduciary Standards to implement agreed action plans to meet the standards. The Council also asked these Agencies to report annually on their progress in implementing their action plans¹¹. The Secretariat subsequently compiled implementation progress reports for submission to the Council at its meetings during the following months: June and November 2010, May 2011, June 2012, November 2013, and May 2014¹².

35. According to Council Information Document [GEF/C.46/Inf.05, Agency Progress on Meeting the GEF Fiduciary Standards](#) (May 2014), two outstanding agencies had completed their action plans to come into compliance with the GEF Fiduciary Standards. The document

¹¹ See Council document GEF/C.35/5, [Status of the GEF Agencies with Respect to Minimum Fiduciary Standards](#).

¹² These documents are as follows: GEF/C.38/10, [Agency Progress on Meeting GEF's Minimum Fiduciary Standards](#) (June 2010); GEF/C.39/Inf.4, [Agency Progress on Meeting GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards](#) (November 2010); GEF/C.40/Inf.10, [Agency Progress on Meeting the GEF Fiduciary Standards](#) (May 2011); GEF/C.42/Inf.11, [Agency Progress on Meeting the GEF Fiduciary Standards](#) (June 2012); GEF/C.45/Inf.04, [Agency Progress on Meeting the GEF Fiduciary Standards](#) (November 2013); and [GEF/C.46/Inf.05, Agency Progress on Meeting the GEF Fiduciary Standards](#).

also noted that the other eight agencies had previously reported their compliance with the Fiduciary Standards.

ANNEX I: IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Annex I-1: FAO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
<p>Overall Progress Report: FAO Director-General approved Environmental and Social Management Guidelines, available at FAO Environmental and Social Standards website. FAO Director-General approved FAO Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards, available at The Office of the Inspector General website.</p> <p>Relevant Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4413e.pdf http://www.fao.org/aud/42564-02ef5f920798b5c5e2edd631ca1c7462e.pdf http://www.fao.org/environmental-social-standards/en/ http://www.fao.org/aud/en/ 				
1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT				
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>Agreed Action(s): FAO has initiated a process to enhance its system of environmental and social safeguards and ensure full</p>	<p>FAO has substantively revised its environmental impact assessment guidelines to ensure full compliance with the GEF environmental and social safeguards (ESS).</p> <p>The new <i>Environmental and Social Management Guidelines</i> (ESMG) have been approved by the Director-General of FAO and can be found on FAO's newly established website: http://www.fao.org/environmental-social-standards/en/.</p> <p>The ESGM consists of the following sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction Management of Risk at Programme and Project Levels. Subsections on stakeholder engagement; screening to identify specific E&S risks at project level; environmental and social analyses/environmental and social assessment; Environment and Social Commitment Plan (ESCP); implementation, monitoring and reporting; disclosure; grievance review mechanism. 	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		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>III. Environmental and Social Safeguards</p> <p>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement ESS 7: Decent Work ESS 8: Gender Equality ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The FAO project cycle guidelines have also been revised to include environmental and social assessment through all stages of the project cycle (identification, preparation, appraisal, and implementation). The organizational chart on page 19 of the ESMG illustrates the integration of environmental and social risk management into the FAO project cycle and provides a delineation of responsibilities.</p> <p>In the new ESMG, projects are now categorized as low, moderate and high risk. The guidelines require that for moderate and high risks projects, independent external experts be used to conduct an environmental and social analysis (for moderate risk projects) and a full environment and social impact assessment (for high risk projects). Paragraph 19 (p. 14 of section II. Management of Risk at Programme and Project Levels specifically states:</p> <p><i>Where projects or sub-projects are classified as moderate or high risk, FAO will require environmental and social analysis (ESA, for moderate risk) and a full Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA, for high risk) carried out by an independent external expert.</i></p> <p>In addition, requirements for the use of independent external experts has been reiterated under several of the safeguards. For example, under ESS 1 Natural Resources</p>	

