



GEF/C.66/09
January 04, 2024

66th GEF Council Meeting
February 05 - 09, 2024
Washington D.C., USA

GAP ANALYSIS OF GEF-FUNDED ACTIVITY AND ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILITY, CONFLICT, AND VIOLENCE-AFFECTED STATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background.....	1
III.	Objective and Scope.....	3
IV.	Methodology.....	3
V.	Overview of GEF Agencies and Other Organizations’ Policies, Strategies, Frameworks and Approaches in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS).....	4
	i. Understanding the Context	5
	ii. Differentiated Approaches	7
	iii. Operational Flexibility Measures.....	9
	iv. Prevention Approaches by Addressing the Drivers of Fragility.....	10
	v. Remaining Engaged in Collaboration with Extended Partners	12
	vi. Support Transition to Strengthen Resilience and Capacity Building.....	14
	vii. Catalyzing Private Sector Engagement.....	15
	viii. Building Internal Capacity	16
VI.	GEF’s Policies, Strategies, and Approaches on FCS.....	17
	i. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Understanding the Context	18
	ii. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Differentiated Approaches	18
	iii. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Operational Flexibility Measures	18
	iv. GEF Policy/Approach Relevant to Addressing the Drivers of Fragility	19
	v. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Remaining Engaged in Collaboration with Extended Partners.....	20
	vi. GEF Strategies Relevant to Strengthening Resilience and Capacity Building	21
	vii. GEF Strategies Relevant to Catalyzing Private Sector Engagement	21
VII.	Gaps And Potential Areas For GEF To Adjust Its Approach And Guidance.....	22
	Annex A: Survey Questions to the GEF Agencies and Other Select Environmental Funds	23
	Annex B: GEF Agencies and Other Environmental Funds’ FCS Approach	24
	Annex 1: ADB – Asian Development Bank	25
	Annex 2: AfDB – African Development Bank	29
	Annex 3: CAF – Corporación Andina de Fomento.....	33

Annex 4: CI - Conservation International	34
Annex 5: DBSA – Development Bank of Southern Africa.....	36
Annex 6: FAO – United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization	37
Annex 7: FECO – Foreign Environmental Cooperation Office (China)	42
Annex 8: IDB – Inter-American Development Bank.....	43
Annex 9: IFAD – International Fund for Agricultural Development.....	47
Annex 10: UNDP – United Nations Development Programme.....	50
Annex 11: UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme	55
Annex 12: WB – World Bank	58
Annex 13: WWF-US – World Wildlife Fund-US	64
Annex 14: CIF – Climate Investment Funds.....	65
Annex 15: GCF - Green Climate Fund	66

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The GEF-8 Policy Recommendations include a request for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat to undertake an analysis of its activity and engagement in fragility, conflict and violence-affected states to determine whether there are any gaps that could have negative implications for achieving results and “to identify areas where the GEF may need to strengthen its approach and guidance”.¹

2. This paper first provides the background, objective and scope of the exercise and the methodology used. An overview of GEF Agency and other environmental funds’ policies, strategies, frameworks, and approaches in FCS follows, along with a description of GEF policy, guidelines and approaches relevant to operating in FCS. The paper then concludes with some potential areas for further work by the GEF on its approach and guidance related to FCS. Annexes contain the detailed Agency and other environmental funds’ approaches, and the survey questions that guided consultations with them.

II. BACKGROUND

3. The GEF has provided funding to countries facing fragile situations over time, despite it not being explicitly listed among the strategic priorities of GEF programming, and in the absence of an explicit risk management framework for GEF programming. The Secretariat will be developing a Risk Framework over the coming months, for consideration at the 65th Council meeting, and is expected to take risks associated with operating in FCS into account. Presently, the risks considered in the project review process include those related to Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) and are articulated in the ESS Policy².

4. Conflict and fragility have significant impacts on environmental and climate change programming, including those funded by the GEF. A considerable portion of the active GEF portfolio is in areas affected by conflict or fragility. Specifically, 7.4 percent (or \$ 636.3 million) of the GEF’s active global portfolio is allocated to situations of “conflict”, while fragility (“institutional and social fragility”) accounts for 5.7 percent (or \$ 493.5 million) of GEF’s country-level projects, based on the World Bank (WB)’s [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#).³ The geographic distribution of “conflict” situations in the GEF’s active portfolio is 71.2 percent in Africa, 17.8 percent in Asia, and 10.9 percent in Europe and Central Asia. Similarly, the geographic distribution of “institutional and social fragility” situations in the GEF’s active portfolio is 57.0 percent in Africa, 32.4 percent in Asia, and 10.6 percent in Latin America.⁴

5. Recognizing the potential impacts of these circumstances, the GEF Secretariat acknowledges the importance of considering project relevance, design, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The GEF Agencies have developed frameworks and guidance to effectively

¹ [GEF/E/C.59/06](#) (November 23, 2020) (page 1, para 5-6)

² [Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#) (SD/PL/03, 2019)

³ Based on the World Bank’s [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#) and active GEF portfolio of as May 22, 2023

⁴ Based on the World Bank’s [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#) and active GEF portfolio of as May 22, 2023

manage the risks associated with conflict and fragility. While these frameworks primarily address engagement and wider programming beyond GEF-financed projects, an increasing number of GEF-financed projects have acknowledged and addressed these risks. Valuable lessons have been learned from the experiences of these projects and other GEF projects.

6. The 2022 edition of the OECD’s multidimensional fragility framework⁵ analyzes trends in fragile contexts related to violence, inequality, food insecurity, and forced displacement. These trends highlight the severity and scale of fragility, which poses challenges to the progress made on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including environmental issues.

7. Given the global recognition of the interconnectedness between climate change, fragility, and conflict, the GEF mission has never been more relevant. Eighteen of the top twenty-five countries most vulnerable to climate change are affected by fragility.⁶

8. The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) concluded, in its *Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (2020)*⁷, that there is a statistically significant impact of major armed conflict on GEF project cancellations and project ‘drops’ (i.e. prior to endorsement/approval). A similar relationship was observed for fragility. The report also found that a country’s fragility classification negatively and significantly affects project outcomes, sustainability, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) design, M&E implementation, implementation quality, and execution quality. Based on these findings, the IEO made several recommendations, including improving conflict-sensitive programming through additional guidance, while providing flexibility to Agencies and projects. The IEO also suggested that the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the Agencies, leverage existing platforms for learning, exchange, and technical assistance to enhance conflict-sensitive design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of GEF projects.

9. During the GEF-8 replenishment negotiations, Participants deliberated on this issue and concluded that the next step should involve the GEF Secretariat conducting a gap analysis of GEF-funded activities and engagement in fragility, conflict, and violence-affected states.⁸ This gap analysis would review current GEF approach and guidance in the context of the policy and guidance deployed by GEF Agencies in FCS. Identifying any gaps would guide potential adjustments to GEF approaches and guidance to better accommodate conflict-sensitive programming.

10. This paper utilizes the most recent classification of FCS from the World Bank (WB)’s [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#)⁹ for statistical analysis. It also builds upon the finding of the GEF IEO’s report on an *Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (2020)*, which highlighted that some GEF Implementing Agencies have created their

⁵ [OECD 2022, States of Fragility 2022](#) (page 20) The report identifies the 60 fragile contexts in terms of their income levels, geography, political nature and conflict status (page 31).

⁶ World Economic Forum, Centre for Nature and Climate, February 2023.

⁷ [GEF/E/C.59/01](#) (November 11, 2020)

⁸ [GEF/R.08/32](#) (April 4, 2022)

⁹ the World Bank’s [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#)

own tools to standardize conflict-risk assessment in project design. Additionally, based on the information from the context analysis, including conflict analysis, GEF Implementing Agencies have included a range of conflict-sensitive measures in project design.¹⁰

III. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

11. The first step in the gap analysis is to identify the GEF Agencies' operational policies, manuals, and guidelines on fragility, and conflict-affected situations (FCS) that are deployed in the implementation of GEF projects. While many GEF Agencies engage in FCS countries with processes of entities that work on development and, social issues, it is vital to note that a mapping exercise is associated with work in FCS countries for entities that work on environmental issues.¹¹

12. The gap analysis placed specific attention to questions such as: a) whether the Agencies have specific operational policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in FCS, and: b) if so, whether the policies specify context analysis, differentiated approaches, operational flexibilities, preventing approaches, supporting transition with additional supports, and building internal capacity to address FCS challenges. It includes the following:

- A broad mapping exercise of practical operational policies, manuals, and/or guidelines on FCS within the GEF, GEF Agencies, and select other environmental funds; and
- identification of areas where the GEF may need to adjust its approach and guidance.

IV. METHODOLOGY

13. The GEF Secretariat sent short questionnaires to the eighteen GEF Agencies and other select environmental funds (Climate Investment Funds (CIF) and Green Climate Fund (GCF))¹² to understand their approaches on FCS. Responses were received from thirteen GEF Agencies¹³, representing 91 percent of the active GEF portfolio by volume.¹⁴ At the same time, the GEF Secretariat reviewed available policies, guidelines, and/or tools on FCS in GEF Agencies online. The GEF Secretariat also conducted interviews with five key Agencies' staff working on FCS issues (ADB, AfDB, FAO, UNDP and WB)¹⁵ and received feedback from the Agencies between March and May 2023.

¹⁰ [GEF/E/C.59/01](#) (November 11, 2020) (page 82, para 208 and page 83, para 211)

¹¹ Comparing GEF engagement in FCS countries with processes of entities that work on development and/or social issues may by nature be different.

¹² These funds have similar operational model as GEF.

¹³ Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF), Conservation International (CI), Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Foreign Environmental Cooperation Office (China) (FECO), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Bank (WB), and World Wildlife Fund-US (WWF-US)

¹⁴ As of May 22, 2023.

¹⁵ Interviews were conducted with ADB (March 14, 2023), WB (March 30 and April 5, 2023), UNDP (April 6, 2023), AfDB (April 6, 2023), and FAO (April 11, 2023).

14. Based on a survey, document review, interviews, and feedback from the Agencies, the GEF Secretariat developed a broad mapping of GEF agencies' operational policies, manuals, and/or guidelines on FCS along with a description of GEF policy, guidelines and approaches relevant to operating in FCS. The GEF Secretariat identified some potential areas where adjustment to approach and guidance may be warranted, further outlined in Section VII.

V. OVERVIEW OF GEF AGENCIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS' POLICIES, STRATEGIES, FRAMEWORKS AND APPROACHES IN FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED SITUATIONS (FCS)

15. The gap analysis revealed that GEF Agencies have varying policies, strategies, approaches, frameworks, and guidelines for FCS. Some Agencies, such as ADB, AfDB, and WB, have mandatory policies that address fragile and conflict-affected situations, including flexible procurement processes and operations with *de facto* governments. IFAD and UNDP have policies and procedures for crisis prevention and recovery and immediate response. FAO and CI deploy 'good practice' in conflict analysis and social responsibility assessment at specific levels (areas, country or sector). They utilize these assessments for project design using conflict-sensitive approaches, even as they do not have mandatory policies. UNEP and CI have prepared thematic risk assessment tools, including climate-related security risks and the seafood sector.

16. Many Agencies, including AfDB, ADB, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNEP, UNDP, and WB, have developed or are developing strategies, approaches, and frameworks, identifying necessary actions such as policies revision, guideline development, and capacity development and training for staff. IDB is in the final stages of approving a *Framework for Supporting Populations in Fragile, Conflict and Violence-affected (FCV) Situations*. The DBSA has a draft policy framework for situations of fragility and an exclusion list for investment currently awaiting final approval. ADB is implementing the Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach (FSA) through a 2021-2025 action plan. AfDB approved a new strategy for addressing fragility and building resilience in Africa (2022-2026) in March 2022 and identified action items. These Agencies are actively working to enhance risk management, swift recovery and prevention initiatives in FCS, including climate change and disaster risk management, and to support building resilience in FCS.

17. In compliance with the GEF ESS Policy, all eighteen GEF Agencies adhere to ESS Policy, Minimum Standard 9: Community Health, Safety and Security. This includes conducting further assessments on conflict or post-conflict context to address risks may be present in a conflict or post-conflict context.

18. Additionally, certain Agencies, such as CI and WWF-US, have developed training manuals, reports on lessons learned, practical guidance, and an internal due diligence system for FCS settings. The analysis found that eleven Agencies¹⁶ have created or are developing toolkits,

¹⁶ ADB, AfDB, CI, DBSA, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, WB, and WWF-US

guidance documents, case studies and lessons learned, and risk assessment tools for specially for FCS – covering 91.2 percent of the active GEF portfolio in FCS.¹⁷

19. Regarding other organizations, the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) rely on its six implementing entities' policies to manage FCV situations and associated risks.¹⁸ The Green Climate Fund (GCF) uses the IFC's Performance Standards as the interim ESS standards which cover fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS) issues, including but not limited to *Performance Standard 4* (Community Health, Safety, and Security), and all relevant guidance notes. The GCF does not have a specific policy/guidance on FCS but is drafting new standards that are not published yet.¹⁹

20. Key elements of FCS policies, strategies, approaches, and frameworks, as informed by GEF Agencies practices, include understanding context through FCS analysis, differentiated approaches based on country dialogue and analysis, and operational flexibility. Other key elements include remaining engaged, collaborating with extended partners (including non-state actors), preventative approaches addressing drivers of fragility (such as climate change, gender equality, and economic and social exclusion), supporting a transition to strengthen resilience and capacity building, catalyzing private sector engagement, and building internal capacity to address FCS challenges.

i. Understanding the Context

21. It is crucial to understand the context of FCS in different areas, countries, and regions through thorough assessment and analysis. Agencies such as ADB, AfDB, FAO, UNDP, and WB, systematically conduct fragility, conflict and resilience assessments in FCS settings. The results of these assessments are integrated into country and regional strategies, priority setting, and project designs. There is no one-size-fit-all approach to FCS risk management, prevention, and recovery. Compliance with GEF ESS Policy, specifically Minimum Standard 9: Community Health, Safety and Security, is observed by all eighteen GEF Agencies.²⁰ This includes conducting additional assessments specific to conflict or post-conflict context. The GEF ESS Policy requires that projects and programs have appropriate risk management plans based on these assessments. Many Agencies develop publicly available toolkits, guidance materials, case studies, training manuals, lessons learned, and risk assessment tools for FCS.

22. **ADB** incorporates fragility and resilience assessments (FRAs), covering the structural–environmental, institutional, economic, and political–societal drivers, as part of the diagnostic work preceding the development of a country partnership strategy.²¹ FRAs are confidential

¹⁷ Based on the World Bank's [FY23 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations](#) and active GEF portfolio of as May 22, 2023

¹⁸ CIF Agencies are AfDB, ADB, EBRD, IDB, WB and IFC

¹⁹ GCF expects the draft to be published in 2023 for Board consultation. The draft places more emphasis on the need for conflict sensitivity assessment.

²⁰ [Third Party Review of Agency Compliance with GEF Minimum Standards](#) (GEF/C.63/09/Rev.1, November 25, 2022)

²¹ [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (ADB 2021) (page viii)

documents, and it is at the discretion of each country whether to integrate them into the country partnership strategy (CPS).

23. **AfDB** conducts comprehensive fragility assessments at national and regional levels, examining various spheres such as political, economic, social, justice, security, environmental and regional spill-over. This has enhanced AfDB's capacity in the application of conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity. Findings are integrated into strategy papers, project documents, and operational processes. Fragility considerations are mainstreamed in programming documents such as Country Strategy Papers, and Project Appraisal Reports including the Regional Operations Selection and Prioritization Framework (ROSPF).²²

24. In addition to Country Resilience and Fragility Assessment (CRFA) profiles produced for all African countries on a regular cycle, AfDB produces fragility-related knowledge products, such as Watching Briefs, Economic and Sector Work, and Full-Fledged Fragility Assessments. In-house experts, sometimes with external support, conduct Country Resilience and Fragility Assessments. Guidance notes on analytics are developed to standardize the formats and methodology for assessments,²³ with a focus on women, youth, and vulnerable groups.

25. **FAO's Programme Clinic**,²⁴ facilitates conflict-sensitive programming by integrating strategies into interventions. It minimizes negative impacts and strengthens conditions for sustainable local peace. The decentralized offices can effectively facilitate the process without external expert assistance. The program clinic and conflict sensitivity assessments are generally undertaken in the inception phase of a project. Conflict analysis supports strategic decision-making, programming entry points, and informed intervention. FAO conducts conflict analyses internally, utilizing the approach and recommendations for staff, partners, and monitoring and evaluation purposes. FAO reported having several conflict analyses in the publishing pipeline, which include Somalia (southern states), Northern Cameroon, Southern Kyrgyzstan, the Karamoja Cluster in Uganda, North Kivu and South Kivu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), and Haiti.

26. In fragile and conflict situations, **UNDP** employs context-specific tools and interventions for crisis prevention, transformation, response and recovery. Multidimensional risk, fragility, and resilience analyses, encompass various risks like conflict, disaster, climate change. These analyses inform policy dialogue and decision-making, enabling the development of risk-informed solutions for prevention, response, or recovery. Systematic country analysis forms the basis for UNDP's crisis prevention work, leading to operational capacity, budget and resource adjustments. UNDP is actively integrating analytical work on FCS into project or program design.

