

Final Draft

Summary Report

# Comparative Analysis of Environmental and Social Safeguards of Selected UN Agencies

---

**Version: 25 June 2018**

**Prepared by:**

Bruce Jenkins  
Consultant  
bjenk@mac.com

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	Summary of Findings .....	4
	ESS architecture and thematic coverage .....	4
	Screening, assessment and management .....	8
	Human rights.....	10
	Women’s empowerment and gender equality .....	10
	Biodiversity, habitats, sustainable natural resource management .....	10
	Indigenous peoples .....	11
	Physical and economic displacement, involuntary resettlement .....	12
	Community, health, safety, security .....	12
	Labour and working conditions.....	13
	Cultural heritage, physical cultural resources.....	14
	Pollution prevention, pesticides, resource efficiency .....	14
	Climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk reduction .....	15
	Stakeholder engagement, access to information, grievance redress, and accountability .....	16
III.	Conclusions and recommendations .....	16
	Appendix. References to normative basis for key safeguard areas.....	18

## I. Introduction

1. The Senior Officials of the UN Environment Management Group (EMG) agreed in September 2016 to establish a work stream under the “Consultative Process on Advancing the Environmental and Social Sustainability in the UN system” (Consultative Process) to consider options for moving towards a common approach to environmental and social standards for programmes/projects.
2. Robust social and environmental standards (e.g. safeguards), and related accountability mechanisms (e.g. grievance mechanisms) are increasingly applied as best practice in programming. In practical terms such standards aim to ensure that development and humanitarian actors are held to the principles they proclaim, and that interventions do not result in inadvertent harm to people and the environment. Such standards support a rights-based approach that is transparent, inclusive and participative so that **no one is left behind**. They also reflect that even with good planning and best intentions, unanticipated impacts and conflict may still arise so accountability mechanisms need to be in place to receive, assess, and respond to grievances from project-affected people.
3. Moving towards a common approach to social and environmental standards would demonstrate a commitment to **Delivering as One** by ensuring the normative principles of the UN are consistently operationalized through country level programming. A common approach would strengthen policy coherence and improve collaboration with governments and other national counterparts in our country level programming. It would also allow for greater shared trainings, tools, and learning among Agencies.
4. Per Output 1 of the ToR of the EMG Consultative Process, the objective of this comparative analysis is to identify specific areas of convergence and divergence in the scope and requirements of programme/project-level safeguard policies and procedures and accountability mechanisms of selected UN Agencies participating in the EMG Working Group in order to inform recommendations for moving towards a common approach to social and environmental safeguards/standards. The seven UN Agencies participating in this exercise are the following: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNICEF (draft policy), United Nations Industrial Organization (UNIDO), and UNOPS.
5. **Methodology.** The methodology for this report involved a careful review of the environmental and social safeguard (ESS) requirements of each Agency in order to provide a basis of comparison across key thematic issue areas. Areas of convergence and commonality as well as areas of divergence and/or gaps were identified. In addition, safeguards among several other international entities were also included for reference, i.e. the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the World Bank, and the Green Climate Fund (GCF, which currently utilizes many standards of the International Finance Corporation, IFC). A summary listing of the relevant UN normative basis for various ESS thematic areas was developed (see Appendix). A set of recommendations for moving towards a common approach follows from the analysis.
6. Thematic safeguard areas reviewed in this report are the following: Human Rights, Gender Equality Biodiversity and Sustainable Natural Resources Management, Physical and Economic Displacement/Resettlement, Indigenous Peoples, Community Health and Safety and Security, Labour and Working Conditions, Cultural Heritage, Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction. In addition, additional Agency overarching ESS requirements were reviewed: Screening, Assessment, and Management of social and

environmental risks/impacts; Stakeholder Engagement, Access to Information and Grievance Mechanisms and Agency-level Accountability systems.

## II. Summary of Findings

7. The comparative analysis found significant alignment and complementarity in the structure, thematic coverage and content of nearly all reviewed Agency ESSs. Where differences and gaps have been identified between Agency ESSs, these concern primarily the scope of issues addressed by particular thematic safeguard areas and the level of detail of specific requirements. In short, the significant commonality across Agency ESSs provides a solid basis for the development of a Common Approach to social and environmental safeguards in programming.
8. A summary of the findings regarding overall ESS architecture and each reviewed thematic area are summarized below.

### *ESS architecture and thematic coverage*

9. Most Agency ESSs are structured around (a) an overarching policy statement, commitments, and principles, (b) a set of thematic safeguard standards and requirements, and (c) a set of implementing procedures and processes. Table 1 provides an outline of each Agency's ESS. One Agency addresses key thematic areas with focused overarching policy requirements and another Agency utilizes an overarching procedure supported by thematic policies and guidance statements.
10. Generally, Agency ESSs align – in full or in many cases, partially – with the overarching thematic safeguard areas reviewed in this report. Table 2 maps Agency ESSs to these thematic areas. In terms of overall structure, thematic safeguard areas showing less alignment include climate change mitigation and adaptation and community health, safety and security.
11. Some Agencies present certain safeguard thematic areas as stand-alone safeguard standards (e.g. environmental and social assessment, stakeholder engagement) while other Agencies present these elements as cross-cutting procedural dimensions. However, no matter how presented, mandatory requirements regarding these areas are clearly stated.