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			<p>Management, section B. Management of Water Resources and Small Dams, para 20 (p. 22) states:</p> <p><i>For projects aiming at developing more than 100 hectares of irrigation or with a water demand of more than 5000 m³/day, a full environmental and social impact assessment will be carried out by an independent expert. As a part of the assessment, the potential cumulative impacts of the project upon communities, other users, the environment, and the resources base itself will be included, any significant adverse impacts will be identified and appropriate mitigation measures will be indicated for incorporation into the project before moving forward.</i></p> <p>With respect to small dams, para 25 on page 23 states:</p> <p><i>For dams above 5m in height, a full environmental and social impact assessment will be carried out by an independent expert.</i></p> <p>Requirements for the need for independent external experts to conduct EISAs can also be found in ESS 2 Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats, para 13 on page 27 and ESS 9 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage, para 21, page 58.</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.	<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>Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	<p>A new sub-section on Disclosure has been added to the ESMG under section II Management of Risk at Programme and Project Levels. See extract below.</p> <p><i>E. Disclosure</i></p> <p><i>1. Disclosure of relevant project information helps stakeholders effectively participate, FAO will disclose information in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, that is accessible and culturally appropriate, placing due attention to the specific needs of community groups which may be affected by project implementation (such as literacy, gender, differences in language or accessibility of technical information or connectivity).</i></p> <p><i>2. In the case of high risk and some moderate risk projects, national or local legislation may specify disclosure requirements.</i></p>	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			<p>3. For moderate risk projects FAO releases the applicable information as early as possible, and no later than 30 days prior to project approval. The 30 day period commences only when all relevant information requested from the project has been provided and is availed to the public.</p> <p>4. For all high-risk projects, FAO releases the draft ESIA as early as possible, and no later than 60 days prior to project approval. The 60 day period commences only when all the relevant information requested from the project has been provided and is available to the public.</p> <p>5. FAO will undertake disclosure for all moderate and high-risk projects (see Annex 6).</p> <p>6. Requirements in projects under Emergency preparedness and response are covered in FAO in Emergencies Guidance Note on Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP).</p> <p><i>FAO in Emergencies Guidance Note; Accountability to affected populations.</i> AAP is applicable to all of FAO's programmes, whether humanitarian or development. It is highlighted in humanitarian situations due to the exceptional power imbalance between aid providers and recipients, and the urgent needs and increased vulnerability found within crisis-affected communities.</p> <p>In addition, FAO has established a website to publicly disclose its environmental and social safeguards and related documents, including environmental and social analyses, environmental and social impact assessments, Environmental and Social Commitment Plans, Indigenous Peoples Plans and other relevant documents. The website is: http://www.fao.org/environmental-social-standards/en/.</p> <p>FAO has an electronic Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) which systematically and efficiently captures project-related information and important benchmarks. Environmental screening and assessments, Environmental and Social Commitment Plans, Indigenous Peoples' Plans, stakeholder consultation, disclosure will be tracked on the FAO Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) and specifically by the Environment and Social Management Unit.</p>	

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS				
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>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	See 1.9 above.	Completed
3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT				
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	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.	<p>Involuntary Resettlement and displacement is ESS 6 in the new ESMG. ESS 6, with reference to the physical relocation of people, adheres to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) where the General Principles lay down, inter alia, that states should "safeguard legitimate tenure rights against threats and infringements. They should protect tenure right holders against the arbitrary loss of their tenure rights, including forced evictions ..."</p> <p>ESS 6 states that FAO: (i) prohibits forced evictions; (ii) will avoid, and when avoidance is not possible, minimize adverse social and economic impacts from restrictions on land or resource use or from land and resource acquisition; and (iii) improve or at least restore living conditions of persons who are physically or economically displaced, through improving and restoring their productive assets and security of tenure. In rare cases where physical or economic displacement may occur, ESS 6 stipulates that a Resettlement Action Plan and/or Livelihoods Restoration Plan must be developed and</p>	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of Oct. 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher;	<p>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>Agreed Action(s): 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>	agreed in full consultation with the affected communities prior to carrying out project activities that may result in economic or physical displacement.	

4. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES				
4.8	<p>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.</p>	<p>FAO requires development of an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) for projects that affect indigenous Peoples. The plan is to include measures 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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): FAO agrees to specify the generic content of and triggers for requiring and Indigenous Peoples Plan when it updates its EIA Guidelines.</p>	<p>FAO requires that, before adopting and implementing projects and programmes that may affect Indigenous Peoples, a process of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is followed and consent given by the indigenous community.</p> <p>Complete information must be disclosed to the indigenous community (-ies) involved in a timely manner and with sufficient time for the community to carry out internal deliberations; in accordance with indigenous peoples' traditions and customs; in their local language; and in an environment and in ways to which the indigenous peoples can relate.</p> <p>This process will aim at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring a positive engagement of indigenous peoples in the project; • avoiding adverse impacts, or when avoidance is not feasible, minimizing, mitigating, or compensating for such effects; • tailoring benefits in a culturally appropriate way. <p>In all cases, consent must be obtained from the indigenous leaders before undertaking any project activities affecting indigenous peoples rights, lands, natural resources, territories, livelihoods, knowledge, social fabric, traditions, governance systems, and culture or heritage (tangible and intangible).</p> <p>In those circumstances when a proposed project may be considered high risk, an Indigenous Peoples' Plan (IPP) will be prepared following the results of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent Process (FPIC). This plan will be developed in full consultation with the affected communities and in accordance with FAO's Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. The IPP will be discussed and approved by the indigenous community and approved by the FAO unit responsible for indigenous peoples. Once approved, the IPP will be integrated into the design and implementation of the project and form part of the project documentation.</p> <p>The IPP will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promote continued consultations during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements; • avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects; • ensure that Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits. 	Completed

