



مؤسسة نهر الأردن  
Jordan River Foundation

## JORDAN RIVER FOUNDATION

### STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS & DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

### ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ESMS)

### POLICY

SPDPD\_POL02

Revision History		
Date of Revision	Version	Summary of Revision

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	1
<b>Glossary</b>	3
<b>1. Introduction</b>	4
1.1. Objectives and Purpose of the ESMS	4
<b>2. Environmental and Social Policy Statement</b>	5
2.1. Institutional Commitments	5
2.2. International Commitments	6
2.3. Alignment with Other JRF Policies and Procedures	7
<b>3. Environmental &amp; Social Safeguards Principles</b>	8
3.1. E&S Safeguards Policy Implementation	9
3.1.1. Scope	9
3.1.2. Screening and Categorization	9
3.1.3. Environmental and Social Assessment and Management Plans	10
3.1.4. Public Consultation	10
3.1.5. Transparency and Information Disclosure	10
3.1.6. Roles and Responsibilities	10
3.1.7. Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, and Reporting	12
3.2. Feedback, Complaints, and Response [Grievance] Mechanism	14
3.2.1. Changes to JRF's ESMS	15
<b>Annex I: Environmental and Social Exclusion List</b>	16
<b>Annex II: Environmental and Social Screening Tool</b>	17
<b>Annex III: E&amp;S Report Template</b>	1
<b>Annex IV: E&amp;S Safeguarding – Position TOR</b>	2
<b>Annex V: Project Level Grievance Mechanism Guidance</b>	5

## Glossary

**Affected Communities:** Local communities directly affected by JRF supported projects.

**ESMS (Environmental and Social Management System):** Establishes environmental and social policies, safeguard principles, and institutional arrangements for implementation.

**E&S (Environmental and Social) Policy:** Outlines institutional commitments to environmental and social safety standards.

**ESS (Environmental and Social Safeguards):** Policies to ensure adverse environmental and social impacts are avoided or, when avoidable, minimized and appropriately mitigated in project planning.

**GCF (Green Climate Fund):** The UN-established fund that finances projects to assist developing countries with climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies.

**IFC (International Finance Corporation):** A World Bank Group institution focused on engaging the private sector for development.

**SDG (Sustainable Development Goals):** 17 goals established by UN member states in 2015 to make progress towards eradicating poverty and tackling climate change by 2030.

**UN Global Compact:** A series of UN-facilitated, voluntary private sector commitments to get companies to adopt sustainable and socially responsible practices.

# 1. Introduction

The Jordan River Foundation (JRF) is a Jordanian non-profit, non-governmental organization established in 1995 with a focus on child safety and community empowerment. JRF's core mission is to engage Jordanians to realize their full economic potential and overcome social challenges. In achieving that mission, JRF is committed to the principles set out under the UN's Global Compact and working towards the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

While the Jordanian government has an extensive web of laws and regulations pertaining to environmental protection and management, JRF is committed to implementing its own internal policy and system to meet international standards.<sup>1</sup> The following Environmental and Social Management Strategy (ESMS) establishes JRF's Environmental and Social (E&S) policy, safeguard principles, and institutional arrangements for implementation. The E&S policy was officially approved on X December 2024 and will be periodically reviewed and updated. The ESMS is designed to ensure JRF operates in compliance with its E&S Policy through appropriate actions and procedures. Its purpose is to support JRF and its staff to ensure the avoidance or minimization and management of potential negative environmental and social impacts of its work while also looking to maximize the environmental and social benefits.

## 1.1. Objectives and Purpose of the ESMS

The ESMS has been designed to provide guidance for the management, oversight, and implementation of E&S-related components of anticipated and/or ongoing projects funded by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) or other multilateral or bilateral donors as applicable. The management system outlined includes:

- JRF's Environmental and Social commitments and policy
- Steps for screening, assessment, monitoring and evaluation, public consultation, and disclosure pertaining to JRF's project-level E&S commitments
- The roles and responsibilities of staff members for JRF's E&S commitments to ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability

---

<sup>1</sup> The main Jordanian national law related to environmental protection is the Law of Environmental Protection, No. 52 of 2006, went into effect Oct. 16, 2006. As per the law, the Ministry of Environment (MoEnv) is responsible for setting Jordan's environmental protection policy, monitoring activities, coordinating national efforts for environmental protection, and preparing environmental contingency plans.