**Table 1. Outline of Agency ESS**

<p><b>FAO Environmental and Social Management Guidelines (ESMG)</b></p> <p>Management of Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder engagement</li> <li>▪ Screening and Classification</li> <li>▪ Environmental and social analysis/assessment</li> <li>▪ Environmental and Social Commitment Plan (ECSP)</li> <li>▪ Implementation, monitoring, reporting</li> <li>▪ Capacity development</li> <li>▪ Disclosure</li> <li>▪ Grievance Review Mechanism</li> </ul> <p>Environmental and Social Standards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Natural Resources Management</li> <li>2. Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</li> <li>3. Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</li> <li>4. Animal —Livestock and Aquatic – Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</li> <li>5. Pest and Pesticides Management</li> <li>6. Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</li> <li>7. Decent Work</li> <li>8. Gender Equality</li> <li>9. Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</li> </ol>	<p><b>IFAD Updated Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedure (SECAP)</b></p> <p>SECAP implementation process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responsibility and preparation of studies and assessments</li> <li>▪ Projects with co-financers and financial service providers</li> <li>▪ Consultation and participation</li> <li>▪ Disclosure</li> <li>▪ Grievance and redress mechanism</li> </ul> <p>Incorporation of SECAP assessments into project cycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project concept <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ E/S categorization</li> <li>○ Climate risk classification</li> <li>○ Impacts (nature/sensitivity, significance, cumulative/induced)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Early Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ E/S impact assessment</li> <li>○ Climate Risk analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Other steps: late design, loan negotiation, board approval, project implementation, completion and ex-post ESIA</li> </ul> <p>Integrating social, env, climate issues into country programming (RB-COSOPS and CSNs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Design and preparatory studies</li> </ul> <p>Guidance Statements (2014 versions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Biodiversity and protected area management</li> <li>▪ Agrochemicals</li> <li>▪ Energy</li> <li>▪ Fisheries and aquaculture</li> <li>▪ Forest resources</li> <li>▪ Livestock and range resources</li> <li>▪ Water</li> <li>▪ Small dams</li> <li>▪ Physical cultural resources</li> <li>▪ Rural roads</li> <li>▪ Development of value chain, microenterprises and small enterprises</li> <li>▪ Rural finance</li> <li>▪ Physical and economic resettlement</li> <li>▪ Human Health (2017)</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES)</b></p> <p>Overarching Policy</p> <p>Principle 1: Human Rights</p> <p>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability</p> <p>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</p> <p>Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</p> <p>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</p>	<p><b>UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework (ESES)</b></p> <p>Statement of Commitment, Purpose, Scope</p> <p>Overarching Principles (precautionary approach, HRBA)</p> <p>Thematic Safeguard Standards</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Habitats and Sustainable Management of Living Resources</li> <li>2. Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes</li> <li>3. Safety of Dams</li> <li>4. Involuntary Resettlement</li> <li>5. Indigenous Peoples</li> </ol>

<p>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency Policy Delivery Process: Screening and Categorization; Assessment and Management; Stakeholder Engagement and Response Mechanisms; Access to Information; Monitoring and Compliance</p>	<p>6. Labour and Working Conditions 7. Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage 8. Gender Equality 9. Economic Sustainability Procedures for Implementation: Implementation approach Use of country or partner safeguard systems Safeguards in project cycle: development, implementation M&amp;E // Screening // Assessment and management plans // Approval and clearance // Mitigation, management, monitoring in implementation // Accountability mechanism // Access to Information // Stakeholder response</p>
<p><b>UNICEF: <u>DRAFT</u> Social and Environmental Sustainability Standards and Procedures (SESSP)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Guiding Principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Statement of Commitment</li> <li>○ Overarching Principle: Social and Env Sustainability</li> <li>○ GP1: Human Rights-Based Approach</li> <li>○ GP2: Gender Equality</li> <li>○ GP3: Compliance with National and Intl Laws</li> <li>○ GP4: Transparency and Inclusivity</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Programme/Project Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SES1: Labour and Working Conditions</li> <li>○ SES2: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention</li> <li>○ SES3: Community Health, Safety and Security</li> <li>○ SES4: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement</li> <li>○ SES5: Biodiversity Conservation and Sust. Management of Living Natural Resources</li> <li>○ SES6: Indigenous Peoples</li> <li>○ SES7: Cultural Heritage</li> <li>○ SES8: Climate-resilient Development</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Implementation Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Application of standards to non-thematic donor proposals</li> <li>○ Use of country or partner safeguard systems</li> <li>○ Stakeholder engagement and accountability mechanisms</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrated Safeguards Policy Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Guiding Principles: Compliance with national and international laws // Transparency and inclusivity // Harmonization in multi-organization projects // Gender equality // Climate resilience</li> <li>○ Operational Safeguards <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Environmental and Social Assessment</li> <li>2. Protection of Natural Habitats and Biodiversity</li> <li>3. Involuntary Resettlement and Land Acquisition</li> <li>4. Indigenous People<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> <li>5. Pest Management<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> <li>6. Physical Cultural Resources and Heritage<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> <li>7. Safety of Dams</li> <li>8. Labor and Working Conditions</li> <li>9. Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention</li> <li>10. Community Health, Safety and Security<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> <li>11. Information Disclosure and Stakeholder Consultation<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> <li>12. Accountability and Grievance Systems<sup>[11]</sup><sub>SEP</sub></li> </ol> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Environmental and Social Safeguard Steps along Project Cycle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project identification, screening and categorization</li> <li>○ Project formulation</li> <li>○ Project clearance/compliance verification/approval</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Project implementation/monitoring/evaluation</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNOPS Executive Office Directive: Occupational Health and Safety and Social and Environmental Management</b> (March 2017) (Policy) and Implementation of Three Levels of Requirements for Health &amp; Safety and Social &amp; Environmental Management (draft) (Implementation Reqs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Principles and requirements grouped around Occupational, Health, Safety and Social and Environment</li> </ul>	