			<p>The IPP will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to ensure that affected populations receive appropriate benefits; • measures to mitigate the impacts that may result from the high risk activities, as identified during the Free Prior and Informed Consent process; • measures to include the affected indigenous communities into the project steering committee and decision making process during the implementation; • budgetary allocation from within the project budget to ensure the adequate implementation of the plan. <p>The trigger questions below will identify the risk level and the circumstances in which an IPP would need to be developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any indigenous communities in the project area? • Are project activities likely to have adverse effects on indigenous peoples' rights, lands, natural resources, territories, livelihoods, knowledge, social fabric, traditions, governance systems, and culture or heritage (tangible and intangible)? • Are indigenous communities outside the project area likely to be affected by the project? <p>CHARACTERIZATION OF RISK LEVEL:</p> <p>LOW: At project assessment there are no indigenous peoples in the project area and there seems not to be any risk associated with project activities.</p> <p>MODERATE: There are indigenous peoples in the project area and/or project activities could affect indigenous peoples outside the project area. The project activities will impact without major disruption indigenous peoples' rights, lands, natural resources, territories, livelihoods, knowledge, social fabric, traditions and governance systems.</p> <p>HIGH: There are indigenous peoples in the project area or outside the project area who are adversely affected by the proposed project activities. In these cases, an Indigenous Peoples Plan will be prepared in full consultation with the affected communities and with advice from the Project Task Force. The IPP will have to be approved by the indigenous community, as well as by the FAO unit responsible for indigenous people.</p> <p>The risk level of a project will be determined by: (i) the results of the project assessment undertaken by the FAO technical units; and (ii) the outcome of the Free Prior and Informed Consent process determined by the indigenous community (ies).</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Actions linked to risk level:</p> <p>Low Risk: No need for FPIC</p> <p>Moderate Risk: FPIC compulsory and agreement by the community on the proposed activities.</p> <p>High Risk: When the project is identified as high risk, an Indigenous Peoples' Plan will be prepared for approval by the indigenous community and the FAO unit responsible for indigenous people.</p>	
4.9	<p>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>	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	See 1.9 above.	Completed
5. PEST MANAGEMENT				
5.6	<p>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>	<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>	See 1.9 above.	Completed

		Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.		
6. PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
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>Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure requirements.</p>	See 1.9 above.	Completed
7. SAFETY OF 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.	<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>Agreed Action(s): FAO will implement a disclosure tracking system to strengthen implementation of its disclosure</p>	See 1.9 above.	Completed

		requirements.		
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"> 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. 	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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 committed to ensuring that its programmes are implemented in accordance with the Organization's environmental and social obligations. In order to better achieve these goals, and to ensure that beneficiaries of FAO programmes have access to an effective and timely mechanism to address their concerns about non-compliance with these obligations, the Organization, in order to supplement measures for receiving, reviewing and acting as appropriate on these concerns at the programme management level, has entrusted the Office of the Inspector-General with the mandate to independently review the complaints that cannot be resolved at that level.</p> <p><i>Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards</i> can be found on FAO's website: http://www.fao.org/aud/en/ and http://www.fao.org/aud/48643/en/.</p> <p>FAO's accountability and grievance system is described in the ESMG in section II. Management of Risk at Programme and Project Levels, subsection I. Grievance Review Mechanism, which has been extracted and can be found below for ease of reference.</p> <p>I. Grievance Review Mechanism</p> <p>43. <i>FAO will facilitate the resolution of concerns of beneficiaries of FAO programmes regarding alleged or potential violations of FAO's social and environmental commitments. For this purpose, concerns may be communicated in accordance with the eligibility criteria of the Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards, which applies to all FAO programmes and projects (Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards).</i></p> <p>44. <i>Concerns must be addressed at the closest appropriate level, i.e. at the programme management/technical level, and if necessary at the Regional Office level. If a concern or grievance cannot be resolved through consultations and measures at</i></p>	Completed

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"> a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects. b. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing. c. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information. 	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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>	<p><i>the project management level, a complaint requesting a Compliance Review may be filed with the Office of the Inspector-General (OIG) in accordance with the Guidelines for Compliance Reviews.</i></p> <p><i>(i) Programme management/technical level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45. <i>All projects, programmes and country offices will be required to publicize the mechanism for the receipt and handling of grievances at the local level. A focal point to receive and process complaints will be established at the country office level.</i> 46. <i>Programme and project managers will have the responsibility to address concerns brought to the attention of the focal point regarding environment and social standards laid down in FAO ESS.</i> 47. <i>Each country office will be responsible for establishing mechanisms by which beneficiaries may communicate their concerns on ESS with the relevant focal point. This may include, but is not limited to, an email address, telephone number(s), contact person or physical address. The focal point will be responsible for keeping a log of all grievances filed regarding their programme or project.</i> <p><i>(ii) Regional office level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43. <i>Should the complainant not receive an acknowledgement of receipt within seven working days, they should forward their matter to the following addresses dependent on their region: Africa FAO-RAF@fao.org; Asia and Pacific FAO-RAP@fao.org; Europe and Central Asia FAO-RO-Europe@fao.org; Near East and North Africa FAO-RNE@fao.org.</i> 44. <i>The Environmental and Social Risk Management Unit will be responsible for providing technical assistance to the programme, country and regional offices to the concerns and complaints raised by beneficiaries regarding compliance with the ESS.</i> <p><i>(iii) Office of the Inspector-General (OIG)</i></p> <p><i>In those cases where a concern is not resolved through consultation with the programme/project management, country office or regional office as set out above, beneficiaries may file a complaint with the FAO Office of the Inspector-General (OIG), which will conduct an independent review. Contacts and details for filing complaints can be found in http://www.fao.org/aud/. Email: Investigations-hotline@fao.org.</i></p>	Completed
-----	---	---	---	-----------