## 2. Environmental and Social Policy Statement

JRF is committed to ensuring its programs and its implementing partners' programs avoid adverse environmental and social impacts or, when unavoidable, minimize and appropriately mitigate and/or compensate for adverse impacts. The Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) policy is adopted to ensure organizational compliance with this commitment. This policy builds upon JRF's existing commitments to protect vulnerable groups and the environment through all stages of JRF's programming. <sup>2</sup> JRF's other ethical commitments are detailed in the Code of Ethics.

### 2.1. Institutional Commitments

A key principle of JRF's ESS policy is to prevent, minimize, and mitigate any harm to the environment and people by incorporating environmental and social concerns throughout the project cycle. The ESS policy applies to all stages of the project cycle from design to implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

In accordance with JRF's commitments to environmental protection and stewardship, to fulfill this commitment through a series of concrete actions (see table 1).

Table 1. Commitment Actions

Commitment Segment	Actions
<b>Communication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication of the E&amp;S policy to all employees</li> <li>• Continuous dialogue with stakeholders on E&amp;S matters and performance</li> <li>• Investment in E&amp;S training and awareness</li> </ul>
<b>Conservation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of the efficient use of energy, water, and natural resources, within JRF, with our partners, collaborators, contractors and subcontractors and in communities where we operate.</li> <li>• Reduction and mitigation of impacts to habitat, wildlife and cultural resources</li> </ul>
<b>Compliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of E&amp;S risks and the undertaking of relevant actions to mitigate those risks</li> <li>• Compliance with all applicable environmental and social laws, regulations, and permits</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> JRF's Code of Ethics includes strong protections through the organization's Child Safeguarding, Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, and Environmental Protection policies. JRF's environmental commitments in their Code of Ethics include safeguarding the environment, striving for the efficient use of resources, minimizing adverse impacts on the environment, and increasing energy efficiency.

As part of this policy, JRF developed organizational processes that ensure continuous environmental and social improvement through:

- I. The establishment of an Environmental and Social management system that includes regular monitoring and periodic progress reports
- II. The reviewing of this policy for updates as required
- III. The incorporation of lessons learned into JRF's Environmental and Social Policy for continuous improvement

To ensure compliance with this policy, JRF's projects will adhere to the objectives and requirements of its E&S Principles (see below) with the purpose of i) strengthening the social and environmental outcomes of projects; ii) avoiding adverse impacts where possible and, where unavoidable, applying the mitigation hierarchy of minimization, mitigation, and compensation/offset; and iii) strengthening JRF and any executing entities' capacity for managing social and environmental risks and impacts. JRF will design and implement projects in a way that avoids the alteration, damage, or removal of any physical cultural resources, cultural sites, and sites with unique natural values recognized as such at the community, national or international level. Projects should also not permanently interfere with existing access and use of such physical and cultural resources.

JRF will ensure that programs are designed and implemented with meaningful community consultation, and that JRF actively engages with potential beneficiaries, government agencies, stakeholders, private sector representatives, financiers, and community leaders and organizers as needed. For more information, please refer to the "Public Consultation" section below.

JRF will also ensure that grievance mechanisms are in place to allow individuals and communities affected by JRF-supported programs to have access to effective mechanisms and procedures for raising concerns about the social and environmental performance of a project.

## 2.2. International Commitments

In addition to JRF's domestic legal commitments, JRF has adopted an Environmental & Social Framework for multilateral and bilateral funded projects in compliance with GCF requirements. JRF's organization-wide E&S policy adheres to the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) E&S performance standards. The focus of this E&S management system is projects funded by the GCF, and as such, the guidelines, procedures, roles and responsibilities outlined herein are applicable to any GCF-funded projects (current or anticipated), and are aligned with the GCF's E&S standards and principles.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> see: [Project safeguards | Green Climate Fund](#) and [Environmental and social policy | Green Climate Fund](#)

## 2.3. Alignment with Other JRF Policies and Procedures

This ESMS and accompanying E&S Policy Statement should be reviewed and assessed in concert with other key JRF policies and procedures, including but not limited to:

- HR Policy
- Gender Policy and Action Plan
- Law of Jordan River Foundation
- Code of Ethics
- Program Development SOPs
- Project Execution SOPs
- Project Monitoring Process SOPs
- Due Diligence for Partners and Grantees
- MEL SOPs
- MEL Policy & Manual
- Grants Management for CBOs
- In-Kind Grants Management to Direct Beneficiaries

### 3.Environmental & Social Safeguards Principles

JRF has adopted IFCs Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability to ensure alignment with international best-practice.<sup>4</sup> The eight performance standards are as follows:

- *Performance Standard 1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts*
- *Performance Standard 2: Labor and Working Conditions*
- *Performance Standard 3: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention*
- *Performance Standard 4: Community Health, Safety, and Security*
- *Performance Standard 5: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement*
- *Performance Standard 6: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources*
- *Performance Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples<sup>5</sup>*
- *Performance Standard 8: Cultural Heritage*

*Performance Standard 1* establishes the importance of (i) integrated assessments to identify the environmental and social impacts, risks, and opportunities of projects; (ii) effective community engagement through disclosure of project-related information and consultation with local communities on matters that directly affect them; and (iii) the management of environmental and social performance throughout the life of the project.

*Performance Standards 2 through 8* establish objectives and requirements to avoid, minimize, and where residual impacts remain, to compensate/offset for risks and impacts to workers, Affected Communities, and the environment. While all relevant environmental and social risks and potential impacts should be considered as part of the assessment, Performance Standards 2 through 8 describe potential environmental and social risks and impacts that require particular attention.

JRF's ESMS has been developed to align with the IFC's performance standards. Per the IFC's standards, an effective ESMS is a dynamic process that involves engagement from JRF management, employees, local communities directly affected by JRF supported projects (the Affected Communities) and, where appropriate, other stakeholders.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> IFC, [Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability](#) (2012), last accessed October 22, 2024.

<sup>5</sup> Jordan does not have indigenous groups in a traditional sense. Minority and indigenous groups include Palestinians, Bedouins of Jordanian origin, Circassians, Armenians, and Bani Murra. In addition, there are significant refugee populations – primarily Palestinian, Syrian, Iraqi, Yemeni, Sudanese, and Somali in origin. (<https://minorityrights.org/country/jordan/>)

<sup>6</sup> Other stakeholders are those not directly affected by the project but that have an interest in it. These could include national and local authorities, neighboring projects, and/or nongovernmental organizations.

## 3.1. E&S Safeguards Policy Implementation

### 3.1.1. Scope

The provisions of this policy are applicable to all GCF-funded projects where JRF is the legally responsible entity for the project, irrespective of the type of project implementation in place or entities involved in its execution. This includes:

- Projects developed and implemented by JRF;
- Projects funded by JRF and implemented through subsidiary organizations;
- Projects developed by donors and other parties and executed by JRF.

It is the duty of all JRF employees and contractors to ensure projects align with JRF's mission, guiding principles, and legal obligations, including its environmental and social policy. See subsection 3.1.6. for specific roles and responsibilities.

### 3.1.2. Screening and Categorization

All JRF projects and executing entities' projects will be screened for E&S risks in line with the principles outlined above. This screening will be conducted at the concept stage to determine a project or program's risk categorization. This exercise is undertaken to determine the nature and extent of potential environmental and social impacts. Each proposed project is scrutinized as to its type, location, scale and sensitivity, and the magnitude of its potential impact. JRF does not and will not support project activities included in the Annex I Exclusion List.

While undertaking the process of assessment and categorization, JRF staff will take into account, as appropriate, existing national standards. Projects will be assessed to be one of the following three categories depending on the significance of the project's potential environmental impact.

- **Category A.** A proposed project is classified as Category A if it is likely to have significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are irreversible, diverse, or unprecedented. These impacts may affect an area larger than the sites or facilities subjected to physical works;
- **Category B.** A proposed project is classified as Category B if its potential adverse environmental and social impacts are less adverse than those of Category A projects. These impacts are site-specific, few if any of them are irreversible and in most cases mitigation measures can be designed more readily than for Category A projects; and
- **Category C.** A proposed project is classified as Category C if it is likely to have minimal or no adverse environmental impacts.