²² [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (AfDB 2022) (para 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 5.10)

²³ [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (AfDB 2022) (para 5.8, and XXVIII)

²⁴ Facilitators' guide- FAO Programme Clinic: Designing Conflict-Sensitive Interventions ([English](#)) ([Arabic](#)) ([French](#)), Participant's guide- FAO Programme Clinic: Designing Conflict-Sensitive Interventions ([English](#)) ([Arabic](#)) ([French](#))

27. **WB** aligns with the [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#)²⁵ and IDA19 commitments by adopted Risk and Resilience Assessments (RRAs). These assessments are utilized in the country engagement cycle in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV)-affected countries and inform conflict-sensitive approaches in operational design. Management provides a methodology for WB staff to prepare RRAs, which is expected to be revised on an ongoing basis. WB conducts assessments, including RRAs, using appropriate tools and collaboration with partners, to inform country diagnostics and partnership frameworks. Understanding the project context enables the design of FCV-sensitive operations, addressing fragility drivers, mitigating risks, and enhancing resilience. WB ensures its engagements do not exacerbate fragility or weaken resilience.²⁶

ii. Differentiated Approaches

28. Many Agencies emphasize the importance of differentiated approaches in FCS based on contextual, national, and regional factors. GEF Agencies adapt their approaches to align with their operational mandates, portfolios, and regional focuses. Several Agencies, including ADB, AfDB, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, and WB, have developed or are in the process of developing FCS-related strategies, frameworks, action plans, guidance, policies, and tools. These agencies regularly update their approaches based on lessons learned and evolving circumstances. They have also established various financial mechanisms to assist FCS countries in prevention, transformation, and recovery.

29. The Secretariat’s review found that only two Agencies - ADB and WB - have disclosed their FCS classifications, which do not consistently translate into additional funding or trigger specific policies or guidelines. The application of funds and the application of flexible procurement policies are determined on a case-by-case basis or through different funding allocation mechanisms, rather than solely relying on FCS classification. Notably, some UN agencies, such as FAO, IFAD, and UNDP, periodically reflect the OECD’s fragile contexts²⁷ without having a formal FCS classification within the organizations.

30. Initiation of conflict analysis varies depending on the level of discussion at the country and regional levels. ADB, AfDB, FAO, UNDP and WB integrate conflict analysis into their country and regional strategies, priority settings, and projects and programs. International institutions have different classifications for FCS, although there is coordination among Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). Nevertheless, each MDB maintains its own classification system.

31. **AfDB** recognizes fragility as a state where countries face overwhelming pressures that jeopardize their capacities to manage them, resulting in instability risk. The Bank identifies four distinct situations along the fragility spectrum: (i) increasing risks of conflict or state collapse; (ii) active conflict and/or prolonged crisis; (iii) signs of turnaround for rebuilding and reform; and (iv)

²⁵ [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#) (WB 2020)

²⁶ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021) (para 6 and 7)

²⁷ [OECD 2022, States of Fragility 2022](#). Sixty countries are categorized by the OECD-DAC as fragile states in 2022.

decreasing risks and emerging pathways to resilience. Building institutional capacity is crucial for successful transitions out of fragility.²⁸

32. AfDB develops an eligibility list during each replenishment period for the Transition Support Facility (TSF)²⁹, a flexible financing vehicle. TSF supports transition states in addressing socioeconomic fragilities, environmental vulnerabilities, strengthen structural policies, peace consolidation, resilient institutions, economic stabilization, and laying foundations for sustainable inclusive growth. However, AfDB does not produce a list of countries in FCS.

33. **FAO** and **IFAD** do not utilize separate FCS classifications but refer to the OECD's fragile contexts when necessary. Conflict and context analyses are initiated based on country-level decisions with support from technical staff. **IFAD** combines the lists of all fragile states identified by other international financial institutions and the OECD for its classification of fragile states. However, IFAD has developed its own criteria to identify situations requiring differentiated approaches.³⁰ IFAD emphasizes four key entry points to address fragility and enhance resilience: gender empowerment, institution-building, food security, and natural resource management. IFAD applies a differentiated approach across four stages of fragility focusing on sustainable livelihood recovery and rebuilding of social cohesion, complementing relief actions with development measures.³¹

34. **UNDP** also does not use any specific FCS classification and UNDP's work in FCS is context based. UNDP's regional bureaus have annual planning exercises with the Crisis Bureau to identify priority countries for anticipation and prevention, response and recovery, and protracted and fragile integrated country support.

35. As of December 2022, **ADB** classifies 12 developing member countries as Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS). A country is considered FCAS if it has an average rating of 3.2 or less based on the ADB [country performance assessment](#) (CPA)³² and the World Bank Group (WBG) country policy and institutional assessment.

36. At the **WB**, the FCS List for FY23 includes 37 countries and the West Bank and Gaza. The primary purpose of the "Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS)" classification is to ensure that the WBG's strategic and programmatic focus in countries affected by FCS-related issues is

²⁸ [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2016\)](#) (AfDB 2022) (para 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5)

²⁹ The TSF provides support through three pillars: the supplemental financing window (Pillar I), arrears clearance resources window (Pillar II), and targeted support for capacity building and technical assistance window (Pillar III). [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2016\)](#) (AfDB 2022) (para 3.2 and Annex XI) TSF is a dedicated, flexible financing vehicle replenished during the African Development Fund cycles (over US \$5 billion thus far).

³⁰ [IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016) (page 3, para 12-16)

³¹ [Special Programme for Countries with Fragile Situations: Operationalizing IFAD's Fragility Strategy](#) (2019) (page 4, para 12)

³² ADB conducts a [country performance assessment](#) (CPA) using the International Development Association (IDA) country policy and institutional assessment questionnaire and guidelines. The CPA assesses the performance of each country based on the (i) quality of its macroeconomic management, (ii) coherence of its structural policies, (iii) degree to which its policies and institutions promote equity and inclusion, and (iv) quality of its governance and public sector management.

adapted and tailored to the diverse challenges faced by these countries.³³ The WB develops the FCS List every year, but the list does not define eligibility of funds available to FCV countries.

iii. Operational Flexibility Measures

37. According to Agencies, operational flexibility is critical to prepare, implement and monitor and evaluate projects and programs in countries and regions in FCS. The GEF Agencies apply operational flexibility in FCS countries to increase effectiveness, and many Agencies, including ADB, AfDB and WB, have operational policies aimed at ensuring flexible design, delivery and monitoring of operations in FCSs. Flexibility measures are included in procurement processes, safeguards application, operations and engagement with de facto governments, and development and integration of digital technologies that support country and project performance monitoring and evaluation. Many Agencies provide supplemental funding to support strengthening capacity of government agencies.

38. ADB's [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach \(FSA\)](#)³⁴ aim to improve development outcomes in FCAS and Small Island Development States (SIDS) by enhancing operational procedures, processes, and guidelines. The FCA institutionalizes approaches through updated guidance notes covering CPS preparation, fragility and resilience assessment (FRA), political economy assessment (PEA), governance risks assessment (GRA), sovereign grants and loans processing, procurement, safeguards, and digital technologies integration for monitoring.

39. AfDB has a fit-for-purpose procurement policy that provides flexibility, including engagement with de facto governments in regional member countries. The [Presidential Directive \(PD\) 03/2010](#) governs these dealings and is periodically updated.³⁵ The [African Development Bank – Operations Procurement Manual, Part A, Volume 2: Specialized Procurement](#) provides provisions, processes, and monitoring mechanisms for FCS.³⁶

40. The [IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#)³⁷ emphasizes flexible and responsive resources, instruments and approaches in countries with fragile situations.

41. The WB designs and adjusts assistance based on the needs and circumstances of each FCV situation.³⁸ Operational flexibility measures have been introduced to enhance effectiveness, including identification of a fragile, capacity constrained, conflict, or emergency (FCCE) situation,

³³ [Classification of Fragility and Conflict Situations for World Bank Group Engagement](#) (2023) To capture the differentiated nature of fragility and conflict, the classification is based on methodologies that distinguish countries in the following categories: 1) [Countries with high levels of institutional and social fragility](#), identified based on public indicators that measure the quality of policy and institutions as well as specific manifestations of fragility; and 2) [Countries affected by violent conflict](#), identified based on a threshold number of conflict-related deaths relative to the population.

³⁴ [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach \(2021\)](#)

³⁵ [Presidential Directive \(PD\) 03/2010 Concerning continuity of operations and engagement with de facto governments in regional member countries](#) (2010)

³⁶ [African Development Bank – Operations Procurement Manual, Part A, Volume 2: Specialized Procurement](#) (2018) (Chapter I: Procurement Under ERA &FCS, page 41-50)

³⁷ [IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016) (page iii, para 4-5)

³⁸ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021) (para 4)

policy exceptions and procedures, and addressing common challenges in project preparation and implementation.

42. Building on the WB 2016 Procurement Framework Policy, WB provides [Hands-On Expanded Implementation Support \(HEIS\)](#) to speed up procurement and mitigate implementation delays in FCV settings. Alternative procurement arrangements (APAs) support project implementation in challenging environments. The Guidance³⁹ is available on procurement in urgent assistance of capacity constraint situation.

43. While WB's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) does not have a separate procedure for FCV situations, it offers flexibility for application. The Bank's Directive on [Addressing Risks and Impacts on Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups](#), provides instructions for due diligence in FCV contexts.

iv. Prevention Approaches by Addressing the Drivers of Fragility

44. The importance of prevention approaches by addressing the drivers of fragility is emphasized by many Agencies, including AfDB, IFAD, UNDP and WB. Overall, these organizations focus on preventive measures, inclusive approaches, and addressing the underlying causes of fragility, conflict, and climate-related challenges. AfDB's new strategy for addressing fragility and building resilience in Africa (2022-2026) re-emphasizes a preventive approach that builds resilience against the diverse shocks and pressures to African regions, countries and vulnerable communities, and describes how AfDB will adapt its operations and instruments to tackle the root causes of conflict and fragility. [IFAD's Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery includes](#) specific objectives such as to reinforce IFAD's approach to the prevention of crisis, especially among those people who are the most vulnerable. UNDP states that prevention is at the heart of its development mandate, anchored in its mission to reduce development deficits, fight inequalities, and foster inclusion. WB's Policy also focuses on prevention and strengthening core institutions, with particular attention to inclusion and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups and individuals.⁴⁰

45. All Agency strategies, policies, and approaches aim not only for 'no harm' but also 'do good', such as maximizing inclusiveness of youth, women and vulnerable communities, contributing to peacebuilding, addressing forced displacement and spillover of fragility, and addressing climate crises. UNEP worked with EU to develop the Guidance Note and Tools to [Address Climate-Related Security Risks](#).⁴¹ These tools provide practitioners with practical guidance for integrating a conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding lens into climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods approaches.

³⁹ [Procurement in Situations of Urgent Need of Assistance or Capacity Constraints](#)

⁴⁰ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021) (para 7)

⁴¹ [Address Climate-Related Security Risks \(2022\)](#)

46. The AfDB's [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#)⁴² aim to prevent and address fragility in Africa by building resilience against various vulnerabilities. The Strategy adapt operations to tackle the root causes of conflict and fragility and emphasizes investment in crisis prevention and stay engaged across the fragility spectrum to contribute to pathways out of fragility. It promotes inclusiveness, peacebuilding, addressing forced displacement and spillover of fragility, and supporting voluntary, safe and orderly mobility/migration to harness opportunities arising from the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), and addressing climate crisis. The strategy also places a particular emphasis on strategic, humanitarian-development-peace nexus partnerships for complementarities and synergies, including in knowledge/analytics, policy dialogues/advocacy and operations. This encompasses climate-displacement nexus interventions, such as via the Bank's Transition Support Facility (TSF) and other internal financing envelopes, to prevent and address climate-induced forced displacement.
47. IFAD has developed an [Crisis Prevention and Recovery](#) to: reinforce its approach to crisis prevention especially for the most vulnerable population, clarify its role in post-crisis situations, define resource allocation process, and enhance implementation procedures in crisis-prone and crisis-affected countries.⁴³ IFAD also seek additional financing to address fragility drivers and consequences.⁴⁴
48. UNDP prioritizes prevention and seeks to mitigate risks, address conflict drivers and root causes, reduce development deficits, fight inequalities, and foster inclusion. It supports conflict analysis, conflict sensitivity and impact measurement, and works with county offices to develop programs targeting conflict root causes. UNDP also integrates climate emergency on conflict⁴⁵ and supports conflict-affected countries by climate-proofing conflict prevention and peacebuilding. It engages in on-the-ground work in conflict-affected and fragile context, focusing on climate-induced displacement and integrated approaches.⁴⁶
49. UNEP's Guidance Note and Tools to [Address Climate-Related Security Risks](#)⁴⁷ were developed under the EU-UNEP Climate Change and Security partnership to provide practitioners with practical guidance for integrating a conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding lens into climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods approaches.

⁴² [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022) This 3rd Strategy sets out the African Development Bank Group's approach to addressing fragility by 1) strengthening institutional capacity, 2) building more resilient societies, and 3) catalyzing private investment in all its 54 Regional Member Countries (i.e. the African continent).

⁴³ [IFAD Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery](#) (2006)

⁴⁴ [Special Programme for Countries with Fragile Situations: Operationalizing IFAD's Fragility Strategy](#) (2019) (page 4, para 12)

⁴⁵ This is done through UNDP's engagement in the Climate Security Mechanism, together with DPPA UNEP and DPO but also through UNDP's programmatic support to government's work on climate security with emphasis on climate-proofing conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and ensuring that nature, climate and energy efforts not only do no harm, but also contribute positively to peace.

⁴⁶ Under the Climate Promise, UNDP is on-the-ground in 46 conflict-affected and fragile contexts pursuing work to this end. Climate-induced displacement is also an area where UNDP offers integrated approaches linking human mobility, climate adaptation, urbanization, local development, and conflict lenses.

⁴⁷ [Address Climate-Related Security Risks \(2022\)](#)

50. **WB's** Bank Policy also focuses on prevention and strengthening core institutions, with particular attention to inclusion and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups and individuals.⁴⁸

v. Remaining Engaged in Collaboration with Extended Partners

51. Remaining engaged in collaboration with extended partners is another vital approach that many GEF Agencies apply, even in *de facto* governments. This is important to engage policy dialogue, maintain emergency support, basic services and capacity in countries, and support swift recovery and transition. Many Agencies emphasize the importance of expanding their collaboration with civil society organizations and local organizations who work with the most vulnerable population, beyond their traditional partners such as UN agencies, African Union, and others. For example, AfDB increases focus on community-centered development in support of national development priorities, including via enhanced Civil Society Engagement with international and local CSOs and partners such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), to protect and empower most vulnerable communities in FCS. WB set up in March 2020 an Operational Framework Agreement to implement projects in FCV through the ICRC. Save the Children, as an INGO, was engaged on an ad hoc basis and subject to the WB regular due diligence to assess capacity to implement project.

52. The [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#)⁴⁹ will institutionalize **ADB's** approaches to FCAS and SIDS to improve their development outcomes by reinforcing partnerships and coordination. For example, ADB has placed its regular assistance to Afghanistan on hold effective 15 August 2021 but remains committed to supporting the economic and social development of the Afghan people through the UN agencies.⁵⁰

53. **AfDB's** Strategy emphasizes the need to remain engaged in FCS even in the *de facto* governments to engage policy dialogue in countries, and the humanitarian-development-peace nexus. Collaboration has expanded with third parties, beyond traditional partners such as the African Union, Regional Economic Communities and Organizations, but also UN agencies⁵¹ via Fiduciary Principles Agreements. The focus is on community-centered development that aligns with national development priorities. This involves enhanced engagement with civil society organizations (CSOs) at both international and local levels, including partners like the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). The aim is to protect and empower most vulnerable communities in FCS. Working with local CSOs is critical for building capacity and implementing livelihood programs as these organizations have close connections with vulnerable communities. AfDB also contribute to peacebuilding through its projects and programs.

⁴⁸ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021) (para 7)

⁴⁹ [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (2021)

⁵⁰ [Afghanistan and ADB | Asian Development Bank](#)

⁵¹ UN agencies include United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), International Organization for Migration (IOM), UNDP, UN World Food Programme (WFP) etc.

54. **IFAD** focuses on strategic partnerships⁵² and works through non-government actors in cases of institutional breakdown. They address urgent community needs and prepare for eventual re-engagement. Resources may be utilized fragility root causes within IFAD's mandate.⁵³

55. **UNDP** works in close cooperation with the humanitarian system, and across the development, peace and human rights pillars of the UN system – and beyond – to facilitate more joined up common and coherent approaches to address risks on the horizon, prevent development losses in the midst of crisis, and to build more sustainable resilience and stable societies for the future. UNDP advocates for system change and adaptation to address systemic bottlenecks to effective collaboration across the humanitarian-peace-development nexus. UNDP's external partnerships include bilateral and multilateral partners, international financial institutions, and private sector, civil society and academia.⁵⁴ UNDP provides support for the MDBs to implement projects in FCS, when MDBs are unable to implement directly through national systems. UNDP also works upstream with MDBs on crisis assessments and planning.

