

## COMMENTS ON STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES OF SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE UNIT (SECU/OAI)

Section and ¶ # / General	Comments	Submitted By (Name/Organization)	Response
<b>INTRODUCTORY REMARKS</b>			
General	<p>Our comments are based on the best practice principles of accessibility, fairness, transparency, effectiveness, independence, and professionalism. UNDP’s April 2012 Proposal for Environmental and Social Compliance Review and Grievance Processes (“Proposal”) rightly states that these principles “should be used as a benchmark for measuring the establishment, implementation, and evaluation of UNDP’s compliance review process.” Our comments also draw on our experience directly supporting communities around the world to use accountability mechanisms to uphold environmental and human rights.</p> <p>We appreciate UNDP’s incorporation into the Draft SOPs of a number of our comments on the Proposal in our letter dated June 18, 2012 to UNDP (“2012 Comments Letter”). However, some aspects of the Draft SOPs still need to be improved in order to satisfy the best practice principles. We also note that the Draft SOPs apply only to the interim phase of the UNDP compliance review mechanism, and that UNDP may be developing further operating procedures. This letter first makes recommendations on specific aspects of the Draft SOPs, before setting out our concerns about transparency and consultativeness in the process of developing the compliance review mechanism.</p>	<p>Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs – <b>See Annex I below</b>)</p>	<p>UNDP has determined that these SOPs will apply when the SES come into force (planned date: 31 December 2014). Until then, the SOPs will apply to projects for which UNDP has committed to providing a compliance review process for social and environmental commitments made by UNDP in the context of the specific funding programme or project.</p>
General	<p>The emergence of strong social &amp; environmental quality standards and affiliated mechanisms to ensure highest quality in UNDP programming is an excellent development and the team should be commended for the excellent draft. The pilot introduction of the Social &amp; Environmental Screening process within POPP since 2012 revealed good lessons from RBx and COs applying such frameworks and any challenges or successes from the Arab region could be registered. The emergence of the new Social &amp; Environmental Compliance Unit within OAI is a good addition to ensure an effective accountability mechanism for application of the new standards during the SP period. In addition to ensuring prevention of social &amp; environmental problems arising from UNDP programme activities, as noted in the documents the approach also entails review of positive opportunities for addressing social &amp; environmental issues within programme design and thus is an important mechanism for achieving more integrated cross-thematic programming.</p>	<p>Kishan Khoday, UNDP</p>	<p>We agree.</p>

	It will be important to address the new tools and processes into regional and country programming with RSCs playing an important role in terms of application of the new system within support to CO project design and broader support for UNDAF/CPD processes.		
General	I fear that the UNDP is following the same path as other international institutions, who copy from each other the same model of conciliation and compliance review for the Accountability Mechanisms (AM) without obtaining the expected results: (a) the institutions do not learn from their past mistakes; (b) the grievance mechanisms do not help the complainants.	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	We believe it is important to learn lessons from other compliance review approaches of international organizations, and we've sought to incorporate key lessons into the design of the SECU. For example, one lesson learned from experiences of the Inspection Panel is that implementation of the Action Plan in response to Panel findings is not always robust. The SECU is able to monitor compliance with the action plan to ensure responsiveness to community concerns. Also, unlike several other mechanisms, the SECU can make recommendations to the Administrator of UNDP in response to a complaint, and can play an advisory role to assist UNDP in avoiding systemic issues that are of concern to communities and present problems for projects.
General	<p><u>How Should the UNDP Accountability Sector Be Seen</u></p> <p>The UNDP Accountability Mechanism, as both a recourse mechanism and an institutional learning tool, should be seen as one of the most important instruments for the defense of communities in areas of UNDP-financed projects, and for the protection of the image and the reputation of the Institution in the eyes of the international community.</p> <p>If there is a complaint by the communities, who claim they are harmed by a project financed by UNDP, it is a duty to identify whether it has any responsibility for the impact and, if so, take two important steps: attempt to mediate the conflict and identify the cause of it, through the compliance review process. The first is an attitude of social responsibility. The second shows that the UNDP adopts the principle of transparency and try to learn from past mistakes, so that they do not happen again in the future.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	We agree.
<b>STRUCTURE</b>			

Section 5	Consider adding a multi-stakeholder "commission" on a project-by-project basis which could potentially also serve as a project-level grievance mechanism.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	<p>UNDP has committed the following through its Social and Environmental Standards:</p> <p><i>UNDP will ensure that an effective project-level grievance mechanism is available, scaled appropriately to the nature of the activity and its potential risks and impacts. The mandate and functions of a project-level grievance mechanism could be executed by the Project Board, or through an Implementing Partner's existing grievance mechanism or procedures. Where needed, UNDP and Implementing Partners will strengthen the Implementing Partners' capacities to address project-related grievances. In addition, UNDP's Stakeholder Response Mechanism will be available to project stakeholders as a supplemental means of redress for concerns that have not been resolved through standard project management procedures.</i></p>
Section 7	Consider also including a process for a project-level grievance mechanism so that there is a locally-accessible link into UNDP--can be less formal to make it more accessible	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	Agree – as noted above.
<b>DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE OR GRIEVANCE</b>			
General	<p><u>Conciliation Process Together With The Compliance Review?</u></p> <p>One aspect that I believe would help UNDP is the convenience to perform the conciliation process together with the compliance review process, although by two different teams. The rationale is as follows: (a) AM should only conciliate conflicts in which UNDP may be liable for acts or omissions in relation to its operational policies, (b) who determines if there was action or omission, is the Compliance Review phase; (c) if the AM determines that the complaint is not of responsibility of UNDP, the conciliation process should be discontinued, saving time and money for the Institution, (d) if UNDP has responsibility for the social or environmental impact, the personal experience of the members of the AM may help mediate the conflict, accelerating and reducing the costs of the process, which will benefit the image of UNDP.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	Agree. That is what we have created in the Stakeholder Response Mechanism to be administered separately from but in coordination with the SECU.
Section 3, para. 1	No mention of ombudsman option, especially for preliminary efforts at negotiation/mediation.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law	Note that the Stakeholder Response Mechanism (with an ombudsman-like function) will be created separately.

