UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES)
Key elements of UNDP’s SES

2008 – 2010: screening procedure design phase

2011: testing phase

2012: screening procedure adopted

2013/2014: consultation on SES

June 2014 – SES adopted

End 2014: roll out and compliance with GEF safeguards policy
1. Early screening of Project concept by Technical staff
   - Categorize project (low, moderate, high)
   - Triggers safeguard issues to further assess in PPG phase
   - SES policy outlines requirements to be met when safeguard triggered

2. Screening of Project Document by Country Office
   - Undertake further assessments during project document development stage
   - Incorporate findings into project design
   - Management and mitigation measures outlined in project document
   - If high risk category reassess project strategy with senior technical advisor

   - Categorize again
     - Standard mitigation/management measures – risk, M&E, evaluation
     - Additional project specific measures when needed

   - Accountability (compliance) with senior UNDP staff at country level

Country level project appraisal
UNDP process for “one-step” project approval cycle

**Screening of Project Document**

- Categorize (low, medium, high)
  - SES policy outlines requirements to be met when safeguard triggered.
  - Revise project document accordingly.
  - Include standard management measures – risk, M&E, evaluation
  - Additional studies (i.e. EIA etc.. included in Phase 1 of project

**Country level project appraisal**

- Accountability (compliance) with senior UNDP staff at country level
At the end of Concept Development, Design & Appraisal, and Closure & Evaluation, and at least annually during Implementation Monitoring stages, project QA assessments are conducted to review and rate the project, and make a decision regarding moving forward.

- Project Concept QA Assessment
- Project Appraisal QA Assessment (PAC)
- Annual Project QA Assessments
- Final Project QA Assessment

- • Project Concept QA Report
- • Project Appraisal QA Report
- • Annual Project QA Reports Part of Annual Project Reports
- • Final Project QA Report Part of final evaluation

Decision
**Annual Project Monitoring QA Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL PROJECT QUALITY RATING</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
<th>CONTINUOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>CONSISTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS ACHIEVEMENT STATUS</th>
<th>TRENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTED</td>
<td>IMPROVING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRATEGIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QA SUMMARY**

- Since the last quality assessment, project quality has diminished in Management & Monitoring and Efficient criteria. Project management and monitoring have been less than effective due to a 4-month gap without a UNDP Project Manager and changes in government personnel involved with the project. Project outputs are being achieved per plan (an improvement), but efficiency is unclear and a long-term view of sustainability and benefits is lacking.
- Efficiency in procurement of consultancy services is 40% over budget to date.
- Most Management Actions identified in the previous quality assessment have been addressed, though not all achieved by defined target dates. Actions remaining to be addressed include: articulation of a clear sustainability and transition plan for the project, annual project indicator measurements confirmed by national counterparts, and ongoing management of the project's implementation and mitigation measures.

**KEY RESULTS HIGHLIGHTS**

- Key results for 2014 include training of over 4,000 government staff from 15 Districts, and transition of 5 Districts to full-government ownership and management of the MDG agenda.
- Output achievement is on track and within quality criteria, with the exception of delays in training scheduled for the 4 Southeast Districts due to regional flooding.
- 2 of 5 project outputs are achieved, with appropriate levels of quality.

**KEY RESULTS DETAILS**

- Following a change in approach in 2014, more rapid training was planned following a training team travelling to each District, rather than a "train the trainer" approach. Through these efforts, the project removed 500 staff days of training time, estimated $25,000 in training budget. The training team reported a set of lessons and conclusions based on their events in 15 Districts, very helpful for future trainings and shared through Teamwork as "An Approach for Increasing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Country-wide Training Rollouts."

**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2015R</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly risk monitoring to begin Q4-2015, following briefings with Ministry leadership to emphasize the importance of government participation and ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2015R</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sustainability and transition plan to be developed and reviewed for government approval. The implementation of this plan may require additional project budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues identified during screening of project concept

**Gender:** Differences in the way women and men would access and benefit from changing freshwater availability

**Impact:**
- Changed investment technology as it could have led to other environmental impacts
- Focus on ‘proper use’ training when pesticides/herbicides involved in small scale agriculture
- Siting of early warning system/other equipment

**Indigenous Peoples Relocation**
Lessons learned

• **Context** - safeguards are about achieving better development results

• **Risk management** - helped us to better define and monitor/manage risks

• **Clear accountability** – who is responsible for what

• **Clarity on which safeguards apply** - National EIA or ESIA and/or UNDP SES

• **Compliance and dispute resolution** – also ensure policy gets implemented