56. **WB's** [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) provides that in FCV situations, besides working with governmental authorities and agencies, the Bank engages within its mandate with: (a) bilateral and multilateral agencies, particularly international and regional institutions, notably the United Nations, that have distinct, but complementary, responsibilities for peacemaking, peacekeeping and security, humanitarian assistance, and reconstruction and development; and (b) civil society, non-governmental organizations, and private sector entities that have common concerns, including supporting inclusion and private sector engagement.⁵⁵

57. Under the [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#), the WB operates in humanitarian crises such as forced displacement and security issues, and engages with civil society on the ground. UN Agencies have been engaged in projects located in FCV countries with high-risk environments, assisting projects in very limited circumstances, namely where the Bank has no presence on the ground, or in situations of acute crisis or emergency. Direct operational engagement occurs through a direct grant agreement between the WB and UN agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNOPS, WFP and WHO) whose engagement is underpinned by the full application of WB operational policies, with certain fiduciary flexibilities applied with respect to procurement, financial management and integrity matters (i.e., Anti-Corruption Guidelines, waiver is normally required as the Agency's system is used, supplemented by specific reporting requirements -- agreed between the Integrity Vice Presidency (INT) and the individual Agencies -- on allegations of fraud and corruption as well as results of investigations). WB set up in March 2020 an Operational Framework Agreement (OFA) to implement projects in FCV

⁵² [Special Programme for Countries with Fragile Situations: Operationalizing IFAD's Fragility Strategy](#) (2019) (page 4, para 12)

⁵³ [IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016) (page 7, para 27-30)

⁵⁴ [UNDP's Crisis Offer](#) (2022) (page 11-12)

⁵⁵ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence \(2021\)](#), [Cooperation, Partnerships, and Engagements](#) (Paras. 17-18).

through the ICRC. Save the Children, as an INGO, was engaged on an ad hoc basis and subject to the WB regular due diligence to assess capacity to implement projects.⁵⁶

vi. Support Transition to Strengthen Resilience and Capacity Building

58. Supporting transition through strengthening resilience and capacity building is also critical in FCS with supplemental financial support. Many GEF Agencies support transition from fragility addressing socioeconomic fragilities, tackle environmental vulnerabilities, strengthen structural policies, consolidate peace, build resilient institutions, and stabilize economies and have special financial envelopes to support transition from FCS. For example, AfDB has the Transition Support Facility (TSF) to help transition states address socioeconomic fragilities, tackle environmental vulnerabilities, strengthen structural policies, consolidate peace, build resilient institutions, stabilize economies, and lay the foundations for sustainable inclusive growth. [IFAD's Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) includes a particular focus on mobilizing supplementary financing for projects in fragile situations. These supplementary resources have the advantage to be allocated outside the performance-based allocation system (PBAS) and on grant terms, and increased resources can be channeled to the most fragile situations without increasing the complexity of the PBAS formula. To help member countries experiencing fragility, conflict, violence, or any spillover effects such as forced displacement, WB also provides FCV countries with exceptional financial assistance under specific terms and conditions.

59. **ADB** provides technical assistance to developing member countries to support training, capacity building, enhancement, and supplementation.

60. **AfDB** has the Transition Support Facility (TSF) to help transition states address socioeconomic fragilities, tackle environmental vulnerabilities, strengthen structural policies, consolidate peace, build resilient institutions, stabilize economies, and lay the foundations for sustainable inclusive growth.⁵⁷ AfDB is expanding these transition funds to women, youth and vulnerable communities, migration and spill over issues and others.

61. The Transition Support Facility (TSF) is a dedicated, flexible financing vehicle replenished during the African Development Fund cycles (over US\$ 5 billion thus far). The TSF is catalytic in nature and can integrate donor resources for scaled-up approaches, including via mobilization of climate finance as well as complement climate resilience operations with a specific focus on transition states (countries in fragile situations). The TSF has given the AfDB the ability to concretely help prevent and address – operationally via the fragility lens application - underlying drivers of fragility, conflict, violence and climate change identified during analytical works. This also enhances the foundation for social cohesion and inclusive growth, and the flexibility to respond quickly in times of crisis.

62. **FAO** established the Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA) in 2004 to enhance FAO's capacity to rapidly respond to emergency situations. Through strategic

⁵⁶ [The UN and the World Bank working together in crisis-affected situations](#) (visited May 10, 2023)

⁵⁷ [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022) (para 3.2 and Annex XI)

resource partner funding, SFERA provides FAO with the financial means and flexibility to react promptly to humanitarian crises, reducing the time between funding decision and action on the ground.

63. [IFAD's Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) includes a particular focus on mobilizing supplementary financing for projects in fragile situations. Supplementary resources have the advantage to be allocated outside the performance-based allocation system (PBAS) and on grant terms, and increased resources can be channeled to the most fragile situations without increasing the complexity of the PBAS formula. Grants funded through supplementary financing can be linked to IFAD investment programs, thereby integrating fragility within regular programming.⁵⁸

64. **UNDP** supports countries on multidimensional risk, fragility, and resilience analyses, including conflict, disaster, climate and other multidimensional risks. These risk-informed analyses and assessments are available to national actors to advance policy dialogue and policy making. They are leveraged to develop and implement integrated risk-informed development solutions whether in terms of prevention, response or recovery.

65. UNDP also supports countries to develop and implement 'Out of Fragility strategies'. Each 2030 Out of Fragility strategy will be context-specific, multidimensional and provide an integrated approach bringing together UNDP's six Signature Solutions of poverty and inequality, governance, resilience, energy, environment, governance, and gender equality. The strategy will aim to build the foundations of stable societies and provide choice and opportunity. The Out of Fragility strategies include programming entry points, expected results, financing strategy and partnerships.

66. To help member countries experiencing fragility, conflict, violence, or any spillover effects, like forced displacement, the **WB** "may provide such countries with exceptional financial assistance under specific terms and conditions. Any such assistance must be consistent with the Bank's financial policies and its preferred creditor status, and it should be consistent with the principles of burden sharing".⁵⁹

vii. Catalyzing Private Sector Engagement

67. Many GEF Agencies, such as ADB, AfDB, WB, stress the importance of catalyzing private sector engagement in FCS settings. To generate economic growth and employment, they find that private sector engagement particularly with small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and local companies, including household enterprises and self-employed workers, will benefit FCS countries.

68. **ADB's** FSA action plan 2021-2025 includes increasing innovative private sector engagement. The Operational Plan for Private Sector Operations, 2019–2024 under its Strategy 2030 outlines a new approach: an increasing share of ADB's private sector operations would

⁵⁸ [IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016) (page 7, para 27-30)

⁵⁹ [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021) (para 19)

involve investments that are higher-risk, experimental, innovative, and strongly developmental. The shift to private sector engagement in higher-risk contexts with small transactions will benefit FCAS and SIDS and generate economic growth and employment. It will also introduce technology transfer and private sector efficiencies.⁶⁰

69. **AfDB** is prioritizing supporting private sector in FCS settings because private sector would be able to create employment, entrepreneurship opportunities, livelihoods and economic activities, which are essential for strengthening resilience and social cohesion.

70. The **WB**, IFC, MIGA, and their partners each have an important role to play in supporting the private sector and creating economic opportunities for people and communities. For countries with strong government commitment to private sector-led solutions, a broad range of solutions are possible, from direct support through local and regional financial institutions, to support for local, regional, and international companies seeking to engage in these markets, as well as infrastructure projects. For countries in conflict or crisis, the opportunities for private sector engagement are much more limited, but engagement may still be possible by providing financing, advice and technical assistance to SMEs and local companies, including household enterprises and self-employed workers.⁶¹

viii. Building Internal Capacity

71. Building internal capacity working in FCS is critical for many GEF Agencies, such as ADB, AfDB, CI, FAO, IFAD, and WB, which have developed internal modules and online resources for their staff, with most training, guidance, and tools open to the public. Some Agencies are strengthening the capacity of internal staff, including increases in the number of staff working on FCS in headquarters and national and regional offices. Ensuring staff security is particularly challenging in non-UN GEF Agencies and information exchange about security issues at country level is critical.

72. **ADB's** capacity enhancement will be achieved with more agile human resource utilization. This means: (i) providing staff training, repurposing vacant staff positions, redeploying staff, using fixed-term staff positions and secondments, pooling resources such as key technical skills in hubs across regions, and harnessing resources thematically; (ii) using staff consultants to assist in the expected surge of activities, and support the implementation of key FSA actions after their approval; and (iii) providing technical assistance to developing member countries to support training, capacity building, enhancement, and supplementation.⁶²

73. To build internal and external capacity, in complement to the Operations Academy's fragility e-Course, **AfDB** will deliver a comprehensive capacity development plan on the Bank's strategic and operational approach—with a particular focus on the fragility lens mainstreaming in programming and operations—to relevant task teams. It also will organize capacity building workshops for the benefit of Government officials and representatives of relevant regional

⁶⁰ [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (2021) (page 21)

⁶¹ [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#) (2020) (page 20, para 56 and 57)

⁶² [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (ADB 2021) (page 29-30)

organizations. These will seek to engage in dialogue with national and regional authorities, raise their awareness, capacity, and skills on the application of the fragility lens.⁶³

74. **CI** aims to summarize and share its experience in striving towards conflict sensitivity and, when relevant, incorporating environmental peacebuilding elements in its work.⁶⁴ The focus of this brief report is on key lessons learned over the past 10+ years of experience at the high-level – both from the perspective of organizational transformation and in relation to operations and programming. The report is also meant to provide a starting point for knowledge exchange for peer organizations as well as organizations from different fields working in similar landscapes or facing shared challenges. CI also developed the [Environmental Peacebuilding Training Manual \(2017\)](#)⁶⁵ to increase the awareness, knowledge and skills of conflict-sensitive environmental peacebuilding approaches among conservation practitioners and organizations working in areas affected by conflict or where conservation efforts could potentially impact conflict.

75. **FAO** provides technical support to country offices by a headquarters' Conflict and Peace Unit⁶⁶ and sub-regional offices in Amman, Dakar and Nairobi providing technical support and backstopping to country offices within the sub-region. Several country offices (including Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Kyrgyzstan, Somalia, South Sudan) benefit from dedicated conflict and peace analysts or focal points. In addition, a global roster of conflict and peace specialists has been finalized, with a view to being able to deploy vetted technical specialists to country offices on demand.

76. **IFAD** established a fragility focal point in the Programme Management Department (PMD) to provide overall leadership of the Special Programme and guidance to country teams. Applicable human resource policies and procedures will provide adequate incentives to work in fragile situations.⁶⁷

77. **WBG** recognizes that training and capacity building for staff has improved but could be enhanced further. Its strategy states that staff working in or on FCV need to feel that WBG management recognize and value their efforts in these tough environments. In particular, WBG has identified the need to do more to enhance the employment value proposition for staff focusing on FCV, including mentoring, next-assignment planning, and career progression. Security is also a primary concern for the WBG's presence on the ground.⁶⁸

VI. GEF's POLICIES, STRATEGIES, AND APPROACHES ON FCS

⁶³ [Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022) (page XXVIII, Annex XII)

⁶⁴ [Conflict Sensitivity and Environmental Peacebuilding in Conservation: Lessons Learned from CI \(2022\)](#)

⁶⁵ [Environmental Peacebuilding Training Manual](#) (2017)

⁶⁶ FAO's headquarters, Conflict and Peace Unit, has 6 staff (team lead, 2 conflict specialists and three staff working on forced displacement (policy and programming).

⁶⁷ [Special Programme for Countries with Fragile Situations: Operationalizing IFAD's Fragility Strategy](#) (2019) (page 4, para 12)

⁶⁸ [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#) (2020) (page 10, para 25)

78. The following section examines each of the key elements of FCS policies, strategies, approaches, and frameworks and the degree to which they are integrated into GEF policies, guidelines, and strategies.

i. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Understanding the Context

79. The GEF ESS Policy includes risks related to a conflict or post-conflict context and other safety and security related risks. *Minimum Standard 9: Community Health, Safety and Security* (para 17) states that “Agencies demonstrate that they have in place the necessary policies, procedures, systems and capabilities to ensure that: (a) Where the screening or assessment processes described under Minimum Standard 1 identify risks or potential impacts to the health, safety and security of project- or program-affected communities, further assessments are carried out, considering: [...]; (iii) The particular risks that may be present in a conflict or post-conflict context; [...].⁶⁹ Agencies are required to provide environmental and social risk assessments including risks in conflict or post-conflict context associated with the proposed project. Agencies are also required to provide an Environmental and Social Management Plan to address such risks and impacts throughout the GEF project cycle.⁷⁰ The GEF Secretariat reviews whether risks associated with FCS have been assessed and addressed in a project management plan that includes monitoring and resource allocation.

ii. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Differentiated Approaches

80. The GEF relies on the FCS risk classifications of GEF Agencies. However, different Agencies apply different approaches befitting their operational mandates, priorities, and portfolios. As the GEF uses a country-driven model based on broad country eligibility and guidance from Multilateral Environmental Agreements, operations in FCV will rely on these allocation principles, and the capacity of GEF Agencies to work in the respective environment. The GEF value-addition therefore lies in sharing lessons learned and different approaches in different FCS settings.

iii. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Operational Flexibility Measures

81. Under the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy⁷¹, the design, implementation modality or timeline of GEF projects and programs can be flexibly adjusted. The GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2020 Update)⁷² provides more detail and guidance on the policy. During project preparation or implementation, changes to the project design, implementation modality, or timeline may be required to allow the project preparation or implementation to continue.

82. A *major amendment* refers to a change in project design or implementation that has a significant impact on the project’s objectives or scope or an increase of the GEF project financing

⁶⁹ [Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#) (SD/PL/03, 2019)

⁷⁰ [Guidelines on GEF’s Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#) (SD/GN/03, December 19, 2019)

⁷¹ [Project and Program Cycle Policy](#) (OP/PL/01, 2018)

⁷² [Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy \(2020 Update\)](#) (GEF/C.59/Inf.03, July 20, 2020), Annex 9: Project Amendment, Drop, Suspension and Cancellation (page 55-58, para 3, 5, 7).

of more than 5%. If the amendment includes an increase of the GEF project financing, the Secretariat needs to confirm and approve resource availability. The GEF Agency then submits a project proposal and project document request for CEO endorsement (or re-approval, if the project is under implementation). This must include the GEF Agency amended notification justifying the changes.

83. If the changes do not include an increase in GEF financing, but significant changes in project objectives or scope, the amendment follows the Agencies' policies before sending the amendment to the Secretariat for review and circulation to Council.

84. If minor changes occur before the CEO endorsement and include an increase of the GEF project financing of up to 5%, the Secretariat needs to confirm and approve resource availability. If the changes occur after the CEO endorsement and do not include a change in the GEF project financing or significant changes in project scope or objectives (and do not include a change in implementation modalities that would have required a waiver or exception at CEO Endorsement/approval), the Agencies act on the amendment at their discretion.

85. The GEF Policy on Co-financing also provides flexibility for co-financing in GEF projects. Under the Policy, Agencies may propose, on an exceptional basis, Full-Sized Projects or Medium-Sized Projects without co-Financing in response to an emergency or other unforeseen circumstance. In such cases, Agencies justify why co-financing is not available and/or not necessary to achieve the objectives of the project. For Full-Sized Projects and Medium-Sized Projects proposed for Work Program entry or CEO Endorsement/ Approval without Co-Financing, the Secretariat assesses whether adequate justification is provided to support an exception.⁷³

iv. GEF Policy/Approach Relevant to Addressing the Drivers of Fragility

86. The [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF for the GEF-8 Period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2026 and Operational Improvements](#) states that conflict and fragility pose important contexts for determining adaptation imperatives and identifies water as one of the themes for the Proposed Adaptation Approach. Freshwater quality and quantity will be an important aspect of the GEF's adaptation program via integrated water resources management interventions. That intervention mainstream climate resilience, with continued support to be provided for ways to capture and store water (e.g., rainwater harvesting, tanks, etc.), conserve water (e.g., drip irrigation, water metering); and enable easier and more reliable access to water. Policy measures to enable efficient water use and effective decision-making, and capacity support for improved hydrological modeling and water resource scenario planning, will be supported. The LDCF and SCCF will continue to support measures to reduce vulnerability to droughts and floods that are induced or exacerbated by climate change.⁷⁴

⁷³ Policy on Co-financing (FI/PL/01, 2018) (page 6, para 13-14)

⁷⁴ GEF, 2022, [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF for the GEF-8 Period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2026 and Operational Improvements](#), Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.32/04/Rev.01. (para 9, 51 and 53)

87. The inclusion agenda is highlighted in many Integrated Programs in GEF-8 and is one of the policy recommendations for GEF-8.⁷⁵ The GEF Policy on Gender Equality also requires ensuring gender analysis, socio-economic assessments or the equivalent to inform gender-responsive design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, including budgeting and staffing including in FCS settings.⁷⁶

v. GEF Policy/Guidelines Relevant to Remaining Engaged in Collaboration with Extended Partners

88. In GEF-8, GEF is seeking to increase the scale and scope of financing for civil society and strengthening collaboration with civil society.⁷⁷ The GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement requires identification and involvement of stakeholders, including local communities, indigenous peoples, civil society organizations and private sector entities, as early as possible in the identification and development of activities implemented by the Agency. Stakeholder engagement is also to be sustained throughout the life-cycle of the activities.⁷⁸

89. Under the GEF's Cancellation Policy, GEF projects can be suspended (temporary stoppage or an interruption of project implementation or disbursement of funds) upon advice of the GEF Agency, the Secretariat or the country, and as warranted by special circumstances, such as refers to conditions in the country that presented imminent danger for undertaking project activities by either the GEF Agency or local staff including in FCS.⁷⁹ GEF's Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2020 Update), Annex 9: Project Amendment, Drop, Suspension and Cancellation⁸⁰, provides more details on GEF's Cancellation Policy.