		Class	
<b>ENSURING ACCESSIBILITY</b>			
General	The Draft SOPs incorporate many of the recommendations in our 2012 Comments Letter on the accessibility of the compliance review function. For example, they rightly clarify that complaints may be submitted by those <i>potentially</i> affected, and base eligibility determinations on whether there potentially are policy violations as opposed to direct harm. We have the following further recommendations on how the SOPs may improve accessibility.	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	We appreciate your input in 2012.
Section 8.2	<p><i>Compliance review should be available to address past violations after UNDP involvement has ended</i></p> <p>Under the exclusion criteria listed in Section 8.2 of the Draft SOPs, complaints made after UNDP’s role has ended and where its role can no longer be considered a cause of the concerns raised will be found ineligible. However, this provision may be interpreted to exclude complaints made after UNDP’s role in a project or programme has ended but raises issues that were caused or facilitated by UNDP’s past involvement. Complaints brought after UNDP support has ended concerning past policy violations should be allowed. There is no principled or practical rationale for cutting off UNDP’s accountability for past policy violations whenever UNDP ceases its involvement in a project. UNDP would benefit from the chance for institutional learning and to prevent future mistakes and abuses.<sup>2</sup> The eligibility of a complaint for compliance review should therefore be left open-ended. In response to public comments on the UNDP grievance mechanism, UNDP has stated that they intend “to allow access to the compliance and grievance mechanisms as long as impacts can be fairly and reasonably traced to UNDP’s involvement. ... Rather than fixing a formal deadline for complaints tied to financial criteria, <i>UNDP is proposing that complaints may be brought at any time</i>, so long as the alleged impacts can plausibly be attributed to UNDP supported activities (and in the case of the compliance function, impacts could plausibly be attributed to violations of UNDP policies).”<sup>3</sup> (Emphasis added.) Leaving eligibility open for past violations is consistent with this statement by UNDP.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Available compliance options include measures geared toward institutional learning and prevention of future recurrences, e.g. “public disclosure of non-compliance,” “UNDP-wide recommendations for improving implementation,” and “[c]ondition[ing] future UNDP participation in a project or programme on compliance with UNDP ___policies,” Draft SOPs, section 10, p. 10.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> UNDP, <i>Comments on Proposed UNDP Accountability Mechanism and UNDP Responses</i> (comments from Global Consultation held April to July 2012), p. 23 (hereinafter, “UNDP Responses to Comments”).</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised as follows: “When UNDP’s support has ended, but impacts can be fairly and reasonably traced to UNDP’s involvement, the SECU will accept complaints that are likely to provide institutional learning, prevent future mistakes and abuses, or support resolution of concerns of communities.” For the SRM, the following requests would be excluded, “projects where UNDP’s role has ended and UNDP has no feasible pathway to address the requestor’s concerns.”
General	<p><i>SECU should broadly interpret the causal link between the UNDP’s support and alleged impact in assessing eligibility</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs are unclear about the connection required between UNDP’s</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to reflect UNDP’s earlier stated intention to interpret eligibility broadly while ensuring that a plausible causal link exists

	<p>involvement in a project or programme and adverse impacts for a complaint to be eligible.</p> <p>The Draft SOPs suggest that a causal relationship is required between the UNDP’s involvement and alleged impact, but this must be clarified in order to ensure that it is not be interpreted too narrowly. 4 The Draft UNDP Social and Environmental Standards require that due diligence includes “direct, indirect, cumulative, and induced impacts,” and it should be clear that the scope of the SECU also extends beyond directly caused impacts.5 We commend the UNDP’s commitment to broadly interpret eligibility criteria to ensure accessibility, and we encourage that to be clearly stated in the SOPs.</p> <p>4 Certain factors suggest that UNDP will require a causal relationship between its involvement and the adverse impact for a complaint to be eligible. According to UNDP, “[i]t is UNDP’s intention to interpret eligibility broadly to ensure the mechanism is accessible to all stakeholders potentially affected by UNDP-supported projects, with the understanding that there must be a plausible causal relationship between UNDP’s involvement and the risk of potential harm to some person or group.” See UNDP Responses to Comments, p. 22. Also, section 7 of the Draft SOPs provides that, in relation to reporting potential violations, reports should describe adverse impacts “that may be caused” by the UNDP-supported activity.</p> <p>5 This requirement is for projects that are determined to be high risk. UNDP, <i>Social and Environmental Standards, Draft for Public Comment</i> (March 3, 2014), para. 36.</p>	orgs)	between UNDP’s involvement and the risk of potential harm. As the comment points out, there is a case for interpreting the provision more broadly in cases of high risk and in order to ensure general access to the SECU.
General	<p><i>A re-filed complaint should be allowed when remedying past eligibility shortcomings</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs allow for a complaint to be filed again when raising the same issues as a prior complaint only when there is significant new information or there has been significant change in circumstances. However, significant information or change is not defined. A new complaint raising the same issues as a prior complaint should be eligible if additional information helps overcome a prior ineligibility finding. This may not be “significant” new information, but important for the viability of the complaint, and should be considered sufficient to find a re-filed complaint eligible.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to reflect that any information that changes the determination on eligibility can be considered significant.
Section 8.4	<p><i>SECU procedures should be strengthened to ensure complainants’ informed decision about compliance review and dispute resolution</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs rightly allow complainants to choose whether to proceed with compliance review, dispute resolution, or both. However, they do not clearly require SECU to ensure complainants are adequately informed about these options.6 The potential for complainants to be confused is greater with the UNDP grievance mechanisms than other similar mechanisms at other institutions, as the two functions are housed in different UNDP organizational units. Although</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to ensure that the Complainants are fully informed of their choices.