	<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-2: IDB Implementation Tracker – Safeguards

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
5. PEST MANAGEMENT				
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>Agreed Action(s): 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 issued and published Guidance on the Implementation of Directive B.10: Pest and Pesticide Management , which includes the requirement that project teams should follow the recommendations and minimum standards described in the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management when designing and implementing Bank-financed operations.	Completed

Annex I-3: IFAD Implementation Tracker – Safeguards

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
<p>Overall Progress Report: IFAD senior management approved Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP), available at IFAD SECAP website. In accordance with IFAD's Policy on the Disclosure of Documents and SECAP's project documents disclosure requirement, draft ESIA reports and other relevant documents will be disclosed in a timely manner, prior to appraisal, at the QA stage on the SECAP website. IFAD senior management approved SECAP Complaints Procedures, available at SECAP Accountability and Complaints Procedure website.</p> <p>Relevant Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.ifad.org/climate/secap/secap_e_16dec.pdf • http://www.ifad.org/climate/SECAP/index.htm • http://www.ifad.org/gbdocs/eb/100/e/EB-2010-100-R-3-Rev-1.pdf • http://www.ifad.org/climate/secap/accountability_complaints_procedure.htm 				
1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT				
1.8	Provide for the application of the Minimum Requirements to subprojects under investment and rural finance (RF) activities;	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. Agreed Action(s): 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.	See <i>Guidance Statement 12 Rural Finance</i> . It provides the specific steps to avoid/mitigate/reduce the potential adverse environmental or social risks to be followed by financial service providers (FSPs). This especially concerns all projects and programmes that are classified as Category A or credit operations specified in Category B.	Completed
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.	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". Agreed Action(s): IFAD will revise its ESAP to ensure that all	IFAD's Policy on the Disclosure of Documents is based on the "principle of full disclosure" . In accordance with the SECAP requirements, draft ESIA's and other relevant documents will be	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		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.	disclosed in a timely manner prior to appraisal at the QA stage on the SECAP website. IFAD developed templates (ESIAs, draft resettlement plans, draft mitigation plans and frameworks, documentation of the IP Consultation process) which are uploaded on its corporate template site.	
2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS				
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". Agreed Action(s): 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.	Completed
3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT				
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 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	See <i>Guidance Statement 13 Physical and Economic Resettlement</i> (proportionate to the range of risk of IFAD's operations). It identifies and addresses risks on resettlement. In addition, IFAD has developed a How-to-do note on Free Prior and	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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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;	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.”	Informed Consent (FPIC) to provide guidance to staff and soliciting FPIC in the design, and supervision of IFAD-supported projects.	
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.		
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;	Agreed Action(s): 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 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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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.			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
4. 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>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>Agreed Action(s): 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.	Completed
5. PEST MANAGEMENT				
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>Agreed Action(s): 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.	Completed
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.	<p>IFAD does not have systems or policies for ensuring the protection of physical cultural resources in its projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP to include</p>	See <i>Guidance Statement 9 'Physical Cultural Resources'</i> . It emphasizes the use of a precautionary approach, and addresses "chance find".	Completed
6.2	If possible, avoid financing projects that could	adherence to national laws and regulations pertaining to cultural		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	significantly damage PCR. As appropriate, conduct field-based surveys using qualified specialists to evaluate PCR.	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.	For item 6.5 on disclosure, see 1.9 above.	
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.	<p>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 safety plans for the small dams in its projects, including for construction supervision, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>	<p>See <i>Guidance Statement 8 Small Dams</i>. The statement addresses issues related to dam safety as well as environmental and social risk assessment and supervision requirements to apply to construction of new small dams or rehabilitation of existing ones.</p> <p>For item 7.6 on disclosure, see 1.9 above.</p>	Completed
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>Agreed Action(s): IFAD will: (i) strengthen its ESAP to include</p>		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		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.		
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>Agreed Action(s): 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 Operational Statement will address the requirements of 7.2, 7.5 and 7.6 below.</p>		
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"> 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. 	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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 has established a dedicated public website on SECAP Complaints Procedure, while taking into account its special status and mandate.</p> <p>This procedure allows affected complainants to have their concerns resolved in a fair and timely manner through an independent process. The procedure also provides for an impartial review to be carried out by the Office of the Vice-President if requested by complainants. The independent</p>	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			and transparency of the review process will be guaranteed by the publication of the IFAD Annual report.	
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects. Work proactively with the complainant and other parties to resolve the complaints or disputes determined to have standing. Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward, with due regard for confidentiality of information. 	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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 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>The SECAP Complaints Procedure will ensure the receipt of and timely response to complaints regarding breaches of IFAD's environmental and social policies and mandatory aspects of SECAP.</p>	