**Table 2. Agency ESS by Thematic Safeguard Areas (screening, assessment and management reviewed separately)**

Thematic Areas	FAO	IFAD	UNDP	UNEP	UNICEF	UNIDO	UNOPS
<b>Human Rights</b>	(promotes right to adequate food, HRBA)	(Values/vision)	Principle 1: Human Rights	HRBA Overarching Principle	Guiding Principle 1. HRBA	Guiding Principle 1.2	Req. 2.3
<b>Gender Equality (in ESS)</b>	ESS8 Gender Equality	(in Targeting Policy)	Principle 2: Gender Equality/ Women's Empowerment	S8. Gender Equality	Guiding Principle 2. Gender Equality	Guiding Principle 1.2	Req. 2.3
<b>Gender Equality Policy/Strategy [TBC]</b>	Policy on Gender Equality	Gender Mainstrming in IFAD 10 Targeting	Gender Equality Strategy, 2014-2017	Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environ	Gender Action Plan	Policy and Strategy on Gender Equal & Empwrm of Women	Strategic Plan
<b>Biodiversity, habitats, sustainable NRM</b>	ESS1. Ntrl Resources ESS2. Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Natural Habitats ESS3. Plant and Genetic Resources ESS4. Animal/ Livestock/Aquatic Genetic Resources	SECAP (applies to all) Envir and Natural Resource Mngment Policy (ENRM) Guidance Statement 1 Biodiversity and Protected Area Management	S1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	S1: Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Habitats and Sustainable Management of Living Resources	SES5: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Resources	OS2: Protection of Natural Habitats and Biodiversity	Req. 2.3
<b>Physical and economic displacement, involuntary resettlement</b>	ESS6. Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement	IFAD Land Policy Guidance Statement 13: Physical and Economic Resettlement	S5: Displacement and Resettlement	S4: Involuntary Resettlement	SES4: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement	OS3: Involuntary Resettlement and Land Acquisition	Req. 2.3
<b>Indigenous peoples</b>	ESS9. Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Policy on Engagement with Indigenous Peoples	S6: Indigenous Peoples	S5. Indigenous Peoples	SES6: Indigenous Peoples	OS4: Indigenous Peoples	
<b>Community health, safety, security</b>	ESS1 includes dam safety	Guidance Statement 14: Community Health	S3: Community, Health, Safety and Working Conditions	S3 Safety of Dams	SES3: Community Health, Safety, and Security	OS10: Comm Health, Safety, and Security, OS7: Safety of Dams	Req. 2.1, I5.2
<b>Labor and working conditions</b>	ESS7 Decent Work	SECAP, Guid Stmts 10, 11, 12, also exclusion list	S3: CHS and Working Conditions	S6. Labor and Working Conditions	SES1: Labour and Working Conditions	OS8: Labor and Working Conditions	Req. 2.1, I5.2
<b>Cultural heritage, physical cultural resources</b>	ESS9. Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	Guidance Statement 9: Physical Cultural Heritage	S4: Cultural Heritage	S7. Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage	SES7: Cultural Heritage	OS6: Cultural Heritage	Re. 2.3, I6.1
<b>Pollution prevention, pesticides, resource efficiency</b>	ESS1 incl. resource efficiency and waste ESS5 Pest/ Pesticides	Guidance Statement 2 Agrochemicals addresses pesticides	S7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	S2 Resource Eff, Pollution Prev & Mgt Chemicals/Wastes	SES2: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention	OS5: Pest Mgt OS9: Resource Eff & Pollution Prevention	Req. 2.3, I5.2, I6.1, I7.1
<b>Climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk</b>	ESS1 incl section on Climate Change Adapt & Mitigation	Specific climate screening and risk assess reqs	Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	S2 Resource Eff, Pollution Prev & Mgt Chemicals/Wastes	SES8: Climate-resilient develop.	Guiding Principle 1.2 OS9: Resource Eff & Pollution Prevention	Req. 2.3
<b>Other</b>		Guidance Statement 12: Rural Finance		S9. Economic Sustainability			