	<p>UNDP has proposed that SECU will give all complainants information about both processes, and a proposed course of action that will help them make an informed choice about which process to undergo,<sup>7</sup> the language of the Draft SOPs does not clearly reflect this proposal.</p> <p>6 Draft SOPs, section 8.4, makes it only discretionary for SECU to provide information to the Complainant about “the potential for” either compliance review, dispute resolution, or both.</p> <p>7 UNDP Responses to Comments, p. 13.</p>		
Section 8.5	<p><i>Potential complainants and informants, including non-UNDP staff, should be able to consult with the Ethics Office, including prior to filing a complaint</i></p> <p>The inclusion of provisions to protect complainants against retaliation for complaints is critical for ensuring accessibility to the mechanism. Although Section 8.5 provides for persons who have reported allegations of UNDP non-compliance or cooperated with an investigation to seek protection against retaliation from the Ethics Office, the Ethics Office and the Policy for Protection against Retaliation it applies are intended to protect UNDP staff, interns, and volunteers. We ask UNDP to clarify how Section 8.5 will be amended to protect non-UNDP staff complainants using or considering using the UNDP grievance mechanism. If it applies only to UNDP staff, UNDP should enact the necessary policies and procedures to expand the provision’s protection to non-UNDP staff who submit complaints, report on possible UNDP non-compliance, or cooperate in SECU investigations.</p> <p>In addition, the current language in Section 8.5 only protects those who have already reported non-compliance issues or cooperated with an investigation, and not those who are too afraid or intimidated to raise their voices. The provision should be extended to those who are considering reporting issues of non-compliance and fear retaliation or retribution, so that they can consult the Director of the Ethics Office to better understand their options prior to filing a complaint.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to clarify that the Ethics Office is accessible to UNDP staff only. The provision for confidentiality often provides protection for complainants worried about retribution, however we understand the need for other measures to protect against retribution when confidentiality is not likely to be effective. We will identify additional measures available to non-UNDP staff through the OAI.
General, Section 7	<p><i>SECU should clarify that affected persons may participate in SECU-initiated compliance investigations</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs do not consider the interaction between affected persons and investigations triggered on SECU’s own initiative.<sup>8</sup> SECU-initiated compliance investigations should not be conducted in isolation from the public; as recognized by UNDP, environmental and social compliance has a public orientation.<sup>9</sup> The SOPs should require SECU to inform affected persons about compliance investigations it initiates, and allow them to participate in a manner similar to</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Agree in general. The SOPs are revised to ensure that affected people will be consulted and involved to the extent that they are comfortable doing so. That may be important, since a typical reason for SECU initiating a compliance review is that the local affected people are unable to do so safely.

	<p>complainants, as long as affected people are not placed in danger. If non-compliance is found and mitigation measures are put in place, procedures should be created to ensure all affected people receive compensation for harm. The SOPs for SECU-initiated investigations should, similar to the Draft SOPs, include provisions for making draft terms of reference and reports public, and for interested parties to comment on these documents.10 SECU should also consider referring affected persons in a SECU triggered investigation to dispute resolution.</p> <p>8 Draft SOPs, section 7, provides for compliance investigations to be triggered on SECU’s own initiative by the Lead Compliance Officer, or at the request of the UNDP Administrator. 9 Proposal, p. 4.</p> <p>10 These provisions include Draft SOPs, sections 8.3, 9.1, and 9.2.</p>		
General, Section 3	<p><i>SECU outreach to affected people should be done in coordination with the Dispute Resolution Support Office</i></p> <p>Outreach will be essential to promote affected peoples’ access to and use of SECU, and we commend the use of various modes of informing people about the mechanism.11 Joint outreach by SECU and the Dispute Resolution Support Office, or dispute resolution staff at the country level, will be important to ensure that affected people are aware of both functions available to them prior to filing a complaint. Joint outreach should not only be done via both offices’ websites, but also in print directly to UNDP-supported project and programme affected people. Outreach coordination will ensure that resources are not being duplicated, and that information about how the mechanisms relate to each other is not confusing.</p> <p>11 Draft SOPs, section 3.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Agree. The SOPs are revised to reflect this more clearly, and steps have been undertaken in communications and outreach planning to ensure such coordination occurs.
Page 7, para. 8.2. Page 9, para. 9.2	<p>“This determination is made in accordance with the likelihood that the UNDP-supported project has violated UNDP social and environmental commitments.” - Experience at the Panel has shown that harm can occur even in case of compliance. By limiting the eligibility assessment to likelihood of non-compliance, the process will have the perverse effect of not correcting harms and not informing future operations. I would suggest adding at the end of that sentence: “... or the likelihood that it negatively affected, would affected, the Complainant(s) or groups they represent.”</p>	Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner	Harm in the context of complete compliance would be referred to the Stakeholder Response Mechanism for consideration. Hopefully in that process, there would be lessons learned to improve policies and procedures going forward.
General	<p><u>How High Should Be The Bar For The Community To Complain To UNDP</u></p> <p>Some communities complain that the process to file a complaint to the international organization is very complicated. UNDP should make this process simpler, but with sufficient safeguards to prevent frivolous complaints, requests containing personal interest (not related to the community), or related to corruption, a matter outside the scope of the AM.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	Agree.
Section 4, para. 3	<p>Many communities do not have web access. If there is a project-based grievance mechanism, task that with disseminating information about the project and grievance procedures.</p>	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law’s Global Administrative Law	Agree. The SOPs will reflect this. Excellent suggestion that will be included in operational plans.