Annex I-4: UNEP Implementation Tracker – Safeguards

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
<p>Overall Progress Report: UNEP Executive Director approved Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability (ESES) Framework, available at UNEP ESES website. UNEP's Access to Information Policy requires disclosure of a) draft environmental and social impact assessments; b) documentation of the consultation process; and c) draft mitigation plans. UNEP ESES Stakeholder Response Mechanism has been published on the ESES website.</p> <p>Relevant Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.unep.org/about/eses/Portals/50272/Documents/UNEP_Environmental_Social_and_Economic_Sustainability_Framework.pdf • http://www.unep.org/environmentalgovernance/Portals/8/documents/UNEP-access-to-information-policy.pdf • http://www.unep.org/about/eses/Portals/50272/Documents/ESES_RESPONSE_MECHANISM.pdf 				
1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT				
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.	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.	The ESES Framework meets GEF Criteria 1, "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment". It includes thematic safeguard standards in following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity conservation, natural habitats, and sustainable management of living resources; • Resource efficiency, pollution prevention and management of chemicals and wastes; • Safety of dams; • Involuntary resettlement; • Indigenous peoples; • Labor and working conditions; 	Completed
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;	Agreed Action(s): 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 (ESES) Framework</i> and related guidelines. UNEP will also update its ESIA training manual for use by project staff.		
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;			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of tangible cultural heritage; • Gender equality; and • Economic sustainability. 	
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			
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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns;			
2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS				
2.2	Give preference to siting physical infrastructure investments on lands where natural habitats have already been converted to other land uses;	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make the needed improvements to its natural habitat protection safeguards operational policies in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.</p>	<p>The approved ESES Framework includes a safeguard standard on "Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Habitat, and Sustainable Management of Living Resources", which fully meet the GEF minimum requirements.</p> <p>UNEP's Access to Information Policy (para. 7) 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 habitats.</p> <p>The safeguard screening template and related procedures, which are under finalization, will identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP's safeguard minimum requirements on natural habitats are respected and complied with so as to avoid/mitigate/reduce potential risks.</p>	Completed
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.			
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,			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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;	<p>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.</p> <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>Agreed Action(s): 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</p>	<p>The approved ESES Framework includes the safeguard standard on “Involuntary Resettlement”, which fully meets the GEF minimum requirements.</p> <p>UNEP’s Access to Information Policy (Para. 7) 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 resettlement.</p> <p>The safeguard screening template and related procedures, which are under finalization, intend to identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP’s safeguard minimum requirements on involuntary resettlement are respected and complied with so as to</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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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.	Grievance mechanism.	avoid/mitigate/reduce related potential risks.	
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 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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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 full implementation (by-end 2013). In practice, UNEP has demonstrated its capacity for dealing	The approved ESES Framework includes a safeguard standard on “Indigenous Peoples”, which fully meet the GEF minimum requirements.	Completed
4.4	Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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.	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.	UNEP has demonstrated its capacity for dealing with IP in its projects in the past, which will be further improved for implementation of the IP Policy Guidance and operational guidelines in the future. UNEP has the Indigenous Peoples (IP) Policy Guidance document (2012). However, an e-learning toolkit is still under development and the estimated production date is end of March 2015. A roll-out of the toolkit is planned in the following months until June 2015. However, the operational guideline and the IP checklist have partly been already incorporated within UNEP Project Review Committee requirements. UNEP's Access to Information Policy (Para. 7) 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 indigenous peoples. The safeguard screening template and	
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.	Agreed Action(s): 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.		
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.			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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.		related procedures, which are under finalization, intend to identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP’s safeguard minimum requirements on indigenous peoples are respected and complied with so as to avoid/mitigate/reduce related potential risks.	
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.			
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 2012-2013 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. Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make needed improvements to its safeguards, operational policies, guidelines, and procedures to meet the	The approved ESES Framework includes a safeguard standard on “Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes”, which fully meets the GEF minimum requirements. UNEP’s Access to Information Policy (Para. 7) 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 pests and pollutants. The safeguard screening template and related procedures, which are under	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.			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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.	outstanding Minimum Requirements listed in column 2 to the left.	finalization, will identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP’s safeguard minimum requirements on Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes are respected and complied with so as to avoid/mitigate/reduce related potential risks.	
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.	UNEP does not have sufficiently detailed operational policies, procedures, or guidelines for dealing with physical cultural resources in its projects. Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make the needed improvements to address physical cultural resources in its projects in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.	The approved ESES Framework includes the safeguard standard on “Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage”, which fully meet the GEF minimum requirements. UNEP’s Access to Information Policy (Para. 7) 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 physical cultural resources. The safeguard screening template and	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.			
6.3	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			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	form and language understandable to them.		related procedures, which are under finalization, intend to identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP's safeguard minimum requirements on Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage are respected and complied with so as to avoid/mitigate/reduce related potential risks.	
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.	<p>UNEP does not have sufficiently detailed operational policies, procedures, or guidelines for ensuring the safety of small dams in its projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make the needed improvements to its operational procedures to address the safety of small dams in its projects.</p>	<p>The approved ESES Framework includes the safeguard standard on "Safety of dams", which fully meet the GEF minimum requirements.</p> <p>UNEP's Access to Information Policy (Para. 7) 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 dam safety.</p> <p>The safeguard screening template and related procedures, which are under finalization, intend to identify safeguard risk types and levels. This effort is to ensure that UNEP's safeguard minimum requirements on</p>	Completed
7.2	Develop plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.			
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.			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			Safety of dams are respected and complied with so as to avoid/mitigate/reduce related potential risks.	
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"> 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. 	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNEP will make the needed improvements to meet the accountability system requirements in its Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework.</p>	<p>UNEP's approved ESES Framework describes UNEP's <i>Stakeholder Response Mechanism</i>, including operating procedures and the structure and procedure for responding to possible grievance cases. This mechanism fully meets the GEF requirements. The response mechanism and additional information is available at: www.unep.org/about/eses</p>	Completed
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"> a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of its projects. 	<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 UNEP supported projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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,</p>	<p>UNEP's approved ESES Framework describes UNEP's <i>Stakeholder Response Mechanism</i>, including operating procedures, and the structure and procedure for responding to possible grievance cases. This mechanism fully meets the GEF requirement 8.2. The response mechanism and additional information is available at: www.unep.org/about/eses</p>	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	<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>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>		