### *Screening, assessment and management*

12. All Agencies employ a risk-based approach whereby increasing levels of due diligence are targeted to projects that present higher levels of social and environmental risks. All Agencies utilize at least a three-point risk categorization scheme – High, Moderate, Low or Category A/B/C (see Table 3). The definitions of risk categories are quite similar, with some Agencies including additional criteria in the definition of High Risk projects (e.g. cumulative impacts, significant stakeholder concern). Differences exist in approaches to screening, with some Agencies categorizing by “project type” while others categorizing by “risk type” presented in the context of the project (generally determining risk significance levels by judging probability and impact of the risk’s occurrence). It is not clear whether this difference would affect development or application of the common approach.
13. Overarching assessment and management planning requirements are aligned across the Agencies, with all Agencies requiring comprehensive environmental and social assessment (e.g. full ESIA or comparable instruments) and management plans (e.g. full ESMPs or comparable plans, including thematic specific plans such as RAPs, IPPs) for High Risk projects, and targeted/limited forms of assessment and application of good practice measures (and possibly ESMPs) for addressing risks associated with Moderate Risk projects. Low Risk projects require no further assessments or management planning beyond screening and application of other Agency policies/standards, such as gender, stakeholder engagement, disclosure and grievance procedures.
14. Agency assessment requirements generally align across a number of key areas, including the following: assessments proportionate to risk/impacts, integration of social and environmental aspects, compliance with national laws in international obligations, consideration of feasible alternatives, application of the mitigation hierarchy, and requiring qualified (if not independent) expertise in conducting assessments.
15. Areas of less commonality or gaps in specified assessment criteria include the following: identification of risks in the project’s area of influence (incl. associated facilities), consideration of global/transboundary risks, identification of disproportionate impacts on certain groups, in particular marginalized and vulnerable; application of assessment criteria to subprojects; and assessment of risks presented by contractors as well as by primary suppliers/supply chains. All of these areas would appear to be important to include in the assessment criteria of the common approach.



**Table 3. Summary of Screening/Categorization, Assessment, Management Requirements**

Agency	Screening/Categorization		Assessment	Management
<b>FAO</b>	High	Significant, irreversible, cumulative	Full ESIA	Env/Social Commitment Plan (reflect ESIA, incl RAP, IPP, etc.))
	Moderate	Not unprecedented, limited footprint, remedied	Env/Social Analysis	Env/Social Commitment Plan (reflect E/S Analysis)
	Low	No or minimal impacts, not controversial	no further analysis	No additional measures
<b>IFAD</b> E/S	Cat A	Significant, sensitive, irreversible, unprecedented	Formal ESIA/ESMF	ESMP, RAP, IPP, FPIC implementation plan
	Cat B	Less adverse, site-specific, remedied	Further E/S analysis	ESMP, either stand-alone or output of analysis
	Cat C	Negligible or no impacts	No further assessment	No additional measures
climate	High	Highly vulnerable to CC hazards	In-depth climate risk analysis	Recommendations for risk management
	Moderate	Moderately sensitive to CC risks	Basic CC analysis/address in design	Make practical adjustments in design
	Low	Not likely vulnerable	No further analysis	No additional measures
<b>UNDP</b>	High	Significant, irreversible, significant concerns	Comprehensive ESIA, SESA, ESMF	Comprehensive ESMP, incl. RAP, IPP, etc.
	Moderate	Limited, readily identifiable, remedied	Targeted assessments	Targeted management measures and plans, good practice
	Low	Minimal or no impacts	No further analysis	No additional measures
<b>UNEP</b>	High	Significant, possibly irreversible	Full Env, Social, Econ Assess (ESEA)	ESEA develops effective management plan (incl RAP, IPP)
	Moderate	Less significant in scale	Limited analysis	Apply good practice, possible management plan req
	Low	Negligible	No further study	No additional measures
<b>UNICEF</b>	High	Significant, possibly irreversible	Full Social/Env Impact Assess (SEIA)	Social and Env Management Plan (SEMP)
	Moderate	Less significant in scale	Limited analysis	Apply good practice, possible SEMP req
	Low	Negligible	No further study	No additional measures
<b>UNIDO</b>	Cat A	Significant, irrev, sensitive, diverse, unprec, broader area	ESIA	ESMP
	Cat B	Less adverse, fewer in number, site-specific, not irreversible	Minimize through good practice	Apply good practice, may require ESMP
	Cat C	Minimal or no impacts	No further study	No management plan, but apply disclosure/acctblty
	Cat No Project	Adverse impacts on critical habitats or PCR; banned chems/ pesticides; invol. restlmnt; forced, trafficked, child labor		
<b>UNOPS</b>	List C	High adverse impacts	Conduct detailed risk assessment	Develop management plans. Full Health/Safety and Social/ Env management plans per country category
	List B	Moderate or unknown adverse impacts	Conduct detailed risk assessment	Develop management plans. Full H&S and S&E management plans per country category
	List A	Minimal or no adverse impacts		All projects req. at least short-format H&S and S&E manag plans

### *Human rights*

16. Agency missions and programming strategies promote the progressive realization of a wide range of human rights. Agency crisis/emergency response programming addresses immediate human rights risks/needs. These programming priorities may not be fully reflected in the risk management focus of Agency ESSs reviewed here. In their ESSs, nearly all Agencies do include some explicit human rights provisions, including but not limited to (a) supporting governments to adhere to their human rights obligations, (b) upholding universal respect for, protection and fulfillment of human rights, including the human rights principles of accountability and rule of law, participation and inclusion, and equality and non-discrimination, (c) following the UNDG human rights-based approach (HRBA) to programming (although this is generally noted by development-focused Agencies), and (d) avoiding acts that contravene international human rights as well as national laws and obligations under international law.
17. Most Agencies include non-discrimination provisions. The most comprehensive statements articulate the grounds for prohibiting discrimination, including on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographic origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority (noting that gender identity is not explicit in all provisions).
18. All Agencies include provisions that call for targeted focus on the rights and interests of marginalized and vulnerable groups and the need to ensure they fully participate throughout projects.
19. The level of detail regarding human rights varies across Agencies which would need to be harmonized in a common approach (areas of less alignment include a prohibition on supporting any activities that may infringe on human rights, application of the HRBA, explicit listing of prohibited grounds for discrimination). Stronger linkages could be drawn between various thematic standards in Agency ESS and the normative human rights framework.