90. If appropriate, in consultation with the country/countries Operational Focal Point(s), the GEF Agency explores options to determine whether under the current circumstances it is still possible to continue to meet the project's objectives. If no other option is feasible than to suspend the project, the GEF Agency makes a final decision. If feasible, the GEF Agency needs the country's commitment to address the identified problems. Once the commitment is received, the GEF Agency sends an official suspension notification to the GEF Secretariat, the Operational Focal Point(s) and the Trustee. The notification specifies the conditions under which the suspension can be lifted, as well as a reasonable maximum deadline after which the project will be cancelled. If the Secretariat concurs with the project suspension, it notifies the GEF Agency, copying the Operational Focal Point(s) and the Trustee, indicating the reasons for the suspension, as well as the suspended project financing amount. The GEF Agency follows its own financial rules

⁷⁵ [Summary of Negotiations of the Eighth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund](#) (GEF/C.62/03, June 15, 2022) (page 216, para 723; page 259)

⁷⁶ [Policy on Gender Equity](#) (SD/PL/02, 2017) (page 8, para 19)

⁷⁷ [Summary of Negotiations of the Eighth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund](#) (GEF/C.62/03, June 15, 2022) (page 216, para 723; page 259)

⁷⁸ [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) (SD/PL/01, 2017) (page 6, para 16)

⁷⁹ [Cancellation Policy](#) (OP/PL/02, 2018)

⁸⁰ [Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy \(2020 Update\)](#), Annex 9: Project Amendment, Drop, Suspension and Cancellation (page 58-65)

and procedures regarding the freezing of disbursements, under the terms of the Financial Procedures Agreement signed with the Trustee.

vi. GEF Strategies Relevant to Strengthening Resilience and Capacity Building

91. The GEF's *Country Engagement Strategy Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8* includes activities on building execution capacity of stakeholders. Some of the CES activities include: i) building the execution capacity of stakeholders, including national executing entities to improve GEF portfolio results, enhance portfolio management, ii) promoting South-South twinning exchanges and peer-to-peer learning; and iii) support to Civil Society Organizations to build their capacity to partner in GEF projects through the transfer of knowledge, experiences, and lessons from CSOs which have gained experience in the execution of GEF projects. In addition, the Strategy includes a Gustavo Fonseca Youth Conservation Leadership Program that will focus on ensuring a pipeline of young professionals in developing countries that have access to the resources for competing their formal training, have resources to keep them active in the field and remain in the conservation sector, and be exposed to International Events and Fora that bridge the science-policy nexus.⁸¹

92. The [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF for the GEF-8 Period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2026 and Operational Improvements also recognizes that](#) “[c]ross-cutting and transformational adaptation and resilience-building measures are needed, to enable the vulnerable poor to thrive, and to enable blue, green, and resilient recovery in the context of complex and interconnected change.”⁸² It also states that “[e]fforts must be made to address climate-related risks and responses from the gender lens, in order to avoid exacerbating vulnerabilities and also to uncover ‘...new entry points for advancing gender equality, improving climate resilience, and sustaining peace.’”⁸³ LDCF's approach to support a wide range of sectoral and cross-sectoral priorities of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) has been “delivering on the urgent special needs of the LDCs while supporting long-term resilience by enabling policies, supporting alternative livelihoods, and strengthening institutional capacities. Nearly 70 percent of LDCF projects support capacity building of institutions, both at national and local levels, for planning and decision making.”⁸⁴

vii. GEF Strategies Relevant to Catalyzing Private Sector Engagement

93. The GEF developed the GEF's Private Sector Engagement Strategy to engage effectively with the private sector. The strategy emphasizes smallholders and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) through value chain interventions, cooperatives, and aggregators as one of the entry points for private sector engagement in GEF projects.⁸⁵ One of the private sector

⁸¹ [Country Engagement Strategy Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8](#) (GEF/C.63/05, October 31, 2022) (page i, 2 and 3, para 14 and 18)

⁸² GEF, 2022, [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF for the GEF-8 Period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2026 and Operational Improvements](#), Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.32/04/Rev.01. (page 2, para 5)

⁸³ ditto. (page 3, para 8)

⁸⁴ ditto. (page 6, para 8)

⁸⁵ [GEF's Private Sector Engagement Strategy](#) (GEF/C.58/05, May 5, 2020) (page 15, para 51 and page 19 Table 1)

engagement modalities is improvement of the capacity of value chain actors, especially SME and smallholders, to support global environmental benefits.

VII. GAPS AND POTENTIAL AREAS FOR GEF TO ADJUST ITS APPROACH AND GUIDANCE

94. This gap analysis demonstrates that the GEF Agencies either have in place or are in the process of establishing appropriate approaches to operations in FCS countries, with GEF financing. It also shows that key elements of FCS policies, strategies, approaches, and frameworks of GEF Agencies are largely integrated already in GEF policies and guidelines. Other environmental funds such as CIF and GCF also rely on their implementing entities' policies and environmental and social safeguard policies regarding FCS related guidance. Consolidation and increased efficiency of GEF operations under the GEF's streamlining agenda may also provide an opportunity to building on existing guidance for FCS. Many Agencies emphasize the importance of prevention approaches by addressing root causes of FCS, including the impacts of climate change. Remaining engaged in FCS in collaboration with extended partners including local and civil society organizations working with the most vulnerable populations is another critical area to effectively implement projects and programs in FCS settings.

95. Responding to the earlier IEO recommendation (that pre-dated the GEF-8 Policy Recommendation), the Secretariat can continue to develop guidance for GEF projects in FCS countries particularly for use by the GEF Agencies that have not developed FCS-related policies and operational guidance.⁸⁶ GEF guidance (as distinct from Council-approved policy or CEO-approved guidelines) would be based on good practices inside and outside the GEF partnership and existing guidance materials of GEF Agencies that have experience in FCS countries. The GEF guidance for FCS would be dynamic and adaptive and revised on an ongoing basis to reflect lessons learned and the changing context. Finally, it would be guided by the upcoming new Risk Framework, planned for consideration by the 65th Council.

96. To effectively design, implement, and monitor GEF projects and programs, sharing lessons learned and different approaches, analyses, tools, and training materials is essential for the successful delivery of GEF projects and programs. The GEF Secretariat could explore opportunities to enable such exchange of experiences and approaches to work in FCS contexts. These cross-learning opportunities may include sharing security information in security-sensitive areas; sharing information of reliable local partners to work with; sharing technical tools for monitoring and evaluation in the FCS settings; sharing good practices of designing, implementing and monitoring the project in FCS; and others.

⁸⁶ [GEF/E/C.59/06](#) (November 23, 2020) (page 1, para 5-6)

ANNEX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS TO THE GEF AGENCIES AND OTHER SELECT ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS

GEF Agencies:

Question 1: Does your organization have operational policies, manuals, and guidelines covering operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

- If Yes:
 - Could you direct us to these documents, or share them if not publicly available?
 - Please confirm if these policies, manuals, and guidelines are applicable to all GEF projects?
- If No:
 - Does your organization have tools, good practices guides, or something equivalent for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)? Could you please provide or direct us to where we could find them?
 - Does your organization have plans or ongoing efforts to develop operational policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

Question 2: What is the best entry point (Unit, staff) in your Agency for any follow-up we may need to do on interpretation or clarifications about your organization's operational policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

Question 3: Do you see a need for additional guidance from GEF related to use of GEF funds in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS), i.e. in addition to policy and guidance of your Agency?

Other select environmental funds:

Question 1: Does your organization have operational policies, manuals, and guidelines covering operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

- If Yes:
 - Could you direct us to these documents, or share them if not publicly available?
- If No:
 - Does your organization have tools, good practices guides, or something equivalent for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)? Could you please provide or direct us to where we could find them?
 - Does your organization have plans or ongoing efforts to develop operational policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

Question 2: What is the best entry point (Unit, staff) in your institution for any follow-up we may need to do on interpretation or clarifications about your organization's operational policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS)?

ANNEX B: GEF AGENCIES AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS' FCS APPROACH

Annex 1: ADB – Asian Development Bank

Annex 2: AfDB – African Development Bank

Annex 3: CAF – Corporación Andina de Fomento

Annex 4: CI - Conservation International

Annex 5: DBSA – Development Bank of Southern Africa

Annex 6: FAO – United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization

Annex 7: FECO – Foreign Environmental Cooperation Office (China)

Annex 8: IDB – Inter-American Development Bank

Annex 9: IFAD – International Fund for Agricultural Development

Annex 10: UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

Annex 11 UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme

Annex 12: WB – World Bank

Annex 13: WWF-US – World Wildlife Fund-US

Annex 14: CIF –Climate Investment Funds

Annex 15: GCF - Green Climate Fund

Annex 1: ADB – Asian Development Bank

Policy:

[Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach \(FSA\) \(2022\) | Asian Development Bank \(adb.org\)](#)

The FSA outlines an operational approach and action plan (2021–2025) for how the ADB will achieve its Strategy 2030 objectives to improve the effectiveness of ADB assistance and the development outcomes of developing member countries (DMCs) in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS) and SIDS contexts, and for pockets of fragility and poverty at subnational level. ADB’s work in FCAS and SIDS are found here: [ADB’s Work in FCAS and SIDS | Asian Development Bank](#).

Applicability of policy:

The FSA is applicable to GEF projects in all FCAS-classified DMCs. Project documentation is reviewed through FCAS lens as part of due diligence during internal ADB processing.

Staff working on FCAS:

Around 20 staff are working on FCAS in ADB

Action Plans:

There are three pillars of the FSA Action Plan to differentiate ADB approaches:

- (i) Pillar 1, improving responsiveness of standard ADB processes, procedures and practices for FCAS and SIDS differentiated approaches;
- (ii) Pillar 2, increasing ADB’s institutional capacity for operations in FCAS and SIDS; and
- (iii) Pillar 3, enhancing understanding of DMC contexts.

To more effectively support ADB operations in FCAS and SIDS, the following priority changes in business processes, procedures, and guidelines have been identified as a part of pillar 1.

Staff instructions. Issuance of new or updated staff instructions to strengthen and streamline business processes for (i) country partnership strategy (CPS) preparation—including a high-quality FRA as part of the diagnostic work to inform the CPS, and integration of FRA findings in project design and preparation; (ii) expanded consultation with civil society organizations at country and project level; (iii) processing of sovereign grants and loans to clarify procedural flexibility and requirements; and (iv) processing of smaller operations under Faster Approach to Small Nonsovereign Transactions.

Memorandum on FCAS classification system. Completion of due diligence and analytical work as a basis for preparing an in-depth assessment and filing of an official memorandum outlining an evidence-based FCAS classification system that reflects regional dimensions and SIDS characteristics.

Guidelines. Issuance of new or updated guidance notes to inform, clarify, and strengthen technical support for (i) CPS preparation, (ii) fragility and resilience assessment (FRA) preparation, (iii) political economy assessment (PEA), (iv) governance risks assessment (GRA), (v) processing of sovereign grants

and loans, (vi) procurement, (vii) safeguards, and (viii) development and integration of digital technologies that support country and project performance monitoring, including third-party independent monitoring.

CPS and project document templates. Issuance of new or updated CPS and project document templates, including guidance on preparing the (i) CPS, (ii) Inclusive and sustainable growth assessment (ISGA), (iii) FRA, (iv) political economy assessment (PEA), (v) GRA, (vi) context-based capacity assessment with support plan (included as an optional supplementary linked document of the report and recommendation of the President (RRP)), and (vii) tailored project administration manual (PAM) as an annex of the RRP.

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS):

As of December 2022, ADB classifies 12 DMCs as Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS). Afghanistan and Myanmar are classified as FCAS because of ongoing national or subnational conflict. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) is classified as FCAS because of fragility. The 9 Small Island Development States (SIDS) are classified as FCAS— the Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, and Tuvalu— because of various dimensions and degrees of fragility. ADB classified Palau as FCAS in December 2022.

ADB has used the MDB harmonized FCAS classification system since 2013. In FCAS-classified developing member countries, ADB implements differentiated approaches and takes special considerations regarding resource allocation.

ADB conducts a [country performance assessment](#) (CPA) using the International Development Association (IDA) country policy and institutional assessment questionnaire and guidelines. The CPA assesses the performance of each country based on the (i) quality of its macroeconomic management, (ii) coherence of its structural policies, (iii) degree to which its policies and institutions promote equity and inclusion, and (iv) quality of its governance and public sector management.

A country is considered FCAS if it has an average rating of 3.2 or less based on the ADB CPA and the World Bank Group country policy and institutional assessment. A country is also considered FCAS if a United Nations and/or a regional peacekeeping or peace-building mission from such organizations as the African Union, the European Union, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been present during the previous 3 years, excluding border-monitoring operations.

ADB is working with other MDBs to develop a new harmonized approach so that it reflects the regional characteristics of fragility and conflict, especially given the distinctive characteristics of the Pacific SIDS. It is expected that the new harmonized approach will be prepared by 2022, after the African Development Bank completes its new strategy for transition countries. As an interim measure for 2021 and 2022, the existing classification system will be followed. (page 16)

FCS risk assessment:

The FSA will institutionalize ADB’s approaches to FCAS and SIDS to improve their development outcomes by developing fragility and resilience assessments, knowledge analytics, and tools to improve risk-based

country partnerships strategies, program planning, and project preparation and implementation in DMCs. (page vii)

The fragility and resilience assessments (FRAs) (covering the structural–environmental, institutional, economic, and political–societal drivers) will be part of the diagnostic work undertaken before preparing a country partnership strategy. It will provide a country context specific analysis of the causes of fragility and propose actions to address fragility and vulnerability and build resilience. The analysis will be used in country-level planning and updated when relevant, to reflect changes in the country’s contextual risk at project level. (page viii) FRAs are confidential documents, and it is up to countries whether they will integrate FRA into country partnership strategy (CPS).

Operational flexibilities:

- [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (2021)

The FSA will institutionalize ADB’s approaches to FCAS and SIDS to improve their development outcomes by (i) enhancing the flexibility and responsiveness of operational procedures, processes, and guidelines. These guidelines include new or updated guidance notes to inform, clarify, and strengthen technical support for (i) CPS preparation, (ii) fragility and resilience assessment (FRA) preparation, (iii) political economy assessment (PEA), (iv) governance risks assessment (GRA), (v) processing of sovereign grants and loans, (vi) procurement, (vii) safeguards, and (viii) development and integration of digital technologies that support country and project performance monitoring, including third-party independent monitoring.

Incentives for FCS operation:

- [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (2021)

ADB’s capacity enhancement will be achieved with more agile human resource utilization. This means (i) providing staff training, repurposing vacant staff positions, redeploying staff, using fixed-term staff positions and secondments, pooling resources such as key technical skills in hubs across regions, and harnessing resources thematically; (ii) using staff consultants to assist in the expected surge of activities, and support the implementation of key FSA actions after their approval; and (iii) providing TA to DMCs to support training, capacity building, enhancement, and supplementation. (page 29-30)

Partnership and cooperation:

- [Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States Approach](#) (2021)

The FSA will institutionalize ADB’s approaches to FCAS and SIDS to improve their development outcomes by reinforcing partnerships and coordination. For example, ADB has placed its regular assistance to Afghanistan on hold effective 15 August 2021 but remains committed to supporting the economic and social development of the Afghan people through the UN agencies. [Afghanistan and ADB | Asian Development Bank](#)

Project suspension and/or cancelation:

ADB allocates the Asian Development Fund (ADF) for country allocations: [Allocation of Concessional Resources | Asian Development Bank \(adb.org\)](#). Currently ADB programs in Afghanistan (AFG) and Myanmar (MYA) are on hold.

AFG: ADB has placed its regular assistance to Afghanistan on hold effective 15 August 2021 but remains committed to supporting the economic and social development of the Afghan people through the UN agencies. [Afghanistan and ADB | Asian Development Bank](#)

MYA: ADB has temporarily put on hold sovereign project disbursements and new contracts in Myanmar effective 1 February 2021. ADB is closely monitoring the situation in Myanmar and remains committed to supporting its people. [Myanmar and ADB | Asian Development Bank](#)

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

- [Mapping fragile and conflict-affected situations in Asia and the Pacific: The ADB experience \(2016\)](#)

This study maps out the major weaknesses of each fragile situation on the latest country performance assessment exercises and identifies overall common issues that need special attention. Findings show that the weakest areas in fragile and conflict-affected countries are policies for social inclusion/equity, followed by structural policies, and public sector management and institutions. Economic management has generally the highest ranking or is the strongest area in many such countries.

[A Peacebuilding Tool for a Conflict-Sensitive Approach to Development: A Pilot Initiative in Nepal \(2012\)](#)

ADB piloted the peacebuilding tool in Nepal as a conflict-sensitive approach, a key to effective and safe implementation of projects in the country's post-conflict context. The peacebuilding tool is an analytical tool for assisting project team leaders and social experts in understanding the local context, and in identifying potential risks to implementation of development projects that are linked to social conflicts, as well as in formulating mitigation measures for addressing these risks.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

It would be helpful for FCAS-classified DMCs to have harmonized processes and requirements when dealing with various lenders and funds providers on a single project for example. GEF, being one of the providers of funds, may be able to work with other providers of funds to have a differentiated harmonized approach to make it easier for FCAS-classified DMCs borrowers to comply with various requirements. However, this suggestion should be further discussed with the ADB GEF coordination team and relevant operations departments as they relate directly with project processing.