		Class	
Section 7, para. 1, word 13	Consider changing "potentially" to "likely."	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	We think 'potentially' better serves the purpose of reducing potential harms and risks than the word 'likely.'
<b>ENSURING A FAIR OUTCOME</b>			
General	<p><i>SECU procedures should allow complainants to amend their complaints during the compliance review</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs do not stipulate procedures by which complainants can amend their complaints, allege new violations, or provide additional information or evidence.<sup>12</sup> Allowing amendments will make the process more flexible, fair, and accessible to all complainants who need to initiate a process while collecting data or information to support their claims, and to those who discover new information or experience new harm after filing a complaint. Doing so shows sensitivity to the circumstantial, resource, and capacity constraints commonly faced by many complainants. Amendment procedures should also allow the terms of reference for the investigation to reflect any new allegations and evidence submitted during the eligibility assessment phase.</p> <p><sup>12</sup> The Draft SOPs therefore fail to implement the UNDP's statement that "[c]omplainants are always free to provide new evidence in an ongoing compliance (sic), and/or file an additional or new complaint based on new evidence" and that the specific modalities for doing so "will be developed as part of the operating procedures for the mechanism." UNDP Responses to Comments, p. 23.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Since complainants can file additional information about the alleged compliance violation, part of this comment is addressed. To file an amendment with regard to a different policy would effectively "start the clock" over again, and complainants need to realize that. The SOPs are revised to reflect that complaints can be amended, but if new policy violations are identified the clock likely will be restarted.
Section 9.1	<p><i>Where comments from complainants and the public conflict, complainants' views should be given priority</i></p> <p>We commend the Draft SOPs for opening the compliance review process to participation not just from complainants, but also the public, thereby allowing public oversight to serve as a check on the process. There may however be situations where the views and interests of the public conflict with those of the complainants. In such situations, the views and interests of the complainants should be given priority in a particular investigation, as they are the ones directly impacted by the process.</p> <p><sup>13</sup> Draft SOPs, section 9.1, provides that after SECU issues a draft compliance review report to OAI Director, it will "subsequently be released to UNDP staff, the Complainants, and the public."</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	It isn't clear what "giving priority" means in this situation. The compliance review process is guided by a fact-finding process, and those facts will be given priority, from whatever source.
General	<p><i>SECU procedures for conducting interviews with complainants and project affected persons need to be more sensitive to their context and difficulties</i></p> <p>The SOP on Interview Guidelines issued in May 2013 by the Office of Audit and Investigation ("OAI") Director ("SOP on Interview Guidelines"), prescribes a formal procedure for conducting witness interviews with, among others, complainants and other victims of the alleged violations. However, it does not</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Agree. Appropriate additions to the SOP are provided.



	<p>contain adequate provisions to ensure that complainants and other project-affected persons are fully informed and able to meaningfully participate in such interviews.</p> <p>Affected persons may come from vulnerable backgrounds and may be unfamiliar with or intimidated by the interview process. The SOP on Interview Guidelines should be revised to better account for their needs and interests. It should provide affected persons with advanced notice and full information disclosure prior to the interview. As being interviewed alone may be intimidating or culturally inappropriate depending on how it is conducted, complainants should be allowed to request an observer of their choosing.<sup>14</sup> The interviewee should also be given the opportunity to privately reject any proposed observer.</p> <p>Where interpretation is required for the interview, key nuances may get lost in translation resulting in misunderstandings, especially where local dialects are involved. We suggest that affected persons be allowed to choose to have their interviews recorded for the purpose of ensuring that misunderstandings arising from interpretation issues may be subsequently clarified.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>14 This would strengthen the existing provision that “[c]ompliance Officers may on their own initiative, or for any other reason, invite an observer to attend the interview if after considering the cultural context of the interview they conclude that the observer’s presence is in the best interest of the investigation.” SOP on Interview Guidelines, para. 14.</p> <p>15 SOP on Interview Guidelines, para. 11 (“Audio or video recording of witness interviews shall be limited to exceptional cases, after consultation with the Lead Compliance Officer (for example, where there is limited time and the issues covered are highly specialised or complex and it may therefore be useful to be able to review the recording).”)</p>		
General	<p><i>SECU should ensure that complaints can be made in, and that all documents are translated to, the complainants’ language</i></p> <p>While the SOP on Intake of Complaints and Eligibility Assessment (“Intake SOP”) mentions that intake systems will accommodate complaints in multiple languages, it does not specify which ones. It is important that the SOPs officially recognize that complainants can submit complaints in their local language. Furthermore, the Draft SOPs do not discuss translation of documents, including the draft and final terms of reference and compliance review reports. Without translation of all documents, it will be impossible for affected communities to meaningfully participate in the SECU process. The SOPs should state that all important documents, particularly those available for public comment, be translated into the local language.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SECU will accept complaints in any languages. To the extent translation support is difficult to locate, the entire compliance review process may be delayed, and complainants will need to recognize the tradeoffs involved. The SOPs are revised to reflect this.
Page 3, para. 1	<p>“... the circumstances of a particular investigation may affect the application of the Guidelines.” - I am always worried with statements that can be interpreted in so many directions. It might be of interest to add an assurance that “... particular investigation may affect the application of the Guidelines, in the interest of a fair</p>	Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner	The SOPs are revised to add the suggested phrase.

	process to the complainants.”		
Page 4, para. 1	“SECU employs the preponderance of evidence, ... impartial mind to one side of the issue rather than the other.” - This is an important principle. I would keep it as is. I would just add in plain English that “In other words, SECU gathers all evidence and will assess it fairly and impartially regardless of how many times a fact is stated or may seem convincing.	Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner	Agree. That provision is modified.
Page 19, SOP para. 7	I would not invite interviews to sign. It is intimidating. I would just invite them to comment and record if no comments were provided.	Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner	Agree. That provision is modified.
Section 10.3, para. 1	This only works if there are significant ongoing disbursements pending. Please specify alternative options if all/most funds have already been disbursed. For example, UNDP could require a "compliance bond" to be posted at the outset of any funded activity, where those funds would be utilized only in the event of non-compliance.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law’s Global Administrative Law Class	This is an interesting idea, but cannot be implemented at the present time.
<b>MAINTAINING TRANSPARENCY</b>			
General, Section 8	<p><i>All complaints should be registered</i></p> <p>Although the Proposal provides that all complaints received will be registered,<sup>16</sup> the Draft SOPs provide that SECU will register the Complaint only “if appropriate.”<sup>17</sup> The Draft SOPs do not elaborate on what the appropriate circumstances are. It is also unclear if complaints will be registered when SECU “can immediately determine that the Complaint is ineligible.”<sup>18</sup></p> <p>The Draft SOPs should be revised to provide for the registration of all complaints. Automatic and mandatory registration of complaints aids the mechanism’s transparency and credibility; the ability of the public to see what is <i>not</i> eligible may be equally important as being able to follow eligible cases. Without registration and a formal determination of ineligibility, there is no transparency with which to evaluate whether the PCM is operating according to its rules.</p> <p>16 Proposal, p. 15 (“Within five business days of receiving a complaint for compliance review, the OAI compliance officer will register the complaint and acknowledge receipt of the complaint to the complainant. This is mainly an administrative step.”).</p> <p>17 Draft SOPs, section 8.</p> <p>18 Draft SOPs, section 8 (“If SECU can immediately determine that the Complaint is ineligible, it will notify the Complainant in writing.”).</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to clarify that all complaints that are not excluded from UNDP’s Compliance Review Process (Note the Exclusions section of the proposal) will be registered. As with all mechanisms, if a complaint has been sent to the wrong office, it should be redirected, rather than registered.
General	<p><i>Complaints should be made public only after determining whether complainants are requesting confidentiality</i></p> <p>The Intake SOP states that during the registration phase, a complaint will be listed on the SECU website registry. However, there is no indication of when the contents of the complaint will be made public, if at all. We recommend that, after consulting with complainants about whether they want to keep their identities</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The intention of the SOP is to determine the question of confidentiality before publishing the contents of the complaint. The SOPs are revised to reflect this comment.