### *Women's empowerment and gender equality*

20. All Agencies address gender equality and women's empowerment in their programming policy frameworks. Four Agencies have adopted stand-alone gender standards as part of their ESSs. Two Agencies have incorporated gender guiding principles and requirements in their ESSs. There is significant convergence on requirements for promoting gender equality, fair treatment and nondiscrimination, as well as provisions regarding gender-responsive programme design. In addition, nearly all Agencies require gender-inclusive stakeholder engagement processes.
21. Less common provisions across the Agencies include the following: specific requirements regarding unequal access to/control of resources; a focus on vulnerable men and women (though addressed under the human rights provisions); a specific requirement to conduct gender analysis for projects; and the need for gender-disaggregated monitoring (however, Agencies may include this in their monitoring policies, which were not reviewed here).

### *Biodiversity, habitats, sustainable natural resource management*

22. All Agencies include a range of requirements regarding conserving biodiversity and promoting sustainable management of natural resources. Nearly all have stand-alone standards covering this

thematic area. Significant commonality exists among key principles and requirements (e.g. key objectives, application of a precautionary approach, siting preferences, more stringent requirements for addressing impacts on critical habitats). However, as requirements get more specific, there is less commonality (but not necessarily divergence).

23. Some requirements that are not widely shared include the following: ensuring access and benefit sharing measures for use of genetic resources, maintaining the function of priority ecosystem services, biosafety requirements, water and soil management, tenure security in natural resource management, and sustainable supply chain requirements.
24. A potential area of divergence involves the standards regarding impacts on critical habitats. A number of Agencies require “no significant conversion or degradation of critical habitats,” while a few Agencies have adopted a standard of “no measurable adverse impacts on those biodiversity values for which the critical habitat was designated, and on ecological processes supporting those values.” The latter appears to be a more stringent requirement.
25. Two Agencies have additional standards/guidance statements on management and use of plant resources, livestock, fisheries, and requirements from these may be relevant for the common approach.

#### *Indigenous peoples*

26. Nearly all Agencies have a stand-alone safeguard statement/policy on recognizing and fostering full respect for indigenous peoples and their human rights, dignity, and cultural uniqueness, and on addressing potential impacts from supported activities on indigenous communities.
27. Significant commonality exists across Agency policies that recognize and support indigenous rights to lands and territories and resources, criteria for identifying indigenous peoples, meaningful participation throughout the project cycle, undertaking appropriate assessments and plans, provision of culturally appropriate benefits, and participatory monitoring.
28. All Agencies require a process of free, prior informed consent (FPIC), however the circumstances for invoking this requirement vary. Five out of the seven Agencies require FPIC for all projects that support/affect indigenous peoples, and another Agency applies FPIC to projects that impact indigenous peoples’ rights, interests, lands, resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods. Some Agencies emphasize that the requirement to pursue FPIC is not simply a safeguard (do no harm) principle, but a pro-active approach to designing projects in partnership with the relevant indigenous peoples.
29. Agencies outline somewhat different circumstances that trigger the need to develop an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP). These circumstances include (a) all projects that affect indigenous peoples, (b) projects that affect indigenous peoples’ rights, interests, lands, resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods, and (c) High Risk projects. Further discussion and clarification may be required here.
30. Only one Agency under review includes requirements respecting the rights of indigenous peoples in voluntary isolation. Such a requirement should be included in the common approach. Additional issues not widely reflected in the Agency indigenous peoples standards may also need attention, such as a focus on the most vulnerable members of indigenous communities, gender dimensions, and intergenerational issues.

### *Physical and economic displacement, involuntary resettlement*

31. All Agencies have a stand-alone standard and/or specific requirements regarding avoiding and/or minimizing impacts from potential project-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement. One Agency requires projects to be redesigned or canceled if they would cause involuntary resettlement. Most Agencies state that their requirements apply to both physical and economic displacement caused by project-related land or resource acquisition or restrictions on land use or access to resources.
32. Requirements regarding displacement and resettlement are among the most detailed in Agency ESSs. Below is a summary of key areas of commonality and divergence in the requirements:

- **Areas of Commonality (though not uniformity)**

- Focus on avoidance of resettlement/displacement by assessing/providing alternatives
- Goal to improve or at least restore affected persons' standards of living/livelihoods
- Prohibition and avoidance on forced evictions
- Provide compensation at full replacement value (though not noted by a few)
- Ensure compensation and support provided before displacement actions
- Provision of relocation assistance and transitional support in addition to compensation
- Need for specific plans (RAP) to address impacts with specific criteria (however, specificity varies, including whether to require livelihood restoration plans for economic displacement)
- Participation and consultation of affected persons and communities (though specifics vary)

- **Areas of gaps/divergence**

- Degree to which affected persons must agree/consent (one Agency applies FPIC) to displacement actions, compensation and support
- Level of specificity in compensation standards for those with formal/recognizable land rights/claims and those w/o such rights/claims
- Level of specificity in addressing impacts of access restrictions and actions that affect land-based livelihoods (e.g. need for continued access or access to areas with equivalent livelihood-earning potential)
- Requirement for independent/specialist monitoring of resettlement program and ex post evaluation to determine if livelihoods restored.