Annex 2: AfDB – African Development Bank

Policy and Strategy:

[Bank Group’s Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022)

This 3rd Strategy sets out the African Development Bank Group’s approach to addressing fragility by 1) strengthening institutional capacity, 2) building more resilient societies, and 3) catalyzing private investment in all its 54 Regional Member Countries (i.e. the African continent).

The purpose of the Strategy is to reinvigorate and scale up the Bank’s engagement on fragility in Africa, re-emphasizing a preventative approach that builds resilience against the diverse shocks and pressures to which African regions, countries, and communities are vulnerable. As fragility is a condition that can arise in any context, the Strategy describes how the Bank will adapt its operations and instruments to tackle the root causes of conflict and fragility, in recognition of the need to scale up investment in crisis prevention and stay engaged across the fragility spectrum to contribute to pathways out of fragility.

AfDB strengthened key operational processes and frameworks to further mainstream the use of the fragility lens in its programming documents (such as Country Strategy Papers, Regional Integration Strategy Papers, Project Appraisal Reports etc.), including the Regional Operations Selection and Prioritization Framework (ROSPF) and the Enhanced Readiness Review. Moreover, to adapt its procedures, AfDB has developed a fit-for-purpose procurement policy providing degrees of flexibility in the context of fragile situations. (para 3.7)

The Strategy places a particular emphasis on strategic, humanitarian-development-peace nexus partnerships for complementarities and synergies, including in knowledge/analytics, policy dialogues/advocacy and operations. This encompasses climate-displacement nexus interventions, such as via the Bank’s Transition Support Facility (TSF) and other internal financing envelopes, to prevent and address climate-induced forced displacement.⁸⁷

[Presidential Directive \(PD\) 03/2010 Concerning continuity of operations and engagement with *de facto* governments in regional member countries](#) (2010)

The purpose of this Directive is to establish procedures, conditions and guidelines to govern the Bank Group’s dealings with *de facto* governments in Regional Member Countries. Presidential Directives are updated from time to time as deemed useful.

[African Development Bank – Operations Procurement Manual, Part A, Volume 2: Specialized Procurement](#) (2018)

The Operations Procurement Manual (2018) provides general consideration in FCS, specific provisions and processes, organizational and institutional arrangements, Fit for Purpose Procurement Methods and Procedures, and simplified procedures and streamlined monitoring and control mechanisms. (Chapter I: Procurement Under ERA &FCS, page 41-50)

⁸⁷ See references to COP27, COP26: <https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/topics/fragility-resilience>

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

[Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022)

The AfDB understands fragility as the condition where countries are subject to pressures that threaten to overwhelm their capacities to manage them, creating risks of instability. (para 2.2) The Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessments (CPIAs) confirm that poor performance in public sector and economic management and economic policy can persist over lengthy periods. Building institutional capacity is therefore key to successful transitions out of fragility. (para 2.4) Along the fragility spectrum, the Bank identifies four distinct situations that call for different forms of support and engagement. These are: (i) increasing risks of conflict or collapse of state functions; (ii) active conflict and/or prolonged crisis; (iii) signs of turnaround to rebuild and reform; and (iv) decreasing risks and emerging pathways to resilience. (para 2.5) AfDB develops an eligibility list for Transition Support Facility (TSF) every replenishment period, but does not produce a list of country in FCS.

FCS risk assessment:

[Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022)

Drawing on an increasingly sophisticated understanding of fragility in Africa, the Bank introduced fragility assessments at national and regional levels, providing a rich source of data and analysis on pressures and risks across the political, economic, social, justice, security, environmental and regional spill-over spheres. This has boosted the Bank's capacity in political economy, conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity application. (para 3.5) Findings from fragility and resilience assessments are now routinely mainstreamed into country and regional strategy papers and project documents. (para 3.6) The Bank will ensure that its fragility and resilience assessments inform key strategy documents, including Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and Regional Integration Strategy Papers (RISPs). (para 5.10)

In addition to Country Resilience and Fragility Assessment (CRFA) profiles produced for all African countries on a regular cycle, the Bank will produce a range of fragility-related knowledge products, such as Watching Briefs, Economic and Sector Work, and Full-Fledged Fragility Assessments. (para 5.8) Guidance notes on analytics will be developed to standardize the formats, set quality triggers, and define the methodology for the preparation of CRFA profiles and full-fledged fragility assessments. (XXVIII)

In the regional diagnostic assessment, AfDB aims not only for no harm but also doing good, such as maximizing inclusiveness of youth, women and vulnerable communities, contributing to peacebuilding, addressing forced displacement and spillover of fragility, supporting governmental efforts for voluntary, safe, orderly and regular mobility/migration to harness opportunities arising from the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), and addressing climate crisis. The Country Resilience and Fragility Assessments are conducted by inhouse experts, at times with support from external experts. These risk assessments are particularly targeting women, youth, and vulnerable groups. AfDB is also prioritizing supporting private sector in FCS settings because private sector would be able to create decent employment, entrepreneurship opportunities, livelihoods and economic activities, which are essential for strengthening resilience and social cohesion.

Incentives for FCS:

[Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) (2022)

Leveraging Financial Instruments:

The Transition Support Facility (TSF) is a dedicated, flexible financing vehicle replenished during the African Development Fund cycles (over \$5 billion thus far). The TSF is catalytic in nature and can integrate donor resources for scaled-up approaches, including via mobilization of climate finance as well as complement climate resilience operations with a specific focus on but not limited to transition states (countries in fragile situations). The TSF has given the AfDB the ability to concretely help prevent and address – operationally via the fragility lens application - underlying drivers of fragility, conflict, violence and climate change identified during analytical works. This also enhances the foundation for social cohesion and inclusive growth, and the flexibility to respond quickly in times of crisis. The TSF provides support through three pillars: the supplemental financing window (Pillar I), arrears clearance resources window (Pillar II), and targeted support for capacity building and technical assistance window (Pillar III). While Pillar I provides concessional loans and grants, TSF Pillar II is dedicated for arrears clearance only and Pillar III offer grants on a Call for Proposals (CfP) and crises response basis. Guided by the application of the fragility lens, TSF resources help transition states address socioeconomic fragilities, tackle environmental vulnerabilities, strengthen structural policies, consolidate peace, build resilient institutions, stabilize economies, and lay the foundations for sustainable inclusive growth. (para 3.2 and Annex XI)

AfDB develops an eligibility list for TSF every replenishment period. AfDB is expanding these transition funds to women, youth and vulnerable communities, migration and spill over issues and others.

Partnership and Cooperation:

AfDB's Strategy clearly articulates the need to remaining engaged in FCS even in the *de facto* governments to engage policy dialogue in countries. Humanitarian-development-peace nexus became one of the important approaches in the AfDB. AfDB continues to expand collaboration with third parties, beyond traditional partners such as the African Union, Regional Economic Communities and Organizations, but also UN agencies (including UNHCR, IOM, UNDP, WFP etc.) via a Fiduciary Principles Agreement. This includes an increasing focus on community-centered development in support of national development priorities, including via enhanced Civil Society Engagement with international and local CSOs and partners such as ICRC, in order to protect and empower most vulnerable communities in FCS. Working with local CSOs is important to build capacity for local communities and livelihood programs since these organizations are working closest with the most vulnerable communities. AfDB supports the strengthening of country systems, but on a case by case basis is working with core partners to contribute to peace building within its socio-economic development mandate through its projects and programs.

Staff safety and security:

AfDB's Security Department secures safety and security of its staff and consultants, especially in fragile and dynamic contexts.

Project suspension and/or cancelation:

[Bank Group's Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa \(2022-2026\)](#) takes approaches to address FCS issues through staying engaged in FCS and building resilience in the most vulnerable areas. In the case of de-facto government situations, AfDB's senior management decides what to do about existing and new funds including suspension and cancelation.⁸⁸

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

- [Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa and for the Transition Support Facility](#) (2014)

This paper sets forth operational guidelines to guide the effective implementation of the Strategy and utilization of resources from the Transition Support Facility (TSF), formerly the Fragile States Facility (FSF). These Guidelines replace the Operations Guidelines of the Fragile States Facility (2008) and the Guidelines of the Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Program of the Pillar III Operations (2010). The intended users of these guidelines are staff of the Bank involved in operations in Regional Member Countries (RMCs) affected by fragility and other staff engaged on issues of fragility. (para 1.4). The Guidelines are being updated for alignment with the latest Fragility and Resilience Strategy as well as ADF priorities and guidance.

The Bank's operational response requires (i) deep analysis of the factors driving fragility in specific contexts; (ii) an approach to operational engagement that is differentiated and tailored to specific fragile situations and targeted to high impact; (iii) support that addresses the drivers of fragility; (iv) a regional approach to regional problems; (v) broader and deeper partnerships to leverage the expertise (and resources) of other institutions; (vi) operational and procedural flexibility and the ability to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances; (vii) and nuanced risk management that can weigh the tradeoffs among programmatic, contextual and institutional risks. (para 2.5)

[Chair's summary - Accelerating Climate Finance for Sustaining Peace in Africa: Towards Integrated, Sustainable and Innovative Financing](#) (2022)

Fragile and conflict-affected countries are disproportionately impacted by climate change. Despite this, climate finance for Africa continues to fall short of the increasing demand. The publication highlights the main challenges that hinder the acceleration of climate finance to Africa, and the key opportunities for African and international financial actors (including development banks, government finance institutions, businesses, and private sector companies) to accelerate climate finance for adaptation and mitigation in Africa.

⁸⁸ In the past replenishment in ADF 15 (2020-2022), all the country allocation did not use every year (including suspension) could not carry over next year and went back to core funding. In ADF 16 (2023-2025), a new policy will be approved by the Board soon to be able to carry over every year's country allocation to the next year within the same replenishment period. There is no carry over of county allocation beyond the replenishment period in AfDB.

Annex 3: CAF – Corporación Andina de Fomento

Policy:

CAF has PROCEDURE FOR RATING SOVEREIGN RISK OPERATIONS, which is an internal document. This is the procedure that establishes and describes the application process and use of the Sovereign Risk Management Matrix.

Applicability of policy:

This procedure is applied to all sovereign risk operations in the origination, evaluation, and administration stages. Currently, this procedure is not covering the technical assistance operations, which include GEF investment.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

It would be convenient to have GEF guidance. CAF must extend the procedures that already have linked to FCS to technical assistance operations. Thus, it is helpful to understand the parameters that the GEF considers they should apply, so that CAF can verify what they need to be included in their procedures or to be able to close the gaps that are detected.

Annex 4: CI - Conservation International

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

CI's trainings are voluntary and free to interested staff and partners, and they can customize skills building activities for target audiences as needed.

[Environmental Peacebuilding Training Manual](#) (2017)

This training manual is designed to increase the awareness, knowledge and skills of conflict-sensitive environmental peacebuilding approaches among conservation practitioners and organizations working in areas affected by conflict or where conservation efforts could potentially impact conflict. The target audience is our staff and partners who plan, implement and monitor conservation programs across the world. This manual is for anyone involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of conservation projects.

[The Social Responsibility Assessment for the Seafood Sector – A Manual for Trainers on Guidance for Assessment Implementation](#) (2021)

This manual is intended to serve as an aide for any facilitator knowledgeable in the Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) to effectively present on the practice of implementing SRA principles into data collection, assessments, and fisheries improvement plans. This training manual is intended for organizations seeking to apply the SRA and in need of support to improve assessment staff's knowledge and capacity on integrating rights principles across data collection methods and in FIP design and implementation.

[Social Responsibility Assessment Tool for the Seafood Sector](#) (2021)

The Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) Tool for the Seafood Sector is a risk-assessment or benchmarking tool for conducting human rights due diligence in seafood supply chains. The Social Responsibility Assessment (SRA) Tool is not a certification and is voluntary for the time being. A FIP implementer decides whether they would like to assess social responsibility principles and performance indicators in the context of each fishery and aquaculture improvement project. A Fishery Improvement Projects implementer decides whether they would like to assess social responsibility principles and performance indicators in the context of each fishery and aquaculture improvement project.

[Conflict Sensitivity and Environmental Peacebuilding in Conservation: Lessons Learned from CI](#) (2022)

CI aims to summarize and share its experience in striving towards conflict sensitivity and, when relevant, incorporating environmental peacebuilding elements in its work. The focus of this brief report is on key lessons learned over the past 10+ years of experience at the high-level – both from the perspective of organizational transformation and in relation to operations and programming. Further, this report is meant to provide a starting point for knowledge exchange for peer organizations as well as organizations from different fields working in similar landscapes or facing shared challenges.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

The GEF has policies and guidelines in place that could help address the challenges of operating in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS), specifically the ESS policies. However, additional guidance from the GEF may be necessary to provide further clarity on how to effectively use GEF funds in FCS. This may

include guidance on how to conduct environmental and social impact assessments in conflict-affected areas, how to engage with local communities in FCS, and how to address security concerns in project design and implementation. Ultimately, additional guidance from the GEF could help ensure that projects in FCS are more effective, efficient, and sustainable and promote stability, strengthening local knowledge, innovative solutions and structures for preventing, managing and resolving socioenvironmental conflict.

Conflict sensitivity and peace-related opportunities are relevant beyond conflict- and fragility-affected contexts. Different kinds of conflict can affect projects in diverse contexts in unique and complex ways; the ability to identify, understand and respond to conflict dynamics is relevant to all projects, requiring staff and institutional capacity as early as project planning and consultation stages. The GEF could also reflect this by broadening the scope of its evaluations to include insights related to conflict and peace from a broader portfolio of projects to others that showcase co-benefits related to positive peace, social cohesion or security.

Annex 5: DBSA – Development Bank of Southern Africa

Policy:

The DBSA has a draft policy framework for situations of fragility (internal document) and exclusions list of their investment.

Applicability of policy:

The policies will be applicable to all projects financed by the GEF.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

No. The DBSA's policies and framework will adequately cover the use of funds relating to FCS.

Annex 6: FAO – United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization

Policy:

FAO's initial resources on FCV

Guidelines

Agriculture, natural resources, food security and nutrition can be sources of peace or conflict, crisis or recovery. Particularly in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, FAO is dedicated to making sure that our work avoids contributing to divisions, disputes and violent conflict, and does no harm. Where possible, positive contributions to local peace related to the Organization's mandate should be identified and supported.

In recent years, FAO has developed corporate tools, guidance and training on context analysis, conflict sensitivity and sustaining peace. These guides and tools have been jointly developed with Interpeace, a global peacebuilding organization, after extensive field-testing and feedback. These guides include:

- [FAO Guide to Context Analysis: Informing FAO Decision-Making \(English\) \(French\) \(Arabic\) \(2019\)](#)

The *Guide to Context Analysis* is an accessible and practical learning tool for country offices to document and institutionalize their knowledge of fragile and conflict-affected contexts.

This Guide provides non-conflict specialists with an accessible and structured methodology to analyze and document a sub-national or national context. The Guide's structure is sufficiently flexible to suit an array of potential audiences or reporting formats including a rapid context analysis for a specific project, an area-based intervention, joint programming with other UN agencies, as well as a standalone strategic analysis to inform management decisions.

The Guide can be read both as a standalone instructional aid on context analysis, as well as an essential precursor to FAO's Programme Clinic approach to design conflict-sensitive interventions.

- [Operationalizing pathways to sustaining peace in the context of Agenda 2030 \(2022\)](#)

Following broad consultation across the Organization, this document provides operational guidance and inspiration to FAO project and technical staff on how to enhance FAO's contributions to peace.

Identifying where FAO can positively contribute to social cohesion and peace must be anchored in robust theories of change. FAO places increasing importance on ensuring that our interventions make a positive contribution to peace – an objective shared across the United Nations system, and increasingly a requirement of our partners and donors. The focus of this how-to guide is to elaborate the pathways through which the Organization can optimize deliberate contributions to peace, and inform the design, adaptation and impact measurement of its interventions.

Framework

- o [Corporate Framework to Support Sustainable Peace in the Context of Agenda 2030 \(English\) \(French\) \(2018\)](#)

The objective of this corporate Framework is to guide FAO in carrying out its mandate in its areas of competence and comparative advantage, i.e. food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, towards a more deliberate and transformative impact on sustaining peace.

Animations

- Conflict-sensitive programming: what is it and why is it important? ([English](#)) ([French](#)) ([Arabic](#))
- Visualizing the P in the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus ([English](#)) ([French](#))

Please click [here](#) to see the entire playlist

Other useful links

- [Conflict Sensitivity: From Contextual Understanding to Conflict Sensitive Practice \(PowerPoint\)](#)
- [FAO's Contribution to Sustaining Peace](#) (brochure)
- [KORE - Knowledge Sharing Platform on Resilience](#)
- **Country Examples:**
 - South Sudan: [Linking community-based animal health services with natural resource conflict mitigation in the Abyei Administrative Area](#)
 - Mali: Analysis of conflicts over the exploitation of natural resources ([English](#)) ([French](#))
 - Burkina Faso: Analysis of conflicts over the exploitation of natural resources ([English](#)) ([French](#))
 - Somalia: [Strengthening the resilience of rural communities through conflict-sensitive programming: Translating context analysis and conflict-sensitive recommendations into adjustment in project implementation in Lower Shabelle region](#)

FAO has several conflict analyses in the publishing pipeline, which includes Somalia (southern states), Northern Cameroon, Southern Kyrgyzstan, the Karamoja Cluster in Uganda, North Kivu and South Kivu in Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) as well as Haiti.