	confidential, SECU should either publish the complaint, or in cases where that is not possible, a summary of the complaint should be published on the registry.		
Section 8.2	<p><i>Complainants should be allowed to comment on eligibility assessment reports</i></p> <p>We commend the inclusion of provisions in the Draft SOPs requiring SECU to give complainants and other interested persons the opportunity to comment on draft terms of reference for the investigation and draft compliance review reports. However, it does not do the same for eligibility assessment reports. Given that an ineligibility determination terminates complainants’ access to SECU at an early stage, caution is required during this stage to ensure that meritorious grievances are not denied consideration. Moreover, the Draft SOPs set out eligibility criteria that could be contentious.<sup>19</sup> To further strengthen transparency and enable a thorough decision-making process, the Draft SOPs should allow complainants to comment on draft eligibility assessment reports.</p> <p>19 Draft SOPs, section 8.2. Examples of criteria that are not straightforward to apply include whether a complaint is filed fraudulently or for a malicious purpose, and whether new information or change in circumstances is significant enough to merit another compliance review notwithstanding an earlier complaint on the same issues.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Disagree. Providing that extra step of consultation would further delay the process.
Section 9.2	<p><i>The review of compliance review reports by the Director of the OAI should be more transparent and participatory</i></p> <p>Although complainants and other interested parties have the opportunity to comment on draft compliance review reports, the Draft SOPs do not require their comments to be submitted to the Director of the OAI for review or made public with the final compliance review report. To continue the participatory approach taken by the Draft SOPs, SECU should submit all comments to the Director of the OAI together with the final compliance review report. Under the Draft SOPs, the OAI Director implicitly has the discretion to make amendments to compliance review reports.<sup>20</sup> The SOPs should be amended to require SECU to inform complainants of any substantive amendments made by the Director, and allow them to comment on the same.</p> <p>20 Draft SOPs, section 9.2 (The Director, OAI, will review and submit the report to the UNDP Administrator with a copy sent to the requesters and released to the public.”).</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Agree with the first part of the comment. The Director of OAI will receive all input from complainants and the public. The SOPs are revised to reflect that. Disagree with the second part of the comment, since the review by the Director of OAI will occur before public release and in the context of overseeing the SECU in OAI.
Section 9.3	<p><i>UNDP should give reasons for adopting compliance measures that deviate from those recommended in the compliance review reports</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs implicitly give the UNDP Administrator the discretion to deviate from compliance measures recommended in SECU’s final compliance review report. <sup>21</sup> For transparency and accountability, reasons should be given for any such deviations.</p> <p>21 Draft SOPs, section 9.3 (“... the UNDP Administrator will make a final decision regarding what steps, if any,</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Disagree. Any differences between the recommendations of the SECU final report and the Administrator’s decision will be evident in the public record. The Administrator has no obligation to make public her reasons for the decision.

	UNDP will take to bring the project or programme into compliance and/or mitigate any harm to the complainants.”).		
Section 10.3	<p><i>SECU should inform and consult complainants or other affected persons when recommending interim measures</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs do not provide for complainant participation or consultation in determining the interim measures for addressing significant, irreversible harm to complainants or other affected people.<sup>22</sup> For transparency and accountability, the SOPs should require SECU to inform and consult complainants or other affected persons in formulating recommendations for such interim measures. Complainants and other affected persons are often the best placed to give insights on the appropriateness of proposed measures and their foreseeable consequences.</p> <p>22 Draft SOPs, section 10.3 (“Notwithstanding the procedures set forth above, if at any time after receiving a Complaint the Lead Compliance Officer believes significant, irreversible harm to the Complainants or other affected people is imminent, the Lead Compliance Officer may recommend to the Administrator that UNDP take interim measures pending completion of compliance review.”).</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to reflect that the Lead Compliance Officer will endeavor to consult potentially affected people, depending on time and related constraints. A formal consultation process could easily delay the process of implementing interim measures with tragic consequences. It can be expected that any such recommendations by the Lead Compliance Officer would reflect discussions with the affected people.
Section 10.2	<p><i>SECU’s advisory function needs to be more transparent</i></p> <p>The Draft SOPs indicate that only advisory notes that raise complex issues will be released for public comment.<sup>23</sup> UNDP has also stated that whether advisory notes are publicly released immediately will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the compliance officer in charge, as “there may be rare instances where immediate public release of the advice may undermine the ability to make systemic reforms.”<sup>24</sup> We ask UNDP to clarify the circumstances where advisory notes will not be released for public comment, and where immediate public release would undermine the ability to make systemic reforms.</p> <p>23 Draft SOPs, section 10.2. 24 UNDP Responses to Comments, p. 32.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	The SOPs are revised to reflect a presumption that advisory notes will be released. Not having any experience with Advisory Notes, it is difficult to be more specific. Once there is experience with such a function, there will be grounds for being more transparent about how it will work.
General	<p><i>All comments from complainants submitted during the compliance review process should be made public</i></p> <p>In the interest of transparency, all comments submitted by complainants in the course of a compliance review process should, with their consent, be made public on SECU’s website. This will enable the public to have a fair and balanced understanding of UNDP and the SECU’s performance.</p>	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Many of the comments provided by affected people and complainants during a compliance review are provided confidentially and/or informally, and it would be inappropriate for much of that information to be made public. If it is included in the report, or is the basis for findings and recommendations, then it will be made available to the public to inform everyone about the process of carrying out the compliance review. The SOPs are revised to reflect that the SECU will endeavor to make public key comments submitted by complainants during the review process, to the extent appropriate.
Page 5,	“In furtherance of disclosure... A link to an external page to file a Complaint	Serge Selwan, Accountability	Agree. Provision is deleted.