### *Community, health, safety, security*

33. Community, Health, Safety (CHS) standards typically address a wide range of health and safety impacts that may arise from project interventions. These include infrastructure safety issues, exposure to disease and hazardous materials, emergency response, security personnel, among other areas.
34. Three Agencies have a stand-alone Community Health and Safety standard (two of which also address risks of engaging security personnel). Another Agency has a dedicated Community Health guidance statement that focuses on a range of health concerns. Other Agencies address some specific CHS

issues in other standards/requirements (e.g. environmental and social assessment, natural resource management).

35. Four Agencies have specific Dam Safety standards/sections/guidance whereas dam safety issues are treated as one element of infrastructure safety in the CHS standards of other Agencies (one Agency has both a CHS and Dam Safety safeguard standard).
36. With a lack of consistency among Agencies in articulating stand-alone CHS standards, a significant number of gaps appear in this safeguard thematic area, such as those related to general infrastructure safety (not just dam safety), health risks, and risks posed by security personnel. However, instead of presenting a summary of all gaps (which would be extensive), listed below are key considerations to address in the drafting of CHS&S requirements for the Common Approach (these areas appear in the CHS standards of some Agencies and comparator organizations):
  - Outline requirements that would apply to all high risk infrastructure
  - Factor in potential climate change and disaster risks into review of risks for infrastructure design, construction and operation
  - Address needs/interests of peoples with disabilities (e.g. concept of universal access)
  - Acknowledge risks of project impacts on ecosystem services that may result in health and safety issues
  - Ensure emergency preparedness and response is adequately addressed
  - Include a focus on risks posed to communities from hazardous materials (noting partial overlap with pollution prevention)
  - Cover broad range of potential community exposure to health issues (communicable, incommunicable diseases)
  - Address potential risks posed by security personnel engaged to safeguard project-related sites and assets.

#### *Labour and working conditions*

37. Most Agencies include requirements on labor and working conditions. Four Agencies have stand-alone labour sections of their ESS, and two others include some labour requirements in parts of their ESS.
38. Agency ESSs address some but not all of the ILO Core Labour Standards. Most Agencies include requirements that – with varying degrees of specificity – address discrimination, child labour, and forced labour. In each of these areas general principles are addressed, with some Agencies providing more detailed supporting requirements. Provisions concerning freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining receive less attention in Agency ESS, with only 3 Agencies noting the right of freedom of association and only one noting the right to collective bargaining.
39. Most Agencies include general requirements regarding occupational health and safety, again with some variation in specificity and supporting requirements. Half of the Agencies include basic requirements regarding providing workers clear information on terms of employment and respecting collective agreements. Two Agencies specify that the labour and working conditions requirements apply to subcontractors, and one Agency noted that it includes a grievance process that specifically covers facilities and employment relations.

### *Cultural heritage, physical cultural resources*

40. All Agencies have stand-alone standards or requirements regarding impacts on Cultural Heritage (CH). However, there is a divergence regarding the scope of the requirements as several Agencies refer only to physical cultural resources (tangible cultural heritage) but not to intangible cultural heritage as outlined in UNESCO conventions. Two Agencies require projects to be redesigned or canceled if there are potential adverse impacts on CH.
41. The divergence regarding the scope of CH requirements is significant and would need to be addressed in the Common Approach. Listed below are areas of convergence and divergence concerning other requirements regarding CH:
- **Areas of commonality (setting aside difference in scope above):**
    - Universally shared overall objective to “Protect, conserve, manage cultural heritage and avoid alteration, damage, removal” and to avoid adverse impacts
    - Requirement to utilize qualified independent experts to assist in identification and assessment of potential adverse impacts on CH
    - The need for meaningful stakeholder consultations
    - Inclusion of chance find procedures (one Agency requires that such procedures appear in all bidding documents).
  - **Areas of gaps or divergence**
    - Although all Agencies call for avoidance and mitigation of adverse impacts on CH, two Agencies refer only to impacts on “critical CH,” however this term is undefined and may be too limiting
    - Only two Agencies include some reference to ensure continued access to CH if access is restricted by the project
    - Although most Agencies require informing people of their rights and the consequences of potential use/commercialization of CH, only two Agencies include a requirement that good faith negotiations need to result in a documented outcome and provide for fair and equitable benefit sharing from such commercialization.
    - One Agency establishes conditions for any removal of CH
    - It would be important to also acknowledge circumstances for maintaining confidentiality of CH.

### *Pollution prevention, pesticides, resource efficiency*

42. This safeguard thematic area encompasses a broad range of issues, including pollution prevention and control, resource efficiency, management of hazardous materials (e.g. POPS), pesticides management, and GHG emissions reduction and tracking. Four Agencies have developed stand-alone pollution prevention and resource efficiency (PP/RE) standards. Three Agencies have stand-alone pesticides management standards. Some requirements of this area are addressed by some Agencies in other standards (e.g. environmental and social assessment, natural resources management, and climate change).

43. Generally, nearly all Agencies address hazardous wastes, pesticide use and management, and avoidance of banned/phase-out substances while requirements regarding general pollution control and waste management are only partially shared. Given the broad range of topics covered by the standard, comments on commonalities and gaps are briefly noted below. Requirements regarding GHG emissions are included in the following section on climate change.