Applicability of policy:

These resources are “available” to all projects but not “enforced”, “applicable” so to speak. Corporate Framework to support sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030 for instance sets the standards and provides guidance but is not a fully-fledged policy.

The **new FAO safeguards policy (the Framework for Environmental and Social Management)** does not have any specific guidance for Fragile, Conflict and Violence Affected Situations. However, it does have provisions to deal with emergency projects. For *emergency response and humanitarian action interventions, the timelines and sequencing of the assessment and management measures will be adjusted to prioritize rapid response activities*. As the crisis situation transitions to early recovery and development, the rest of the Environmental and Social Safeguards should be fully integrated in the programme or project cycle. During an emergency, environmental and social assessments are instrumental for preventing secondary emergencies, addressing acute risks to human life and health,

and making positive contributions to the recovery and resilience of affected communities and their livelihood systems.

In many instances, the initial disaster can have a direct adverse impact on the natural environment, often with negative consequences for the livelihoods of affected populations. Moreover, existing environmental issues (e.g. over-extraction of natural resources) might affect the way humanitarian assistance is delivered. It is important to also evaluate how the humanitarian intervention itself may cause or contribute to negative socio-economic and environmental impacts. Such an analysis is particularly important during multi-year crises where long-term humanitarian assistance might be required. As the crises and modalities of humanitarian response change over time, socio-environmental impacts may need to be reassessed. When programming is focused on emergency and crisis response and recovery action, FAO will undertake efforts to integrate the Environmental and Social Safeguards into crisis response training, preparedness and prevention protocols, debiasing checklists or similar tools, and operating procedures.

FAO still has a lot to do as demonstrated by this **recent evaluation on the Humanitarian-development-peace (HDP) nexus**

- [Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the humanitarian–development–peace nexus 2014–2020 \(2021\)](#)
- [Issue Paper EXPLORING PEACE WITHIN THE HUMANITARIAN- DEVELOPMENT-PEACE NEXUS \(HDPN\) IASC Results Group 4 on Humanitarian-Development Collaboration](#) (Inter-Agency Standing Committee 2020)

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

FAO does not have FCS classification, and time to time use the OECD's fragile contexts. Initiation of conflict/context analyses is dependent on country-level decisions with support from regional/HQ technical staff.

Staff working on conflict and peacebuilding:

Technical support to country offices is provided by:

- Headquarters:
 - Conflict and Peace Unit: Team leader, 2 conflict specialists and three staff working on forced displacement (policy and programming), 6 total.
 - Sub-regional offices in Amman, Dakar and Nairobi: Providing technical support and backstopping to country offices within the sub-region.
 - Country offices: Several offices (including Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Kyrgyzstan, Somalia, South Sudan) benefiting from dedicated conflict and peace analysts or focal points.
 - Conflict & Peace roster: A global roster of conflict and peace specialists has been finalized with a view to being able to deploy vetted technical specialists to country offices on demand.

Incentives for FCS

The Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA) was established in 2004 to enhance FAO's capacity to rapidly respond to emergency situations. Through strategic resource partner funding, SFERA provides FAO with the financial means and flexibility to react promptly to humanitarian crises, reducing the time between funding decision and action on the ground.

FCS risk assessment:

Conflict-sensitivity

- Facilitators' guide- FAO Programme Clinic: Designing Conflict-Sensitive Interventions ([English](#)) ([Arabic](#)) ([French](#))
- Participant's guide- FAO Programme Clinic: Designing Conflict-Sensitive Interventions ([English](#)) ([Arabic](#)) ([French](#))

The Programme Clinic is a key step in operationalising conflict-sensitive programming, being a structured participatory analysis designed to identify and integrate “conflict-sensitive” strategies into the design and implementation of FAO interventions. The objective is to minimize the risk of any negative or harmful impacts, as well as maximize any positive contributions towards strengthening and consolidating conditions for sustainable local peace. The Programme Clinic is designed in a way that empowers staff from the decentralised offices to facilitate the process effectively without needing to rely on external expert facilitation.

The programme clinic, conflict sensitivity assessments, is generally undertaken in the development or inception phase. Conflict analysis is initiated by country office and decision making is decentralized. Conflict analysis is for strategic decision making, programming entry points, and informed intervention. These are not published, though the approach and recommendations are used by staff (project and M&E) as well as joint and implementing partners.

Staff safety and security in FCS:

The FAO's approach to security is aligned with the UN Security Management System (UNSMS) Security Policy Manual (https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/undss-unsms_policy_ebook.pdf).

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

FAO supports all five recommendations of the [2020 Evaluation of GEF Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations](#), namely:

1. The GEF Secretariat should use the project review process to provide feedback to Agencies to identify conflict and fragility-related risks to a proposed project and develop measures to mitigate those risks.
2. To improve conflict-sensitive programming while also providing flexibility to Agencies and projects, the GEF Secretariat could develop guidance for conflict-sensitive programming.

3. To improve conflict-sensitive design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of GEF projects, the GEF Secretariat together with the Agencies should leverage existing platforms for learning, exchange, and technical assistance.
4. The current GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards could be expanded to provide more details so that GEF projects address key conflict-sensitive considerations.
5. The GEF Secretariat could consider revising its policies and procedures so that GEF-supported projects can better adapt to rapid and substantial changes common in fragile and conflict-affected situations

Annex 7: FECO – Foreign Environmental Cooperation Office (China)

Policy:

FECO has no operational policies, manuals, and guidelines covering operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations by now, but FECO has the ability to and will develop relevant policies, manuals, and guidelines for projects in fragile and conflict-affected situations if needed.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

FECO welcomes additional guidance for GEF funds in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS) from GEF.

Annex 8: IDB – Inter-American Development Bank

Policy:

IDB is in the final stage of approving a ***Framework for Supporting Populations in Fragile, Conflict and Violence-affected (FCV) Situations***. In its final draft, the Framework includes items such as a definition and classification of fragility, conflict and violence; guiding principles; an IDB FCV engagement model that includes three pillars: enhancing knowledge in FCV settings, adapting the IDB’s operational approach and processes to FCV and strengthening institutions and building capacity in FCV settings., as well as measures for resourcing the FCV engagement model. It is expected that the Framework will be approved in the first semester of 2023 and it will be applied to all IDB operations, including all GEF projects. At the same time, IDB is forging synergies between MDBs with semi-annual meetings of a MDB working group (the next one is in April 2023).

The **IDB Environmental and Social Policy Framework (ESPF)** was approved by the Board of Directors in September 2020 and entered into effect in November 2021, together with the Guidelines for Borrowers for each one of the ten Environmental and Social Performance Standards (ESPS). The ESPF and its Guidelines apply to IDB financed projects, including GEF projects and include numerous provisions to manage operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations. Here is a summary of some of them:

Risk classification, ESPF Policy Statement, paragraph 3.17: In addition to the impact classification, the IDB will assign a risk classification, using an Environmental and Social Risk Rating (ESRR) that is based on a four-level risk rating: low, moderate, substantial, or high. This risk classification will be reassessed throughout the project cycle and adjusted in accordance with the developments and circumstances of implementation and findings of the IDB’s monitoring and supervision. Key factors considered in the ESRR are cause (direct environmental and social impacts), contribution (indirect environmental and social impacts), and additional areas of risk that may be relevant to the delivery of environmental and social mitigation measures and outcomes. These could include legal and institutional considerations; the nature of the mitigation measures and technology being proposed; governance structures and legislation; *and contextual factors relating to stability, conflict or security, among others.*

Definition of vulnerable people, ESPF Annex II Glossary: Vulnerable people/groups are people or groups of people who may be more adversely affected by project impacts than others by virtue of characteristics such as disability, state of health, indigenous status, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, race, color, ethnicity, age, language, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, economic disadvantage, or social condition. *Other vulnerable individuals and/or groups may include people or groups in vulnerable situations* including the poor, the landless, the elderly, single-headed households, refugees, internally displaced persons, natural resource dependent communities or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national legislation and/ or international law.

Identification of risks and impacts, ESPS 1, paragraphs 8 & 9: The Borrower will establish and maintain a process for identifying the environmental and social risks and impacts of the project....The scope of the risks and impacts identification process will be centered on the application of the mitigation hierarchy and consistent with good international industry practice and will determine the appropriate and relevant methods and assessment tools....The risks and impacts identification process will be based on recent environmental and social baseline data at an appropriate level of detail..... The risks and impacts identification process will consider, among others: (i) *risks whose negative project impacts fall*

disproportionately on individuals and groups who, because of their particular circumstances, are in a vulnerable position; (ii) any prejudice or discrimination against individuals or groups in providing access to development resources and project benefits, particularly in the case of those who may be disadvantaged or vulnerable;... (vi) those related to community safety, including the safety of the project's infrastructure, and threats to human security through the risk of escalation of personal or communal conflict and violence that could be caused or exacerbated by the project;... (xiii) gender-related risks, including gender-based exclusion, gender-based violence (sexual exploitation, human trafficking, and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases), and potential discrimination risks based on gender and sexual orientation, among others.

Guidelines for ESPS 1, paragraph GL24: The Borrower will consider contextual risks and how they may evolve over time. Those considerations will be included in the E&S assessment process and management programs, underscoring project scenarios or situations that may have the potential to exacerbate social tensions, impede project implementation, and hinder environmental and social performance. Contextual knowledge should be obtained from a wide range of stakeholders. Project scenarios or situations where contextual risk is particularly relevant include: *(i) areas where armed or social conflict or the risk of conflict exists; (ii) areas where gross human rights abuses or systematic human rights violations exist; (iii) areas experiencing significant social flux linked to migration, including influx of labor; (iv) areas where the rule of law and governance are weak or non-existent and in areas where respect for human rights is limited or absent; (v) area recently affected by a natural disaster; (vi) areas significantly affected by epidemic or pandemic issues; and (vii) areas with severely curtailed civic space*

Provisions on the protection of human rights:

- ESPF Introduction, paragraph 3: *Projects should be implemented with due respect for human rights, which means avoiding infringing on the human rights of others and addressing adverse human rights impacts that the project may cause or to which it may contribute. Each ESPS has elements related to human rights dimensions that a project may face in the course of its operations. Due diligence with respect to these dimensions will enable the Borrower to address many relevant human rights issues in its projects.*
- ESPF Policy Statement, paragraph 1.3: *Respecting human rights. The IDB is committed to respecting internationally recognized human rights standards. To that end, in accordance with Environmental and Social Performance Standard (ESPS) 1 of this Policy Framework, the IDB requires its Borrowers to respect human rights, avoid infringement on the human rights of others, and address risks to and impacts on human rights in the projects it supports.*
- ESPS 1, paragraph 3: *The Borrower will consider risks and impacts related to human rights, gender, and natural hazards and climate change throughout the assessment process. Where appropriate, the Borrower will complement its environmental and social assessment with further studies focusing on those specific risks and impacts.*
- ESPS 1, footnote 52: *It may be appropriate for the Borrower to include in its environmental and social risk and impact identification process a specific human rights due diligence in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. A requirement for human rights due diligence is most likely to be appropriate where the nature of the project or its operating contexts pose significant risk to human rights, such as investments in security provision, in contexts where internally displaced persons exist, and in contexts of post- or ongoing conflict, among others.*

Environmental and Social Performance Standard (ESPS) 4, paragraph 2: *In conflict and post-conflict areas, the risks and impacts described in this ESPS may be greater.* The risk that a project could exacerbate an already sensitive local situation, leading to an increase in the risk of personal or communal conflict, or stress scarce local resources, should be considered carefully, as it may lead to further conflict and increased threats to human security.

Provision on use of security forces, ESPS 4, paragraph 15: When the Borrower retains direct or contracted workers to provide security to safeguard its personnel and property, it will assess risks posed by its security arrangements to those within and outside the project site. In making such arrangements, the Borrower will be guided by the principles of proportionality and good international practice in relation to hiring, rules of conduct, training, equipping, and monitoring of such workers, and by applicable law. The Borrower will make reasonable inquiries to ensure that those providing security are not implicated in past abuses; will train them adequately in the use of force (and where applicable, firearms), and appropriate conduct toward workers and the project-affected people and will require them to act within the applicable law.

Stakeholder engagement, ESPS 1, paragraph 11: *The Borrower will identify and document those project-affected people who, because of their circumstances, may be disadvantaged or vulnerable.* Based on this identification, the Borrower will further identify individuals or groups who may have different concerns and priorities about project impacts, mitigation mechanisms, and benefits and who may require different or separate forms of engagement.

Consultation, Guidelines for the ESPS 10, paragraph GL38: Meaningful consultation is a cornerstone of informed decision making and a key aspect of a project's stakeholder engagement program. It requires an understanding of the project context and any risks for the project that originate from that context (contextual risk), *such as ongoing conflict or societal tensions*, poor community experience with previous projects, or extreme poverty.

Project grievance mechanism, ESPS 10, paragraph 27: The Borrower will respond to questions, concerns, and grievances of affected stakeholders related to the project's environmental and social performance in a timely manner. For this purpose, *the Borrower will propose and implement a grievance mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of concerns and grievances.*

IDB Grievance Mechanism, ESPF Policy Statement, paragraph 7.3: Stakeholders may submit complaints regarding a Bank-financed project to (1) the project grievance mechanism; (2) appropriate local grievance mechanisms; or (3) *directly to the IDB, which will respond within a reasonable timeframe.* In addition, *the IDB's Independent Consultation and Investigation Mechanism (ICIM) provides a mechanism and process to address allegations of harm by projects* as a result of noncompliance by the IDB with one or more of its operational policies, including the ESPF.

Guidelines for ESPS 9, paragraph GL43: The Borrower should identify and assess SGBV risks that the project might pose to local communities and project workers. SGBV risks are present in every project. However, the level of risk will vary depending on the local context, the characteristics of the project itself, the Borrower's capacity to respond, among other factors. Factors that might indicate a heightened risk of project related SGBV include:... *Project-affected communities have preexisting high levels of gender-based*

violence, insecurity, and criminality; poverty and lack of economic opportunities (which increases the likelihood of sexual exploitation); and social tolerance and normalization of violence against women and sexual and gender minorities.

Links to the referred documents:

- Environmental and Social Policy Framework:
<https://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=EZSHARE-110529158-160>
- Guidelines for the ESPS 9
<https://www.iadb.org/document.cfm?id=EZSHARE-110529158-201>
- Guidelines for the ESPS 10
<https://www.iadb.org/document.cfm?id=EZSHARE-110529158-202>

Risk assessment:

Disaster and Climate Change assessment is mandatory for all IDB project.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

We consider the policy and guidelines that we have as sufficient, however, it would be interesting to learn about the experience of the GEF in this matter.

Annex 9: IFAD – International Fund for Agricultural Development

Policy:

[IFAD Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery](#) (2006)

The specific objectives of this policy are to:

- (a) reinforce IFAD's approach to the prevention of crisis, especially among those people who are the most vulnerable;
- (b) clarify the role for IFAD in post-crisis situations;
- (c) define the resource allocation process with respect to the financing of post-crisis interventions; and
- (d) enhance programme implementation procedures and processes so as to operate more effectively in crisis-prone and crisis-affected countries.

[IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016)

The strategy proposes a classification approach to identify the countries with the most fragile situations, i.e. those that would benefit from enhanced, fragility-sensitive engagement. The classification builds on indicators related to institutional capacity and conflict. The strategy outlines the guiding principles for IFAD's engagement in countries with fragile situations. These guiding principles are: (a) risk management and resilience; (b) focus on root causes (within IFAD's mandate and comparative advantage); (c) gender mainstreaming and targeting; (d) institution-building to promote trust and social cohesion; (e) flexible and responsive resources, instruments and approaches; (f) strategic and complementary partnerships; and (g) results measurement and learning. (page iii, para 4-5)

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

[IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016)

IFAD's current methodology for classification of fragile states combines the lists of all fragile states identified by other IFIs and the OECD. This currently results in an unwieldy list of about 50 countries, covering half of IFAD's portfolio, which does not allow for the development of clearly differentiated approaches. Furthermore, as identified by the corporate-level evaluation (CLE) on fragile situations, project performance is significantly lower only in a limited subset of the most fragile situations (MFS). Therefore, IFAD has developed IFAD-relevant criteria to identify situations that warrant genuinely differentiated approaches. The indicators, country level (institutional capacity and conflict) and beyond countries, will be used to identify the MFS countries in which differentiated approaches will be developed and additional resources, when mobilized, will be committed to address fragility. (page 3, para 12-16)

"Fragility is a condition of high vulnerability to natural and man-made shocks, often associated with an elevated risk of violence and conflict. Weak governance structures along with low-capacity institutions are a common driver and consequence of fragile situations. Fragile situations typically provide a weaker enabling environment for inclusive and sustainable rural transformation and are characterized by protracted and/or periodic crises, often with implications for smallholder agriculture and food security." (page iii, para 3)

Incentives for FCS:

[Special Programme for Countries with Fragile Situations: Operationalizing IFAD's Fragility Strategy](#) (2019)

Definition and goal. The Special Programme is a comprehensive operational approach, combining existing and new arrangements, to enable IFAD to more effectively engage in fragile situations. Business as usual will not bring results in fragile situations. Therefore, the Special Programme will ensure that a fragility lens is applied by IFAD in the design and implementation of country strategies, programmes and projects. A new focal point for the Special Programme will help to disseminate knowledge and practice around what works in fragile situations and create a community of practice around fragility. The ultimate goal is for poor rural poor to sustainably move out of poverty and live in societies that are more resilient to natural and man-made shocks. (page 4, para 11)

Main elements. The Special Programme's main elements include:

- (a) Harmonized list. Utilizes the World Bank Harmonized List of Fragile Situations to classify countries with fragile situations;
- (b) Key entry points to address fragility. Identifies four main entry points to maximize impact in addressing fragility and building resilience: (i) gender empowerment; (ii) institution-building; (iii) food security; and (iv) natural resource management (NRM).
- (c) A differentiated approach using four stages of fragility. Reinforces IFAD's position as a facilitator of the transition from humanitarian relief to development, with experience in complementing relief actions with measures focused on sustainable livelihood recovery and rebuilding of social cohesion;
- (d) Fragility lens applied to IFAD's country programmes and projects. In line with the IFAD Transition Framework, the Special Programme will help design and implement country strategies and operations that are better tailored to fragile contexts.
- (e) Financing. Identifies ways in which to augment IFAD's country allocations for additional and specific financing to address the drivers and consequences of fragility;
- (f) Strategic partnerships. Focusing on fewer and more strategic partnerships enables a coordinated and coherent approach to fragility;
- (g) Human resources. Establishes a fragility focal point in the Programme Management Department (PMD) to provide overall leadership of the Special Programme and guidance to country teams. Applicable human resource policies and procedures will provide adequate incentives to work in fragile situations. (page 4, para 12)

[IFAD Strategy for engagement in countries with fragile situations](#) (2016)

This strategy includes a particular focus on mobilizing supplementary financing for projects in fragile situations. Supplementary resources have the advantage that they can be allocated outside the performance-based allocation system (PBAS) and on grant terms, meaning that increased resources can be channelled to MFS without increasing the complexity of the PBAS formula. Grants funded through supplementary financing can be linked to IFAD investment programmes, thereby integrating fragility within regular programming. In cases of institutional breakdown, where state institutions have negligible

capacity and mandate, IFAD may work primarily through non-government actors to address the urgent needs of communities. These resources could also be used to work with partners (including civil society and non-government partners) in countries currently without access to the PBAS, to deliver development outcomes and prepare the country programme for eventual re-engagement. Resources would be used to help MFS address the root causes of fragility within IFAD's mandate. (page 7, para 27-30)

Staff safety and security in FCS:

The IFAD's approach to security is aligned with the UN Security Management System (UNSMS) Security Policy Manual (https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/undss-unsms_policy_ebook.pdf).

Annex 10: UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

Policy:

UNDP has policies, guidelines, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and related resources that guide UNDP’s work in FCVs. Over two decades, crisis prevention and recovery have been a core part of UNDP’s development mandate. UNDP invests in development solutions that build hope for people throughout crises, to prevent loss of development gains and to find sustainable pathways from crisis and vulnerability. UNDP is boosting prevention efforts and anticipatory investments based on foresight, horizon scanning and early warning. UNDP supports countries in protracted crisis and fragility to move out of fragility through multidimensional risk analysis and integrated systems approaches.

[UNDP’s Crisis Offer](#) (2022)

UNDP’s work in FCV is centered on the UNDP Crisis Offer, which presents a framework for development solutions to crisis and fragility. UNDP has established Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), guidance, tools and other resources to provide institutional and operational guidance for all teams across the organization that are working in and/or implementing projects (including GEF projects) in FCV settings.

[Standard Operating Procedures for Immediate Crisis Response](#) (2018)

UNDP broadly defines crisis response in the 2018 Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) as a response to sudden-onset and escalating protracted crises, conflict and disasters. The SOP aims to provide a robust institutional and operational framework so critical decisions and actions can be taken quickly in response to crises. The SOP aims to ensure a transparent and fast process for Country Offices (CO) to request and receive critical corporate assistance to respond to a crisis and initiate early recovery activities.

SURGE Planning: Pre-crisis, initiation, planning, implementation and deactivation

1. Guiding questions for minimum preparedness actions (MPAs), template for portfolio analysis and template for risk analysis monitoring
2. Checklist for the first 72 hours, guidance on communication, needs assessments, post-disaster needs assessments, crisis operations, exit planning, after action reviews, etc.
3. Levels of Organizational Crisis Response ([link](#)) – enhanced support to country offices is provided based on the crisis level declaration, which is complemented by “special measures” depending on the operating context, including repurposing core resources. See the attached the example of Afghanistan.
4. Crisis Assessment and Coordination Resources ([link](#))
5. Strategy for Fast-Tracking UNDP’s Crisis Response ([link](#))
6. Management of Cash in Crisis or Emergency Situations ([link](#))

Applicability of policy:

All the policies are applicable to all GEF investments.

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

UNDP does not have any specific classification of FCS, and work in FCS is context based. UNDP's regional bureaux have annual planning exercises with the Crisis Bureau to identify priority countries for anticipation and prevention, respond and recover, and protracted and fragile integrated country support.

UNDP is present on the ground in all 60 countries categorized by the OECD-DAC as fragile ([OECD 2022, States of Fragility 2022](#)). More than half of UNDP's total annual budget is delivered in fragile and crisis settings, and nine out of ten of UNDP's largest Country Offices are likewise in such contexts. UNDP is present in programme countries before the advent of crises, building on decades of partnerships and experience in-country, working with local, national and international partners to bring a development and longer-term lens to crisis risks.

FCS risk assessment:

Tools and programmatic offers

UNDP work in fragile and crisis countries includes anticipating and preventing crisis; supporting transforming of protracted and fragile contexts; and helping countries to respond and recover from crisis. In each of these cases UNDP used a number of analytical tools and programmatic interventions, which are context specific.

Supporting transforming of protracted and fragile contexts

UNDP supports countries on multidimensional risk, fragility, and resilience analyses, including conflict, disaster, climate and other multidimensional risks. These risk-informed analyses and assessments are available to national actors to advance policy dialogue and policy making. They are leveraged to develop and implement integrated risk-informed development solutions whether in terms of prevention, response or recovery.

UNDP also supports countries to develop and implement 'Out of Fragility strategies'. Each 2030 Out of Fragility strategy will be context-specific, multidimensional and provide an integrated approach bringing together UNDP's six Signature Solutions of poverty and inequality, governance, resilience, energy, environment, governance, and gender equality. The strategy will aim to build the foundations of stable societies and provide choice and opportunity. The Out of Fragility strategies include programming entry points, expected results, financing strategy and partnerships.

Anticipating and preventing crisis

Prevention is at the heart of UNDP's development mandate, anchored in its mission to reduce development deficits, fight inequalities, and foster inclusion. UNDP leads policy and programme efforts to get ahead of the curve of future crisis by mitigating risk and addressing drivers and root causes of conflicts, disasters, and other types of crisis. UNDP also supports national capacities for conflict analysis, conflict sensitivity and impact measurement. UNDP supports county offices to analyze conflicts, review existing portfolios and develop new programmes targeting the root causes of the conflicts and/or mitigating conflict drivers.

UNDP also works to support conflict-affected and fragile countries through integrated solutions that address the impacts of the climate emergency on conflict. This is done through UNDP's engagement in the Climate Security Mechanism, together with DPPA UNEP and DPO but also through UNDP's programmatic support to government's work on climate security with emphasis on climate-proofing conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and ensuring that nature, climate and energy efforts not only do no harm, but also contribute positively to peace. Under the Climate Promise, UNDP is on-the-ground in 46 conflict-affected and fragile contexts pursuing work to this end. Climate-induced displacement is also an area where UNDP offer integrated approaches linking human mobility, climate adaptation, urbanization, local development, and conflict lenses.

Respond and recover from crisis

Based on its long history of supporting countries in crisis, UNDP has developed the following crisis response packages that can be deployed quickly during the early phase of a crisis:

- Emergency livelihoods, employment and enterprise recovery projects
- Community infrastructure projects
- Debris management support
- Cash-based interventions

In addition, UNDP provides local governance support during the early phase of a crisis to strengthen the capacity of local authorities to plan, coordinate, and implement early response and recovery programmes. Specific programmatic packages are also developed for disaster recovery.

Incentives for FCS:

Crisis Assessment and Coordination Resources

Resources are primarily used in response to sudden crises but can also support, if justified, responses to escalating situations in protracted crises. They are to be used in conducting or participating in needs assessments (e.g. Multi-Sector Initial Rapid Assessment, Post Disaster Needs Assessment, Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment), coordinating the response, and establishing early recovery frameworks and other tools for recovery planning.

These resources are allocated following the declaration of a crisis (in line with UNDP's Standard Operating Procedure for Crisis Response -SOP) and in situations where the national response capacity and scale warrant financial resources. These resources are not meant to support response to events such as industrial disasters, civil accidents, and security incidents, unless in exceptional circumstances.

Partnership and Cooperation:

[UNDP's Crisis Offer](#) (2022)

UNDP works in close cooperation with the humanitarian system, and across the development, peace and human rights pillars of the UN system – and beyond – to facilitate more joined up common and coherent approaches to address risks on the horizon, prevent development losses in the midst of crisis, and to build more sustainable resilience and stable societies for the future. UNDP advocates for system change and adaptation to address systemic bottlenecks to effective collaboration across the

humanitarian-peace-development nexus. UNDP's external partnerships include bilateral and multilateral partners, international financial institutions, and private sector, civil society and academia. (page 11-12)

UNDP provides support for the MDBs to implement projects in FCS, when MDBs are unable to implement directly through national systems. UNDP also works upstream with MDBs on crisis assessments and planning.

Project suspension and/or cancelation:

UNDP is funded from a variety of partners: Member States, multilateral organizations, non-governmental entities, private and philanthropic sectors, and financing institutions. Donor country governments remain the biggest contributors followed by multilateral partners and programme country governments. UNDP receives its funding through various channels: 1) **Regular resources (core)** are unearmarked funds that are foundational to delivering results across the Strategic Plan. They underpin UNDP's operational capacity, networks and presence at global, regional and country levels, across 170 countries and territories, and enable UNDP to provide on-demand support to Governments as part of the broader UN System. Being the most flexible funding modality, core enables UNDP to lay the foundational work in programme design that will help attract additional funding from other sources. 2) **Other resources** are earmarked funds for specific themes, programmes or projects. They represent a critical complement to the regular resources base. They are channeled to UNDP through Government financing, Thematic Funds, Third-party cost-sharing, UN Pooled Funds, Vertical Funds and Reimbursable support services.

Core funding (TRAC3) resources were established to provide UNDP with the capacity to respond quickly and flexibly to the development needs of countries affected by crisis. TRAC3 is the only core facility of UNDP for immediate action when crisis risks emerge, or when a crisis occurs. It is a demand-driven mechanism which enables the organization, under the leadership of the Crisis Bureau, to quickly bring policy advice, technical expertise, and catalytic programmatic funding to bear at the country level for a comprehensive, coherent response. TRAC3 resources are a catalytic investment which enables to be well positioned, advocate for and influence policies for crisis risk reduction and conflict prevention, and implement quick recovery interventions. It gives UNDP the flexibility to cater to immediate needs; and tackle emerging challenges and opportunities (such as COVID-19).

In crisis contexts and contexts with unconstitutional change of government or internationally contested elections, suspension, pivot or cancelation for donor funded projects will be determined in discussion with donors and in line with the principles of engagement agreed by the UN system. Funding from UNDP core resources that cannot be implemented due to the extra ordinary circumstances can be carried over for the next year in crisis context with the necessary clearances.

Projects in "politically-estranged" situations are implemented directly by UNDP, or via INGOs, NGOs and other UN agencies. In all such occasions UNDP country office will be in the lead as they understand the local situation.

When there is a sudden onset crisis or a "politically-estranged" situation, a Crisis Board, a time bound senior-level decision-making body convenes to declare the crisis level and provide strategic direction to UNDP support for crisis response and recovery programming. Depending on the Level 1, 2 or 3 declaration a suite of support structures kicks in by default to support the Country Offices.

If an unconstitutional change of governments occurs, such as Chad, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Mali, Sudan, and Afghanistan, UNDP tries to stay in countries and deliver programmes using different approaches. In some regions e.g. Africa, based on needs and context, UNDP may take a regional approach e.g. Sahel. The regional approach has also been used in Africa to address other type of crises such as armed conflict and spillover of violent extremism (Horn of Africa, Lake Chad Basin, etc.)

UNDP does not usually suspend all development work in these countries. UNDP assesses the contexts and may suspend certain programmes, pivot existing programmes or develop new context specific programme using existing resources. The approach will depend on countries, leadership and policies. In these cases, there is no direct funding that is channeled to governments, e.g. Myanmar and Afghanistan, and there will not be any projects that can legitimize the government or directly builds its capacity.

Staff safety and security in FCS:

The UNDP's approach to security is aligned with the UN Security Management System (UNSMS) Security Policy Manual (https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/undss-unsms_policy_ebook.pdf).

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

- [Local Governance in Fragile and Conflict-affected Settings: Building a Resilient Foundation for Peace and Development](#) (2016)
- [The Peace Promise](#) (2016)
- [Natural Resource Management in Transition Settings](#) (2013) (through UN Development Group)
- [Strengthening Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Natural Resource Management](#) (2012) (through UN Framework Team on Protective Action)
- [Conflict-related Development Analysis](#) (CDA) (2017)

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

UNDP has a robust set of policy, guidelines and resources that sufficiently guide UNDP's operations/programming in FCVs; however, given the challenges faced at the country level during situations of conflict and fragility, we would welcome conversations with the GEF on the following:

- Flexibility for implementing agencies to apply direct implementation modalities in FCV contexts.
- Options for direct support or enhanced PMC budgets to take into account the additional costs incurred due to enhanced security support, higher operating costs, limited market supply, and etc.
- GEF guidelines on specific funding/programming restrictions put in place by the GEF Secretariat/Council in relation to specific countries and/or contexts.

Annex 11: UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme

Policy:

In its latest [Medium-term Strategy \(2022-2025\)](#), UNEP commits to focusing on the special needs of countries that are vulnerable to or affected by disaster and conflicts, and assisting peacekeeping, humanitarian, and political missions where dedicated responses to environmental dimensions of a crisis are required.

UNEP, as the only subsidiary entity of the UN Secretariat⁸⁹ in the GEF Partnership, provides political and executive direction through relevant Departments to the wider engagement in conflict affected contexts, whether humanitarian or peacekeeping. UNEP mandate complements the work of the UN Secretariat, particularly in addressing the special needs of countries that are vulnerable to or affected by disaster and conflicts. This includes peacekeeping, humanitarian, and political missions where dedicated responses to environmental dimensions of a crisis are required. This function is reflected in UNEP's new [Medium-term Strategy](#), demonstrated through the recent work to assist [Ukraine](#) in recovery from the current conflict, previously in [Iraq](#), and more generally in Somalia on [the state of environment](#) and exploring [adaptive solutions to displacement](#).

Furthermore, UNEP is mandated by its Governing Body through the *United Nations Environment Assembly* to continue providing enhanced assistance to countries affected by armed conflict and countries in post-conflict situations. The resolutions request UNEP to work on pollution threats arising from armed conflict.

- Resolution [UNEP/EA.2/Res.15: 2/15. Protection of the environment in areas affected by armed conflict](#)
- Resolution [UNEP/EA.3/Res.1: 3/1. Pollution mitigation and control in areas affected by armed conflict or terrorism](#)

The following guidelines covering operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations have been developed by UNEP, in consultation or jointly with UN entities and other partners:

- Guidance Note and Tools to [Address Climate-Related Security Risks](#) (UNEP, EU, adelphi) (2022)
- [Integrated Analysis Tool](#). Climate, Peace and Security: Understanding Climate-Related Security Risks through and Integrated Lens. (2022)
- [Knowledge Platform on Gender, Natural Resources, Climate, and Peace](#)
- Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on [Climate Change, Peace and Security: Understanding Climate-Related Security Risks through an Integrated Lens](#) (UNEP, UN Women, UNDP, DPPA, UN CC:Learn, adelphi)
- The UN Climate Security Mechanism (in which UNEP partners with the UN Department of Political Affairs, UN Department of Peace Operations and UN Development Programme) has issued a toolbox on understanding and addressing climate-related security risks. Links are below in English, French and Spanish:
 - Overview ([en/fr/sp](#))
 - Briefing note on climate security ([en/fr/sp](#))
 - Conceptual approach to risk assessments ([en/fr/sp](#))

⁸⁹ As per ST/SGB/1997/5, sect. 3

- Relevant data sources ([en/fr/sp](#))
- Checklist to help climate-proof political analysis ([en/fr/sp](#))

Applicability of policy:

GEF projects are integrated into UNEP’s Programme of Work and Medium Term Strategy and are subject to the established procedures and policies where applicable.