para. 4	operated by an independent third party.” - I frankly don't understand the message here: independent from SECU or independent from UNDP. This language is sending a concerning message to the public, while in the same time sending an assuring one. Are you saying, in short, that Complaints might disappear or that SECU may not be fully trustworthy?	Practitioner	
Section 1	Include an annual or periodic update/revision these guidelines to reflect continuing best practices	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	A review will be conducted in 2016 after a year of implementation. The review will include an internal and external consultation process and the Guidelines will be revised accordingly.
Section 8	Consider not making a complaint public until deemed eligible.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	The language on this issue has been clarified in the SOP.
Section 9.1, para. 1	What is the role of the public in the commenting process?	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	The public can provide input to the SECU at any time in response to the draft final report, etc.
Section 10, para. 1	"Options" is a difficult word here. It creates uncertainty and inconsistency whether public disclosure will necessarily occur in the case of non-compliance.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	Not intended. Public disclosure will occur, and the language of the SOP is revised to reflect that.
<b>ENSURING EFFECTIVENESS</b>			
Section 9.2	<i>OAI Director should be given a defined time period to review the compliance review report</i> The Draft SOPs generally encourage expeditious handling of complaints by prescribing time limits at most stages of the compliance review process. However, the review of the final compliance review report by the Director of the OAI has no prescribed time limit. <sup>25</sup> Allowing open-ended procedural steps may cause unnecessary delays while harm continues on the ground. The SOPs should accordingly prescribe a time limit for the OAI Director's review.  25 Draft SOPs, section 9.2.	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Agree. The SOPs are revised to reflect that the OAI Director will review the report within ten working days, but that if there are exigent circumstances or reasons for delay, then this step might take longer.
Section 9.3 and Section 10	<i>UNDP should establish a compensation fund</i> We greatly welcome the provision in the Draft SOPs for mitigation of harm, restoration of complainants to a pre-harm state as a compliance option, and defined consequences for violating UNDP's social and environmental policies. <sup>26</sup> However, mitigation of harm and restoration of complainants should not be contingent on the availability of financial resources. <sup>27</sup> Where a UNDP-supported project or programme has caused or contributed to harm, compensation is an obligation, and not a matter of convenience or chance. We recommend that UNDP establish a compensation fund in cases that warrant mitigation of harm or the restoration of complainants.	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	Not feasible at this time.

	<p>26 Draft SOPs, sections 9.3 and 10.</p> <p>27 Draft SOPs, section 10, provides that the UNDP Administrator may decide “to ___restore claimants to a pre-harm state, in collaboration with the implementing partner, ___where the circumstances and financial resources allow for it.”</p>		
<p>Section 1, SOP on Proactive Investigation para. 3</p>	<p><i>SECU should have the authority to initiate thematic or sectoral compliance reviews</i></p> <p>In addition to the UNDP Administrator and Lead Compliance Officer having the ability to initiate compliance review processes in specific cases, they should also be allowed to initiate thematic or sectoral compliance reviews when concerns arise about structural social and environmental non-compliance within a certain group of UNDP-supported projects or programmes. The current definition of “proactive investigation” does not restrict a broad investigation into a group of projects or programmes, but this power should be made more explicit in procedures.<sup>28</sup> Thematic or sectoral compliance reviews will support SECU in fulfilling its purpose to “protect locally-affected communities and, in particular, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups,” by ensuring that structural issues in UNDP projects and programmes are not causing harm,<sup>29</sup> and are consistent with the <i>Charter of the Office of Audit and Investigations</i>.<sup>30</sup></p> <p>28 SOP on Proactive Investigations, para. 3.</p> <p>29 Draft SOPs, section 1.</p> <p>30 Draft SOPs, section 1, which defines a compliance investigation as “A systematic, documented process of objectively obtaining and evaluating evidence to determine whether UNDP-supported activities are in conformance with applicable UNDP social and environmental norms.”</p>	<p>Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)</p>	<p>This comment blurs the boundary between SECU and the office of evaluation. We believe it is better to remain single project-focused for the time being. This proposal might be considered at a later date. Additionally, the Advisory function allows consideration of structural or systematic issues of concern, including issues that are specific to certain sectors or themes.</p>
<p>Page 4, para. 2 and Page 9, para. 9.2</p>	<p>“... an effective system of independently and objectively investigating...” - This is all good! But you need to guarantee the independent ‘reporting’. Paragraph 9.2 requires “The Director, OAI, will review and submit the report to the UNDP Administrator.” No timetable is provided and no limitation on the depth of the review process. This is worrisome and exposes SECU to an added review process beyond the public one. I would suggest removing “will review and”, adding a timetable to submit SECU’s report to the Administrator (“the next say”). I would also inserted that “SECU will issue PUBLICLY to the Director, OAI...”. This would be a public disclosure that the report left SECU.</p>	<p>Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner</p>	<p>Disagree. By virtue of being located in OAI, the draft SECU report to Complainants and Management (para 9.1) as well as the final report from SECU to the Administrator (para. 9.2) necessarily require the review of the OAI Director as the overseer of SECU. The review will not compromise the functional independence of the SECU compliance review process. The language of the SOP is revised to make para 9.1 and 9.2 consistent in providing for the review role of the OAI Director prior to issuance to external stakeholders, Management, or the Administrator.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p><u>Accountability Mechanism x Managers and Board</u></p> <p>In some institutions Accountability Mechanism (AM) is in constant conflict with the managers and the Board. The AM is seen as a sector whose only function is to show that the manager and the Board failed in applying the Institution's</p>	<p>Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB</p>	<p>We appreciate your thoughts, and suggest that SECU intends to function in ways that increase perceptions that accountability through SECU is useful for all.</p>