- *Objectives:* Widely shared objectives of avoiding and minimizing adverse impacts from pollution and promoting more sustainable use of resources
- *Pollution prevention:* Three Agencies include specific requirements regarding avoiding, minimizing, controlling intensity and flow of pollutants, requiring control technologies to be consistent with international good practice throughout project life cycle. Two Agencies have specific requirements regarding discharge and treatment of waste water
- *Wastes:* Three Agencies have specific requirements regarding waste management and disposal, including transboundary movement and chain of custody requirements
- *Hazardous materials:* Most Agencies include provisions to avoid, minimize and control the release of hazardous materials, but not all Agencies. Two Agencies include a prohibition on the manufacture, trade, and use of materials subject to international bans or phase-outs in this section. Other Agencies incorporate a similar ban under their pesticides requirements.
- *Resource Efficiency:* Agencies include broadly shared general requirements to improve efficiency and consumption of inputs. Most Agencies require reduction in/management of water use, esp. where there is high demand.
- *Pesticide use and management:* Widely shared requirements to reduce synthetic pesticide use, to utilize least toxic options, and to follow FAO and WHO codes regarding classes and handling of pesticides. Broad commonality exists in calling for adoption of Integrated Pest Management/ Integrated Vector Management approaches. There is general alignment on not allowing procurement of banned pesticides under international agreements, however there is a lack of clarity across Agency ESS on the specific international agreements to be respected (Stockholm, Rotterdam, Basel, Montreal, others).

#### *Climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk reduction*

44. Two Agencies have stand-alone Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation (CCMA) standards, and one Agency has a separate climate screening procedure that it applies to all projects. Most Agencies however incorporate some requirements related to CCMA in other standards, primarily focused on minimizing GHG emissions.

45. *Climate risk analysis:* Requirements for analyzing climate risks are not widely shared among Agencies. Currently three Agencies have specific provisions requiring climate risk analysis (another Agency recommends such analyses). Some key dimensions of such analyses are noted, such as examining potential vulnerability and exposure; sensitivity of project outcomes/outputs to CC changes/hazards; maladaptation; and social risks. Two Agencies call for in-depth climate risk analysis for projects with high CC risks, and a basic analysis for moderate risks.

46. *Disaster risk:* Four Agencies include some provisions regarding the need to consider risks of natural hazards and disaster risks in their ESSs. While other Agencies include general provisions regarding emergency response, it is unclear the degree to which disaster risks are to be specifically addressed.



Current provisions regarding disaster risk are quite general (e.g. consider vulnerability and risks of hazards).

47. *GHG emissions*: Most Agencies include requirements regarding minimizing or reducing project-related GHG emissions. Generally, the full range of long-lived climate pollutants are not specifically referenced. Two Agencies include provisions on tracking and reporting “significant” project-related GHG emissions.

#### *Stakeholder engagement, access to information, grievance redress, and accountability*

48. *Stakeholder participation/consultation*: All Agencies address the need for stakeholder engagement in projects, and nearly all require it regardless of a project’s potential social and environmental risk levels. While nearly all Agencies call for “meaningful, effective” consultation processes, the degree of to which this term is defined varies. Only three Agencies formally require stakeholder engagement plans, and four stipulate stakeholder involvement in project monitoring. One Agency applies FPIC broadly to where community land access and use rights are affected while other Agencies apply FPIC only in regards to indigenous peoples.
49. *Access to information*: Nearly all Agencies require disclosure of relevant ESS information as part of the stakeholder engagement process. Also, nearly all require that relevant information be provided in an accessible place and in understandable form and language. However, the degree of specificity as to “what” needs to be disclosed varies. Most Agencies require disclosure of draft and final assessments and management plans. Several Agencies require specific disclosures regarding stakeholder engagement processes and availability of grievance mechanisms. Two Agencies include specific disclosure timelines, while most other Agencies require more generally “timely” disclosure and/or before project approval.
50. *Grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs)*: Five Agencies include requirements to establish project-level grievance redress mechanisms, with varying degrees of specificity and criteria for their effectiveness.
51. *Agency-level accountability*: Nearly all Agencies have either an Agency-level complaints solving or a compliance review function/entity (or both). Four Agencies have a combined problem solving/compliance mechanism. The degree to which the compliance review function is independent from programme management varies across the Agencies.

### **III. Conclusions and recommendations**

52. The comparative analysis found significant alignment and commonality in the structure, thematic coverage and content of nearly all Agency ESSs reviewed. Where differences and gaps have been identified between Agency ESSs, these concern primarily the scope of issues addressed by particular thematic safeguard areas and the level of detail of specific requirements. While some differences in overall ESS architecture were noted for two Agencies, this did not inhibit addressing the range of thematic safeguard areas (although, again, with variances in the level of specificity). In short, the significant commonality across Agency ESSs provides a solid basis for the development of a Common Approach to social and environmental safeguards in programming.
53. Additional analysis could be undertaken to review specific Agency environmental and social risk screening procedures for potential areas of convergence and divergence. In addition, further review could be undertaken regarding accountabilities and responsibilities for the implementation of



safeguard requirements (e.g. direct Agency implementation, implementing entities and borrowers). These are important issue areas, but fall outside the scope of the current review. However, that level of detailed alignment may not be appropriate for the Common Approach which will need to be flexible enough to encompass a variety of mandates and modes of operation across a wide-range of Agencies.