Staff safety and security in FCS:

Policies of the wider UN Secretariat:

- [Policy for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence \(CRSV\)](#): The Policy institutionalizes the role and approach of Field Missions in preventing and responding to conflict-related sexual violence and articulates the roles and responsibility of Heads of Missions and of the different mission components in implementing this CRSV mandate, with the support of Senior/Women’s Protection Advisers (S/WPAs).
- [Handbook for United Nations Field Missions on Preventing and Responding to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence](#): The Handbook is a practical guide to support the implementation of mandates to prevent and respond to conflict-related sexual violence by Field Missions. It aims to provide guidance and recommendations to civilian, military, and police components of Field Missions and increase their capacity to prevent and respond to conflict-related sexual violence.
- The Department of Operational Support (DOS) supports peace operations in achieving by 2023 the [DOS Environment Strategy for Field Missions](#) with a vision for minimum risk, maximum efficiency and leaving a positive legacy. In phase 2 efforts focus on further mainstreaming to demonstrate significant improvements in the reduction of each mission's environmental footprint. The [2019 Progress so far](#) and the [2020 Environmental Good Practices](#) also provide valuable information.
- Department of Peacekeeping Operations - Department of Field Support issued a practice note on the [community engagement](#) within the context of peacekeeping within conflict affected contexts.
- United Nations Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support issued a study that touches upon state authority. The study is: [“Presence, Capacity and Legitimacy: Implementing Extension of State Authority Mandates in Peacekeeping”](#)

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

- [Natural Resource Management in Transition Settings](#) (2013) (through UN Development Group)
- [Strengthening Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Natural Resource Management](#) (2012) (through UN Framework Team on Protective Action)
- [Integrating Environment in Post-Conflict Needs Assessment: UNEP Guidance Note](#) (2009)

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

UNEP has already developed extensive guidance on operating in fragile and conflict-affected situations.

To ensure consistent integration by GEF project managers of such guidance and tools on fragile and conflict-affected situations, UNEP recommends that:

- i) the GEF should include specific questions about these issues at the project design phase, to ensure that all project managers have considered and costed them in project design;
- ii) the GEF should require projects that will be implemented in fragile/conflict contexts to include dedicated capacity to monitor conflict-related risks during project implementation period, and to advise on appropriate adjustments as necessary. The GEF/STAP independent evaluation found that GEF-supported projects should be designed to “adapt to rapid and substantial changes common in fragile and conflict-affected situations.” Dedicated capacity is required to assess, design and implement such adjustments during the project cycle.
- iii) the GEF should consider policy exemptions for programming in FCS to include flexibility, amongst others towards the cancellation policy, co-financing requirements, and PMC (10% at least).

Annex 12: WB – World Bank

Policy:

Two policies are particularly relevant in FCV situations: (i) the recently updated [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence \(or FCV Policy\) \(formerly OP 2.30\)](#); and [Operational Policy \(OP 7.30\) on Dealings with De Facto Governments](#).

- o [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)

The FCV Policy provides the framework for the WB's engagements across a spectrum of FCV situation and countries. It updates former Operational Policy 2.30 on Development Cooperation and Conflict, which was issued in January 2001 after IDA and IBRD's Executive Directors approved the policy's content in October 2000. The WB's strategic and operational engagements in FCV settings have transformed since OP 2.30 was issued in 2001, from the initial focus on post-conflict reconstruction, to address a range of development priorities and challenges posed by fragility, conflict, and violence.

The FCV Policy lays out the core legal and policy principles for Bank involvement in these settings. It reiterates the importance of the Bank's development mandate and the political prohibitions. It also clarifies the framework for Bank engagement in humanitarian crises and emergencies, forced displacement and with the security sector. Together with OP 8.00 (*Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies*), the principles embedded in the FCV Policy can guide the Bank's response to crisis and emergency situations in FCV and non-FCV contexts.

The FCV Policy highlights that the Bank's assistance must be backed by strong country ownership. It states that the Bank's intervention in a member country may take place at the request of the government in power. If more than one government asserts power, the FCV Policy requires the Bank to observe OP 7.30. The FCV Policy authorizes Bank assistance for countries with no government in power upon requests from the international community as properly represented, e.g., by the United Nations. Executive Directors approve assistance in response to such requests.

- [OP 7.30 - Dealings with De Facto Governments \(together with is accompanying Bank Procedure – BP 7.30\)](#)

OP 7.30 provides an operational policy framework for the Bank's response to the emergence of a de-facto government in a member country. A de facto government comes into, or remains in, power by means not provided for in the country's constitution, such as a coup d'état, revolution, usurpation, abrogation or suspension of the constitution. OP 7.30 prescribes principles and procedures to assess whether the Bank may continue making disbursements under existing operations or provide new financings to a country with a de facto government.

Other Relevant Policies

Besides the FCV Policy and OP/BO 7.30, the Bank's decisions are also guided by the Environmental and Social Framework and other policies such as the relevant instrument-specific lending policies, financial and trust fund policies, fiduciary policies and procedures such as those relating to financial management, anti-corruption, procurement, and anti-money laundering/countering the financing of terrorism.

- [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#) (2020)

In February 2020, Executive Directors discussed the *World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence* (the “FCV Strategy”). The FCV Strategy provides an operational framework for tailored support to countries facing diverse challenges and lists specific implementation measures to more effectively support countries impacted by fragility, conflict, and violence. A key objective of the FCV Strategy is to enhance the Bank’s operational and development effectiveness on the ground in FCV situations. It commits the Bank to update Operational Policy 2.30 (*Development Cooperation and Conflict*) and, in particular, to articulate how the Bank will operate in humanitarian crises, in refugee and forced displacement situations, and when dealing with security and military actors, particularly in insecure environments.

The framework to deliver on the FCV Strategy comprises four Guiding Principles and four Pillars of Engagement. The *Guiding Principles* are (i) Differentiation; (ii) Inclusion; (iii) Legitimacy and accountability; and (iv) Growing private sector solutions for impact. The *Pillars of Engagement* are (1) Preventing violent conflict and interpersonal violence; (2) Remaining engaged during crisis situations and active conflicts; (3) Helping countries transition out of fragility; and (4) Mitigating the spillovers of FCV. Critically, FCV risks are interrelated and mutually reinforcing and cut across each of the four pillars of engagement.

The four Guiding Principles set out in the FCV Strategy have informed and are captured in the [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#), as described below.

(a) *Differentiation*. The Policy highlights the need for a differentiated approach to tailor Bank assistance to specific country contexts and most effectively support the needs of clients impacted by diverse FCV challenges (see paragraphs 2, 4, 6, and 7).

(b) *Inclusion*. In line with the FCV Strategy’s focus on a people-centered approach, the Policy emphasizes the importance of inclusion and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups and individuals (this is particularly noted in paragraphs 2, 7, and 10).

(c) *Legitimacy, transparency, and accountability*. The importance of building government capacity and strengthening national systems and institutions is a core part of the Bank’s comparative advantage and engagement in FCV settings, as reflected throughout the Policy (this is particularly noted in paragraphs 2, 7, 8, and 9).

(d) *Scaling up private sector solutions for impact*. Partnering with, and supporting, the private sector, is critical in FCV contexts. To this end, the Policy specifically highlights the importance of the private sector in the section on Cooperation, Partnerships and Engagements (paragraph 17(b)).

Applicability of policy:

The policies and strategy are applicable to the GEF investments.

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

The term “FCV” refers to the challenges of fragility, conflict and violence. “Fragility” refers to situations of deep governance issues and state institutional weakness; “conflict” refers to situations of active conflict; and “violence” refers to situations of high levels of interpersonal and gang violence. These

challenges may impact a country regardless of whether it is listed in the Bank’s classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations or other lists. Under the new strategy, the identification of FCV situations is on a case-by-case basis.

The primary purpose of the “Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS)” classification is to ensure that the WBG’s strategic and programmatic focus in countries affected by FCS-related issues is adapted and tailored to the diverse challenges faced by these countries.

The FCS List for FY23 includes 37 countries and the West Bank and Gaza. To capture the differentiated nature of fragility and conflict, the classification is based on methodologies that distinguish countries in the following categories:

- Countries with high levels of institutional and social fragility, identified based on public indicators that measure the quality of policy and institutions as well as specific manifestations of fragility.
- Countries affected by violent conflict, identified based on a threshold number of conflict-related deaths relative to the population.

Countries with high institutional and social fragility include a range of countries that are facing deep institutional crises, that have very poor transparency and government accountability, or that have weak institutional capacity. These issues are sometimes compounded by threats posed by climate change (for example, for some small Pacific Islands states).

- Fragile countries are defined as:
 - (i) those with one or more of the following: (a) the weakest institutional and policy environment, based on a revised, harmonized the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) score for IDA countries (for which CPIA scores are disclosed) that is below 3.0; or (b) the presence of a UN peacekeeping operation because this reflects a decision by the international community that a significant investment is needed to maintain peace and stability there; or (c) flight across borders of 2,000 or more per 100,000 population, who are internationally regarded as refugees in need of international protection, as this signals a major political or security crisis; and
 - (ii) those that are not in conflict (see methodology below), as such countries have gone beyond fragility.

Sources of data for the CPIA are the World Bank, the African Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank; the UN Department of Peace Operations (UNOP) for the presence of peacekeeping missions; and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for a number of refugees.

Countries in conflict are identified based on the number of conflict deaths in absolute terms and relative to their population.

- Countries in conflict are defined as:
 - (i) those with (a) an absolute number of conflict deaths above 250 according to the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) and 150 according to the Uppsala

- Conflict Data Program (UCDP); and (b) above 2 per 100,000 population according to ACLED and above 1 according to UCDP; or
- (ii) countries with a rapid deterioration of the security situation, as measured by (a) an absolute number of conflict deaths above 250 according to ACLED and 150 according to UCDP; (b) a lower number of conflict deaths relative to the population between 1 and 2 (ACLED) and 0.5 and 1 (UCDP) and (c) more than a doubling of the number of casualties in the last year.

The sources of data for conflict deaths are ACLED and UCDP. To maximize the robustness of the classification, a country will be included in a certain category only if it meets threshold criteria in both databases.

FCS risk assessment:

- [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)

In line with the FCV Strategy and IDA19 commitments, the Bank has adopted Risk and Resilience Assessments (“RRAs”) as an input into the country engagement cycle in FCV-affected countries, and the use of conflict-sensitive approaches in the design of operations in paragraph 6 of the Policy. Management has also issued a methodology to guide Bank staff in preparing RRAs. This methodology, like other staff guidance, is expected to be revised on an ongoing basis to reflect lessons learned and the changing context.

Paragraph 7 of the Policy explains that the Bank deploys appropriate analytical and diagnostic tools and undertakes relevant assessments (which include RRAs), including in partnership with other actors, to inform country diagnostics and country partnership frameworks and an understanding of the project context to design FCV-sensitive operations to help address the key drivers of fragility and mitigate associated risks and enhance resilience and coping capacities. Mitigating risks includes avoiding risks of Bank engagements exacerbating drivers of fragility or weakening resilience.

Operational Flexibilities

- [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)

The Bank designs and adjusts its assistance in an agile and dynamic manner, differentiating its approaches to best respond to the needs and circumstances of each FCV situation. To this end, the Bank utilizes the options embedded in policies that underpin the Bank’s response in the FCV context. (para 4)

Incentives for FCS operation:

- [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)
- Exceptional Financial Assistance: To help member countries experiencing fragility, conflict, violence, or any spillover effects, like forced displacement, the Bank may provide such countries with exceptional financial assistance under specific terms and conditions. Any such assistance must be consistent with the Bank’s financial policies and its preferred creditor status, and it should be consistent with the principles of burden sharing. (para 19)

Partnership and cooperation:

- o [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)

Cooperation, Partnerships, and Engagements (Paras. 17-18). The Policy provides that in FCV situations, besides working with governmental authorities and agencies, the Bank engages, within its mandate, with: (a) bilateral and multilateral agencies, particularly international and regional institutions, notably the United Nations, that have distinct, but complementary, responsibilities for peacemaking, peacekeeping and security, humanitarian assistance, and reconstruction and development; and (b) civil society, non-governmental organizations, and private sector entities that have common concerns, including supporting inclusion and private sector engagement.

Under the [World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2050](#), WB operates in humanitarian crises such as forced displacement and security issues, and engagement with civil society on the grounds. UN Agencies have been engaged in projects located in FCV countries with high-risk environments, assisting projects in very limited circumstances, namely where the Bank has no presence on the ground, or in situations of acute crisis or emergency. Direct operational engagement occurs through a direct grant agreement between the WB and UN agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNOPS, WFP and WHO) whose engagement is underpinned by the full application of WB operational policies, with certain fiduciary flexibilities applied, with respect to procurement, financial management and integrity matters (i.e., Anti-Corruption Guidelines, Anti-Corruption Guidelines, waiver is normally required as the Agency’s system is used, supplemented by specific reporting requirements -- agreed between the Integrity Vice Presidency (INT) and the individual Agencies -- on allegations of fraud and corruption as well as results of investigations). WB sets up in March 2020 an Operational Framework Agreement (OFA) to implement projects in FCV through the ICRC. Save the Children, as an INGO, was engaged on an ad hoc basis and subjected to the WB regular due diligence to assess capacity to implement project.

Transparency and communication:

- o [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)
“Legitimacy, transparency, and accountability” is one of the Guiding Principles set out in the FCV strategy. Security sector engagement risk assessment will particularly consider track record and accountability mechanism including a number of other factors, such as the relevant institution or agency’s purpose and function, capabilities, the strength of oversight arrangements, the presence of partners with relevant technical competence and expertise, and the risks of diversion for political or other nondevelopment objectives. (para 16)

Staff safety and security in FCS:

All World Bank Group (WBG) security management-related Directives, Procedures and Guidance are restricted under the Bank’s information classification system and should not be distributed outside of the WBG. The Bank’s approach to security is aligned with the UN Security Management System (UNSMS) Security Policy Manual (https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/undss-unsms_policy_ebook.pdf).

Project suspension and/or cancelation:

- o [Bank Policy: Development Cooperation and Fragility, Conflict and Violence](#) (2021)

Where the Bank seeks to reengage in an FCV situation or where its assistance is no longer possible in accordance with the country partnership framework due to fragility, conflict, or violence, the Bank may initiate a watching brief in order to develop an understanding of the situation's context, dynamics, needs, and institutions to position the Bank to resume support or operations when conditions permit. This activity normally involves consultations with the Bank's partners. (para 5)

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

o [A Practical Handbook for Environmental Regulations and Legislators Working in Situations Affected by Fragility, Conflict, and Extreme Violence \(FCV\)](#) (2018)

This handbook is intended as a handy toolkit with practical tips that are borne out of experiences garnered from years of working in FCS, including post-conflict situations. This handbook is the product of a workshop held in June 2014 with about 25 environmental regulators from over 10 FCV-affected countries (Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, and Sudan) that was financed by the Korean Trust Fund (KTF) and organized and hosted by the World Bank Group (WBG). The structure of this handbook was conceived during extensive discussions towards the end of the workshop and seen as a 'road map' towards the best chance for environmental regulators to make a difference in practice.

o [Strategic Environmental Assessment: Capacity Building in Conflict-Affected Countries](#) (2005) (with Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment)

The paper focuses on questions such as: what should be the purpose of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and when to apply it? How to undertake an SEA most effectively in those situations; is it different from emerging good practice in non-conflict situations? How to build capacity for an SEA in conflict-affected countries: what are priorities and where to start?

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

No.

Annex 13: WWF-US – World Wildlife Fund-US

Policy:

WWF designed its systems to working in places that have institutional/governance fragility. WWF escalates this due diligence around the countries/situations with the highest level of fragility and/or conflict. For example, WWF Network has set up a Conservation Quality Committee (CQC) that has terms of reference and operating procedures around ensuring the thorough review and assessment of projects that are identified as being implemented in high-risk situations (“Special Consideration” countries) and/or that project activities are inherently higher risk.

Applicability of policy:

These due diligence systems apply to all WWF project, including GEF projects, that are implemented in “Special Consideration” countries where WWF works.

Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:

WWF US’s Special Consideration countries are based on the World Bank list of countries in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations.

Good practices guide, tools, lessons learned, and training:

[The Trampled Grass: Mitigating the impacts of armed conflict on the environment \(2001\)](#)

This publication is based on the results of the Biodiversity Support Program’s Armed Conflict and the Environment (ACE) Project, which reviewed negative impacts of armed conflict on the environment in Africa and analyzed a wide range of practical experiences in reducing these impacts before, during, and after conflict. The recommendations in this guide aim to help natural resource managers, conservation practitioners, policy makers, and donors better prepare for conflicts before they occur, cope with them while they are occurring, and recover from them after they are over.

Need for additional guidance from GEF in FCS:

From WWF’s perspective, it would be most helpful, where we are developing and implementing projects in FCV situation, if the GEF would ensure there is ample time and space to properly work through risk screening, stakeholder engagement, and mitigation planning based on potential concerns for accessibility to communities affected by project activities; for thorough assessment of the context including assessing the conflict sensitivities and risks; for personal security of project development teams and other stakeholders, etc. In addition, facilitating cross-learning from agencies on best practices and lessons in working in FCV situations, would certainly be a helpful use of GEF resources.

Annex 14: CIF – Climate Investment Funds

Policy:

CIF relies on the 6 CIF's implementing entities', namely AfDB, ADB, EBRD, IDB and WB Group including International Finance Corporation, policies to manage FCV situations and associated risks. Their policies and guidelines are available on their respective websites.

Annex 15: GCF - Green Climate Fund

Policy:

GCF uses the IFC Performance Standards as the interim ESS standards and cover fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS) issues, including but not limited to Performance Standard 4 (Community Health, Safety, and Security), and all relevant guidance notes. GCF does not have a specific policy/guidance on FCS.

GCF is drafting its new ESS standards, but these are not published yet. GCF expects the draft to be published in 2023 for Board consultation. The draft places more emphasis on the need for conflict sensitivity assessment.