Annex I-5: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Safeguards

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
<p>Overall Progress Report: UNIDO Executive Board approved on December 18, 2014 UNIDO Environmental and Social Policy and Procedures (ESSPP), available under <i>Documents</i> on UNIDO's Internal Oversight Services website. ESSPP Accountability and Grievance Mechanism has been established within UNIDO's Office of Internal Oversight Services.</p> <p>Relevant Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media_upgrade/Overview/Internal_Oversight_Services/UNIDO ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.pdf http://www.unido.org/en/overview/internal-oversight-services.html 				
1. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT				
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.	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. Agreed Action(s): 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.	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.	Completed
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;	UNIDO has extensive experience performing technical environmental studies and ESIA's, 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.	OS8 (<i>Information Disclosure</i>) presents UNIDO policy on information disclosure.	

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		Agreed Action(s): 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.		
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>Agreed Action(s): UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure that assessments of national legal and institutional 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.</p>		
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>UNIDO needs to develop written operational policies or guidelines regarding the analysis of project alternatives.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures to ensure analysis of viable project alternatives.</p>		
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,	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.		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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;	Agreed Action(s): 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.		
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;	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. Agreed Action(s): UNIDO is in the process of further strengthening the relevant provisions for stakeholder engagement.		
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	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. Agreed Action(s): UNIDO is in the process of adopting policies and procedures requiring the use of independent ESIA expertise in the		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	environmental and/or social concerns;	preparation, review and implementation of ESIA's for projects with significant risk as per categorization system (see 1.1).		
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>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
2. PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS				
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>Agreed Action(s): 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>	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>), OS2 (<i>Protection of Natural Habitats</i>), and OS8 (<i>Information Disclosure</i>).	Completed
2.2	Give preference to siting physical infrastructure investments on lands where natural habitats have already been	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		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	converted to other land uses;	<p>does finance small-scale infrastructure projects that may involve trade-offs with natural habitats.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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 to siting physical infrastructure on lands where natural habitats have already been converted to other land uses.</p>		
2.3	<p>Avoid significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those habitats that are:</p> <p>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>	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
2.4	Where projects adversely affect non-critical natural habitats, proceed only if viable alternatives are not available, and if appropriate conservation and mitigation	UNIDO needs to come up with written operational policies or guidelines to ensure that its projects avoid adverse impacts on non-critical habitats.		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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>Agreed Action(s): 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 standard either: (i) consider alternative designs/siting arrangements to avoid any conflict with the standard or (ii) are not approved for further development.</p>		
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>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
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>Agreed Action(s): 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</p>		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		alternative design/siting arrangement in order to avoid any conflict with the requirement or (ii) fail to get approved for further development.		
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. Agreed Action(s): UNIDO is in the process of further strengthening the relevant provisions for stakeholder engagement.		
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. Agreed Action(s): 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.		
3. INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT				
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. Agreed Action(s): 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 for such potential	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS3 (<i>Involuntary Resettlement</i>), which states UNIDO's commitment not to involuntarily resettle anyone affected by a project	Completed