	<p>operational policies. In other words, the Panel is seen as just a punitive sector, blaming sectors of the Institution for all non-compliances. This conflict hinders one of the task of the AM, to bring learning from past errors.</p> <p>The AM should not be seen as the Inquisition, nor as a prosecutor of charge, but as a source of appeasement and wisdom. My view is that when the AM, the managers and the Board work together, the winners are the Institution, the host country and the communities in the areas of influence of the projects financed.</p> <p>My suggestion is that the UNDP should be innovative, and change the way the AM and the rest of the institution shall relate.</p>		
General	<p><u>Accountability Mechanism &amp; Managers Working Together</u></p> <p>In most institutions, the managers of the projects see the AM as a threat to their job, as a sector whose only function is to show that the manager failed in applying the Institution's operational policies. This makes the managers refuse, on purpose or unconsciously, to cooperate with the AM. As a consequence, the Institution loses a valuable opportunity to identify gaps in their projects, and to prevent the same problems from recurring in future projects.</p> <p>When a non-compliance is due to lack of emphasis of the institution's policies and safeguards on some potential environmental and social impacts, the best solution for the benefit of the Institution, the communities involved and the project host country is the AM and managers work together issuing a document addressed to the Board suggesting that the operational policy in question, be amended to include well-defined instructions on how to deal with the impact that resulted in non-compliance.</p> <p>I don't see this possibility in the UNDP documents.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	The SOPs include measures to receive and incorporate feedback from UNDP staff and managers.
General	<p><u>When a Non-Compliance is Due to the Executing Agency</u></p> <p>When the executing agency does not properly execute the Social and Environmental Management Plan, the Institution's reputation is stained on the internet due to the denounces of the communities. Often, the management team does not know the problem, because the monitoring is periodic, or it has no strength or power to make the agency correct the impact. Formally, this fact appears as a non-compliance, opposing the AM and the management team.</p> <p>In this case, the project manager cannot be blamed for the fact. The non-compliance was caused by an external agent, and the AM can help resolve the conflict notifying the Board of the Bank, and communicating to the executing agency that the continuity of the offense may cause interruption of the works. In general, this warning of the AM works, helping to solve the complaint and the non-conformity. But the AM must be authorized to do so.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	The SECU is not designed to apportion "blame," but rather intends to assist the UNDP in keeping the projects it finances in compliance with UNDP policies and procedures.
General	<p><u>The Power of UNDP on the Executing Agency</u></p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at	The SOPs indicate a wide array of measures the UNDP Administrator can take to address project-

	<p>UNDP, in general, has the role of an implementing agency. The executing agency is a local organ, on which, not always UNDP has a power of interference. And, sometimes, it is the executing agency failures that lead to complaints from the residents of the project area.</p> <p>I was not able to easily identify in the attached documents, a clear power of UNDP to demand from the executing agency the stopping of the project and the refund of all monies received in the case of a serious non-compliance with the UNDP's policies, standards and guidelines</p> <p>The lack of this power by the UNDP is a big cause of suffering of the complainants, because the executor agency, knowing that the interruption of a project is a very complicated and very time consuming process continues to run without attending to complaints from the public . To prove this, just get on the internet, put the name of an environmentally contentious project and see how long the population is suffering.</p> <p>My conclusion is that this lack of power of the UNDP, common to the accountability mechanism of other organisms, may be a factor that will hinder or delay the resolution of environmental and social impacts.</p>	IADB	related concerns.
Section 3, para. 1	Also, add a mandate to compile and distribute to UNDP staff on an organization-wide basis periodic assessment/recommendations for best practices distilled from the cases it handled in the past.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	There will be opportunities to accomplish this in the Annual Report as well as through the new Advisory function.
Section 9.1, para. 1	This clause should clarify <i>when</i> the draft compliance review report will be public with respect to information shared prior to a final decision.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	The SOPs are revised to reflect that the draft will be shared when the compliance review team has finished its report, subject to revisions after public review.
Section 10.1, para. 1	This frequency—annually—is too low. Also, the non-complying party should bear the costs of an on-site inspector/monitor until all issues have been remedied	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	The SOPs are revised to reflect that the annual frequency is only a guideline. If the situation demands more frequent monitoring, the SECU can do that. Because the only compliance being reviewed by SECU is that of UNDP with its policies and procedures, the cost issue is inherently an issue for UNDP to settle.
Section 10.3, para. 1	Consider immediately deploying a field team on site for (a) verification/assessment and (b) so that such a recommendation is not at the sole discretion of one individual.	Kristin Hite, on behalf of U of Maryland School of Law's Global Administrative Law Class	The SOPs are revised to reflect that the SECU can deploy a field team. The decision to recommend Interim Measures to the Administrator is formally reserved to the Lead Compliance Officer.
<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>			
General	<u>Interference With Proceedings in Judicial Courts or Political Processes</u>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at	Not applicable to SECU's SOPs.



	<p>One source of criticism of the AM’s Rules and Procedures of some international institutions is the paragraph that states that neither the conciliation phase nor the compliance review phase will be applied to Requests that raise issues under arbitration or judicial review by national, supranational or similar bodies. The same exclusion applies if the presence of AM can interfere with political processes in the country.</p> <p>According to human rights defenders, that paragraph violates the rights of injured persons to resort to the judiciary for protection of their rights and, at the same time, request the Institution to interfere to solve the social or environmental impact.</p> <p>One proposed solution is to continue with the process of conciliation or compliance review, but to keep the results restricted to the internal scope of the Institution as classified, until the triggering event of potential ineligibility is ended.</p> <p>A justification for this solution is that, if there is no action of AM, the Institution will lose the opportunity to learn a lesson that will prevent the resurgence of the same problem in future projects.</p>	IADB	
--	---	------	--