54. The Common Approach would need to strike the right balance between incorporating the most comprehensive requirements contained across Agency ESSs, those most widely shared, and those most reflective of relevant normative frameworks. The appropriate format and level of detail for the requirements of the Common Approach would need to be discussed among the Agencies.
55. Development of a Common Approach would present opportunities for Agencies to move toward greater harmonization of social and environmental programming requirements, particularly as Agencies undertake reviews and updates of existing Agency ESSs. For a number of Agencies, the Common Approach would most likely contain broader and/or more extensive requirements than those contained in their current Agency ESS. Agencies would need to consider which requirements outlined in the Common Approach would be most appropriate and relevant for their operations.
56. To support the development of the Common Approach, additional steps are required, including (a) synthesizing and collating the most comprehensive social and environmental requirements reflected across Agency ESSs; (b) further mapping of relevant normative frameworks to specific ESSs (noting that normative frameworks are already reflected in several of the reviewed thematic areas; (c) undertaking targeted engagement with expert groups/bodies to further develop and verify the scope and requirements of the common approach (e.g. ILO, indigenous peoples experts, resettlement experts); and (d) once the common approach is further advanced, seeking public comments to further strengthen it.

## Appendix. References to normative basis for key safeguard areas

Most of the UN Agencies reviewed in the report make reference to various normative frameworks within their environmental and social safeguards (ESS). The below listing is partial and could be further elaborated. It is clear that many of the Agencies have based their ESSs at least in part on these normative frameworks.

Thematic ESS Areas	International Conventions, Agreements, Frameworks (Partial listing)
<b>Human Rights, Gender Equality</b>	<p><i>Core International human rights treaties:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1969)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1976)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1976)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1981)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1987)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on the Rights of the Child (1990)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (2003)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (2010)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2008)</a></li> </ul>
<b>Biodiversity, habitats, sustainable NRM</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Biological Diversity</a>, 1992 (CBD) and protocols (<a href="#">Cartagena Protocol</a>, 2000; <a href="#">Nagoya Protocol</a>, 2010)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals</a>, 1979 (Bonn Convention)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna</a>, 1975 (CITES)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat</a>, 1971 (Ramsar Convention)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage</a>, 1972 (UNESCO World Heritage Convention)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context</a> (Espoo Convention, 1991)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention to Combat Desertification</a> (UNCCD, 1994)</li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Framework Convention on Climate Change</a> (UNFCCC, 1994)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Basel Convention on the Control of Hazardous Waste</a> (Basel Convention, 1989)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants</a> (Stockholm Convention, 2001)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer</a> (1987)</li> <li>• <a href="#">International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources through Food and Agriculture</a> (2004)</li> </ul>
<b>Physical and economic displacement, involuntary resettlement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>International legal instruments that prohibit forced evictions</i>, including the <a href="#">Universal Declaration of Human Rights</a>; <a href="#">International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</a>; <a href="#">Convention on the Rights of the Child</a>; <a href="#">Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</a>; <a href="#">International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</a>.</li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Evictions and Displacement</a>, which reflect human rights norms related to evictions and development-based displacement. More broadly, see also the <a href="#">UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement</a>.</li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming</a> (the Common Understanding)</li> <li>• <i>Food Agriculture Organization's Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security</i></li> </ul>
<b>Indigenous peoples</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Universal Declaration of Human Rights</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights</a></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Convention Against all Forms of Racial Discrimination</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO N°. 169)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Biological Diversity</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">The American Convention on Human Rights</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</a></li> </ul>
<b>Community health, safety, security</b>	<p>CHS: A wide range on international treaties regarding health and safety need to be reviewed for correspondence with focus of ESS.</p> <p>Security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">UN Human rights due diligence policy on United Nations support to non-United Nations security forces</a> (2013)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights</a> (2000)</li> <li>• UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (1979)</li> <li>• UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials</li> </ul>
<b>Labor and working conditions</b>	<p>The eight fundamental ILO Conventions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)</a></li> <li>6. <a href="#">Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182)</a></li> <li>7. <a href="#">Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)</a></li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)</a></li> </ul>
<b>Cultural heritage, physical cultural resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage</a>, 1972 (UNESCO World Heritage Convention)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage</a> (UNESCO, 2003)</li> </ul>
<b>Pollution prevention, pesticides, resource efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Basel Convention on the Control of Hazardous Waste</a> (Basel Convention, 1989)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants</a> (Stockholm Convention, 2001)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer</a> (1987)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context</a> (Espoo Convention, 1991)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management</a> (SAICM, 2006)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade</a> (2008)</li> <li>• <a href="#">International Code of Conduct on Pesticides Management</a> (FAO 2014)</li> </ul>
<b>Climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</a> (UNFCCC) (1992/1994)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Kyoto Protocol to UNFCCC</a> (1997/2005)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Paris Agreement</a> (2016)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction</a> (2015)</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder Engagement, Access to Information and Grievance Redress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article 19 of the <a href="#">Universal Declaration on Human Rights</a></li> <li>• Article 25 of the <a href="#">International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</a></li> <li>• Article 5(c) of the <a href="#">International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</a> (multiple articles)</li> <li>• Articles 12,13, 15 of the <a href="#">Convention on the Rights of the Child</a></li> <li>• Articles 3 and 29 of the <a href="#">Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</a> (multiple articles)</li> <li>• Article 2 <a href="#">Declaration on the Right to Development</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Principle 10 Rio Declaration</a> and <a href="#">Bali Guidelines</a></li> <li>• UN HRC <a href="#">Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights</a></li> </ul>