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		impacts.		
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>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing IP in its projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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 ensure early screening of its projects for the presence of IP in project areas.</p>	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>), OS4 (<i>Indigenous People</i>), and OS8 (<i>Information Disclosure</i>).	Completed
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>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
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>Agreed Action(s): 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 ensure</p>		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		that its projects perform appropriate ESIA's with the involvement of IP to assess potential impacts and identify appropriate measures.		
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>Agreed Action(s): 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 ensure that the benefits of its projects are appropriate for IP and reflect their preferred options.</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.	<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>Agreed Action(s): 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>Where applicable, UNIDO will support activities for recognition of traditional land tenure systems used by Indigenous Peoples.</p>		
4.7	Refrain from utilizing the cultural resources or knowledge of Indigenous Peoples without obtaining their prior agreement to such use.	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		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.		
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.	<p>UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing indigenous peoples in its projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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 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.</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>See 1.9 above.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
4.10	Monitor, by experienced social scientists,	UNIDO has not yet developed policies or procedures for addressing		

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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>indigenous peoples in its projects and therefore needs to come up with specific monitoring requirements for projects involving indigenous peoples.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>		
5. PEST MANAGEMENT				
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.	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNIDO will develop guidelines to add to its Procurement Manual and/or other relevant documentation: to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to ensure that any procurement of pesticides in its projects complies with WHO regulations; • banning procurement in its projects of any persistent organic pollutants (POPs) identified by the Stockholm Convention; and, • to ensure that any management and disposal of pesticides in its projects complies with the FAO Code of Conduct. 	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>) and OS5 (<i>Pest Management</i>) which states 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.	Completed
5.3	The Agency also does not allow the procurement or use in its projects pesticides and other chemicals specified as			

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	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	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, 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.	<p>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, this minimum standard largely does not apply to UNIDO.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>), and OS6 (<i>Physical Cultural Resources</i>), which states UNIDO's commitment to banning projects that adversely affect physical and cultural resources.	Completed
7. SAFETY OF DAMS				

#	Criterion / Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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>Agreed Action(s): 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>	See OS1 (<i>Environmental and Social Assessment</i>), OS7 (<i>Safety of Dams</i>), which includes a commitment to dam design quality and safety, and OS8 (<i>Information Disclosure</i>).	Completed
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>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> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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.</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>See 1.9 above.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>		

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"> 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. 	<p>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.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): UNIDO will adopt a mechanism for ensuring accountability for and enforcement of its environmental and social safeguards.</p>	<p>See OS9 (<i>Accountability and Grievance Systems</i>) which includes procedures for dealing with policy non-compliance and project-level grievances based on existing UNIDO Internal Oversight mechanisms.</p>	Completed
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"> a. Designate staff or a division that is available to receive and respond to complaints related to the implementation of 	<p>UNIDO does not currently have an ESS-specific mechanism for receiving and responding to complaints from parties affected by implementation of its projects.</p> <p>Agreed Action(s): 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>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>			
--	---	--	--	--

ANNEXES II: IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORTS 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 October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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>Agreed Action: 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 UNEP Executive Director approved UNEP's ESESF on 31 st December 2014 by the Executive Director. The ESESF includes a requirement that during project reviews UNEP will avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate adverse gender impacts.	Completed
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>Agreed Action: 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&E of gender mainstreaming by end-2014.</p>	<p>The UNEP Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment (2014-2017) was approved by the UNEP Senior Management Team in November 2014. Its available online at http://www.unep.org/gender</p> <p>The on-line course on Gender Mainstreaming in Environmental Project Management (composed of three self guided modules) for UNEP and MEA staff was launched in November 2014 and is now available on the UNEP Learning Management Portal at http://unep.unssc.org/. The modules cover the various topics on gender and environment and staff receive a certificate at the end of the course.</p> <p>A Gender Marker - an accountability tool that measures the degree to which a project addresses gender equality issues - has already been developed and integrated into</p>	

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			<p>the UNEP Programme Review Committee requirements. The Gender Marker can be used to track resources and report internally and externally (to donors) on funds that in different degrees support gender equality. (see attached)</p> <p>The UNEP Evaluation office has already undertaken an assessment on the integration of gender equality criteria in evaluation of UNEP projects and extent to which these are aligned with the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Gender Norms and Standards and the UNEG Guidance on Integration of Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. The progress on UNEP's integration of the UNEG gender norms for evaluation was reported to the UNSWAP in January 2015. In preparing for the UNSWAP report the UNEP Evaluation office undertook a scoring of UNEP projects to determine extent of gender analysis in projects ending December 2014 (see enclosed) . The scoring methodology applied is that developed by the UNEG in collaboration with UN Women and is standardized for all UN agencies.</p> <p>The results of the UNEP Evaluation scores have been very useful in the review of the evaluation methodology by the UNEP evaluation office which is now complete and gender equality criteria integrated into TORs for the consultants undertaking terminal evaluations. (see attached).</p>	