**OUTREACH**

General	<p>One of the points that should be explored in the review of the AM Operating Rules and Procedures is the diffusion of its existence for the population of the regions where there are projects financed by UNDP. Especially in Africa, where internet communications in rural areas are almost nonexistent.</p> <p>My personal experience in Central and South America and Africa showed that the best place to spread the existence and activities of the UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism is the schools of the communities that are affected positively or negatively by the project financed by the UNDP. In general, the parents have little formal education. But children have a higher degree of education and take home all the information passed on by the staff of UNDP or the executing agency, including how to communicate with UNDP in the case of a negative impact. This is also a way to increase the environmental awareness of children.</p>	Mario Epstein, Member of Compliance Review Panel at IADB	The SOPs are revised to reflect this possibility.
---------	--	--	---

**DEFINITIONS AND MISSING ELEMENTS**

Page 7, para. 8.1	There’s a typo, last word on second line and first word on third should be connected to read “allege”.	Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner	Corrected.
-------------------	--	---	------------

**TIMEFRAME / PILOT PHASE**

General	The interim compliance review and grievance process should be transparent and accountable. We ask UNDP to clarify the development and status of the compliance review and grievance process, and any subsequent stages of mechanism development. UNDP should also provide for an easily accessible	Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)	These SOPs will apply when UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards come into force (planned date: 31 December 2014). Before this date, the procedures will apply to projects for
---------	--	--	--

	<p>online platform for the public to view information on cases that have gone through the interim process. UNDP should ensure that the public has the opportunity to participate at all stages of development.</p>		<p>which UNDP has committed to providing a compliance review process for social and environmental commitments made by UNDP in the context of the specific funding programme or project.</p> <p>Until December 31, UNDP will be building staff capacity and understanding related to the mechanism and implementation of the standards.</p> <p>A website will be launched to ensure public awareness and information of all cases.</p>
General	<p>The timelines and implementation plan for the development of the compliance review mechanism need to be more clearly defined and transparent. The Draft SOPs include four different related SOPs issued in May 2013. The public is only now able to comment on these SOPs, though it is unclear if they are already in effect and if there are other SOPs that have been developed. UNDP should make public all SOPs related to the compliance review mechanism, any plans to develop additional SOPs, and timelines for public comment and implementation.</p>	<p>Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)</p>	<p>See comment above.</p> <p>The public will be provided ample notice of the actual launch of the mechanism.</p> <p>A review will be conducted in 2016 after a year of implementation. The review will include an internal and external consultation process and the Guidelines will be revised accordingly.</p>
General	<p>As having clear and certain procedural rules ensures fairness, the Draft SOPs should not be mere guidelines. Even though they apply only to the interim phase of UNDP compliance review mechanism, changes to the Draft SOPs should be made at a systemic level rather than on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis, and in a transparent, consultative, and accountable manner.</p>	<p>Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)</p>	<p>Agreed, see comment above.</p>
Page 3, para. 1	<p>“The procedures described by the Guidelines are intended to apply to the interim phase ...” - Since the limitation is stated in the Guidelines, it would be just as appropriate to state the timeframe through which the Guidelines will cover all UNDP activities. If not known, stating the process and timetable to establish whether the coverage of these Guidelines will be expanded to all UNDP activities will be of interest.</p>	<p>Serge Selwan, Accountability Practitioner</p>	<p>These procedures will apply when UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards come into force (planned date: 31 December 2014). Before this date, the procedures will apply to projects for which UNDP has committed to providing a compliance review process for social and environmental commitments made by UNDP in the context of the specific funding programme or project.</p>
<b>CONCLUDING REMARKS – CONTINUING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>			
General	<p>We appreciate this opportunity to comment on UNDP’s Draft SOPs. We invite members of UNDP working on this initiative to contact us with any questions regarding our comments. We look forward to continued communication in the creation of the UNDP Environmental and Social Compliance Review and Grievance Processes.</p>	<p>Komala Ramachandra, Accountability Counsel (and signed by 26 civil society orgs)</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>

**ANNEX I: List of Signatories to Comments Submitted by Accountability Counsel**

<p>Komala Ramachandra Accountability Counsel, USA</p> <p>Okereke Chinwike African Law Foundation (AFRILAW), Nigeria</p> <p>Manu Shrivastava Beyond Copenhagen Collective, India</p> <p>Sharad Joshi Centre for Community Economics and Development Consultants Society (CECOEDECON), India</p> <p>Antonio Gambini Centre national de coopération au développement, CNCN-11.11.11, Belgium</p> <p>Md Shamsuddoha Center for Participatory Research and Development (CPRD), Bangladesh</p> <p>Kingsley Ozegbe Centre for Socio Economic Development (CSED), Nigeria</p> <p>Reinford Mwangonde Citizens for Justice (CFJ), Malawi</p> <p>Sukhyun T. Park Citizens' Institute for Environmental Studies, South Korean</p> <p>Laura Ceresna Cividep, India</p> <p>Patrick Chiekwe Foundation for the Conservation of the Earth (FOCONE), Nigeria</p> <p>Michelle Chan Friends of the Earth, USA</p> <p>Edem Okon Edem Green Concern for Development (GREENCODE), Nigeria</p> <p>Teklemariam Berhane Woldegebriel Human Rights Council (HRCO), Ethiopia</p>	<p>Natalie Bugalski Inclusive Development International, USA</p> <p>Maurice Ouma Odhiambo Jamaa Resource Initiatives, Kenya</p> <p>Emem B. Okon Kebetkache Women Development Resource Centre, Nigeria</p> <p>Ayodele Akele Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre, Nigeria</p> <p>Shankar Limbu Lawyers Association for Human Rights of Nepalese Indigenous Peoples (LAHURNIP), Nepal</p> <p>Doug Norlen Pacific Environment, USA</p> <p>Sukhgerel Dugersuren OT Watch, Mongolia</p> <p>Rivers without Boundaries, Mongolia</p> <p>Umo Okoh Peace Point Action (PPA), Nigeria</p> <p>Pastor Philip Kalio Support Initiative for Sustainable Development, Nigeria</p> <p>Roht-Arriaza, Naomi Distinguished Professor of Law University of California, Hastings College of Law, USA (Affiliation for identification purposes only)</p> <p>Knud Vöcking Urgewald, Germany</p> <p>Caroline Emmanunel Women Environment and Development Network (WEDEN), Nigeria</p>
---	---