Annex II-2: UNIDO Implementation Tracker – Gender Mainstreaming

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
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>Agreed Action(s): 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"> • The establishment of its new Office for Gender mainstreaming • Providing additional staff working full time on gender 	<p>UNIDO has come into full compliance with the agreed actions under this item. Since the last reporting period, UNIDO has achieved the following:</p> <p>The UNIDO Executive Board (EB) approved the revised version of <i>UNIDO Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</i> in its meeting on 17 December 2014. The <i>Policy</i> has been officially issued on the UNIDO Gender webpage at the following link: http://www.unido.org/gender.html</p> <p>With the issuance of the revised <i>Policy</i> UNIDO has demonstrated that the Organization significantly strengthened its institutional framework and capacity for gender mainstreaming, especially with (i) the establishment of the UNIDO Office for Gender Mainstreaming, Ethics and Accountability in the Office of the Director General, with a direct reporting line; (ii) the assignment of additional staff working full-time on gender; (iii) the establishment of the Gender Mainstreaming Steering Board, led by the Director General and consisting of UNIDO's Managing Directors. Furthermore, 21 Gender Focal Points, on part time assignment, in every Branch of UNIDO will be supporting the development, implementation, monitoring, and provision of guidance on gender mainstreaming within the Organization. The <i>Policy</i> outlines in detail the performance requirements, which comprise of actions and measures structured along the six pillars of the Chief Executive Board's (CEB's) United Nations System-wide Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. These are:</p> <p>A. Accountability for gender equality results among staff at all levels in order to close implementation gaps in organizational policies, programmes and business practices;</p>	Completed

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			<p>B. Results based management for gender equality and empowerment of women by utilizing common-system indicators and measurement protocols;</p> <p>C. Oversight through monitoring, evaluation, audit and reporting by means of programme/project appraisal and review processes, peer reviews, gender audits and collection of sex-disaggregated baseline and monitoring data;</p> <p>D. Human and financial resources, through strengthening of the Organization's gender mainstreaming architecture, better utilization of current resources and allocation of additional resources where required, alignment of resources with expected outcomes and tracking the utilization of resources, while paying significant attention to the creation and preservation of a positive organizational culture and to gender balance within the Organization;</p> <p>E. Capacity development of staff and building of organizational competency in gender mainstreaming by adopting both common-system and Organization-specific capacity development approaches; and</p> <p>F. Coherence, and knowledge and information management on gender equality and empowerment of women in Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) at the global, regional and national levels through the development of partnerships with women's organizations, the private sector, multilateral and bilateral partners of UNIDO, development finance institutions and the UN system.</p> <p>Gender mainstreaming guidelines and tools have been further developed and updated, including the documents below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix on mainstreaming gender in project formulation implementation, monitoring and evaluation with gender mainstreaming examples. • Gender relevance categorization and minimum requirements tool for project design and formulation 	

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender mainstreaming checklist for projects • Gender analysis tool • Theme-specific Guides on Gender Mainstreaming. (The Guide on Gender Mainstreaming for UNIDO Energy and Climate Change Projects, the Guide on Gender Mainstreaming Environmental Management Projects, the Guide on Gender Mainstreaming Montreal Protocol Projects, the Guide on Agribusiness Development Projects and the Guide on Trade Capacity Building Projects define theme-specific indicator frameworks to monitor gender-related impacts, as well as provide guidance on gender mainstreaming throughout the whole project cycle. A further Guide on Business, Investment and Technology Services for Private Sector Development will be available in April 2015.) <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> <p>With regard to further strengthening the institutional framework, UNIDO is currently in the process of drafting a Gender Strategy for the period 2016-2019, that will include gender targets and indicators for each of UNIDO's thematic areas along the priorities indicated in the Organization's strategic planning documents, specifically, the Medium Term Programming Framework and the biennial Program and Budgets.</p>	
18	The Agency has a system for monitoring and evaluating progress in gender	UNIDO was assessed as not fully meeting this Minimum Requirement. UNIDO has developed written strategies,	UNIDO has come into full compliance with the agreed actions under this item. All tools mentioned above, including the revised <i>Policy</i> , support the integration of gender into the monitoring and evaluation procedures of project	Completed

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
	mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators.	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 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>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"> • 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&E system • Gender mainstreaming checklist for projects that includes specific requirements for M&E • Theme-specific Guides on Gender Mainstreaming include the gender mainstreaming Indicator Frameworks that provide typical performance indicators specific to Branches' interventions for monitoring and evaluating gender-related impacts. (See item 13 above for complete list of these Guides). <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&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; A Gender Marker. 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</p>	

#	Minimum Requirements	Formerly Outstanding Items & Agreed Actions (As contained in Agency Action Plan of October 2014)	Implementation Steps Undertaken	Status
		<p>Agreed Action(s): 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>gender equality investments have been developed and are ready for testing.</p> <p>Currently, the ISAP for the 2014-2015 is being implemented.</p>	