JRF and its executing entities will only implement projects at the Category C level. If projects are assessed to fall into one of the two higher risk categories, JRF will revise the scope of the project to fit a Category C classification. Annex II details JRF's screening process and associated template.

### 3.1.3. Environmental and Social Assessment and Management Plans

JRF will only implement Category C projects. These projects will require a topic specific assessment or a risk/hazard assessment on a case-by-case basis.

### 3.1.4. Public Consultation

JRF will require a meaningful consultation process that: (i) engages with communities, groups or people affected by proposed projects; (ii) begins early and is carried out on an ongoing basis; (iii) provides timely disclosure of relevant and adequate information that is understandable and readily accessible, undertaken in an atmosphere free of intimidation or coercion; (iv) is gender inclusive and responsive, tailored to the needs of vulnerable groups; and (v) enables the incorporation of all relevant views of affected people and other stakeholders into decision making.

### 3.1.5. Transparency and Information Disclosure

JRF is committed to ensuring that environmental and social assessment documents are made available in a timely manner, in an accessible place, and in a form and language understandable to affected people and other stakeholders, including the general public, so they can provide meaningful inputs on project design and implementation. JRF's screening and reports for GCF-funded projects will be linked to the GCF repository on JRF's website.

### 3.1.6. Roles and Responsibilities

Responsibility for adhering to JRF's E&S Policy lies with every JRF staff member and subcontracting organization. The Programs Division Director and Programs Quality and Research Sr. Manager will have supervisory authority in ensuring that elements of this ESMS are adhered to on current or anticipated GCF-funded projects. Additionally, JRF will contract a technical specialist to conduct the ESMS Review and due diligence, and guide E&S monitoring at all stages of the project cycle in close coordination with the Project Manager. See Annex IV for a sample Terms of Reference (TOR) for the ESMS technical specialist.

JRF Project Cycle	ESMS Review Steps	Responsible Party	Involved Parties
<i>Concept Development</i>	Complete Environmental and Social Screening Report	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible) Program Development Department (Accountable)	Projects/ Program Manager (Consulted) Programs Quality & Research Sr. Manager (consulted) Budgeting Manager(consulted) Media & Communications Division (consulted)
<i>Preparation and Appraisal</i>	Project Scoping Study	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible)	Projects/ Program Manager (Consulted) Programs Quality & Research Sr. Manager (consulted)



ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM POLICY

		Program Development Department (Accountable)	Budgeting Manager (consulted)
	Conduct applicable E&S assessment	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible)  MEL Department (Responsible)	Projects/Program Manager (Consulted) Program Development Department (Consulted)
	Public consultation on draft report	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible)  MEL Department (Responsible)	Affected Communities (Consulted) Projects/Program Manager (Consulted) Program Development Manager (Consulted) Programs Director (Informed)
	Appraisal/Approval of Environmental and Social Assessment	Technical Specialist (Responsible) (Responsible)  MEL Department (Responsible)	Projects/Program Manager (Consulted)  Programs Director (Informed)
<i>Final Project Approval in JRF</i>	E&S Clearance	Strategic Partnerships & Development Director (Responsible)  Programs Director (Responsible)	Program Development Department (consulted) Projects/Program Manager (Consulted) Programs Quality & Research Sr. Manager (consulted) Technical Specialist (consulted)
<i>Implementation and Supervision</i>	Implement mitigating measures and monitor progress	Programs Division (Responsible)  MEL Department (Responsible) Technical Specialist (Responsible)	Programs Director (consulted)  Budgeting Manager (consulted)
	Review of monitoring	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible) MEL Department (Responsible)	Programs Quality & Research Senior Manager (Accountable)

<i>Project Completion and Closing</i>	Evaluation of effectiveness of the ESMS implementation	Technical Specialist – Consultant (Responsible)  MEL Department (Responsible)	Programs Director, (Accountable) Project Manager or Executing Entity (Accountable)
---------------------------------------	--	---	---

*Responsible:* Person who completes the task.

*Accountable:* Delegates and reviews the task.

*Consulted:* Provides input and feedback on the task.

*Informed:* Parties informed of progress but not directly involved.

### 3.1.7. Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning, and Reporting

E&S issues will be incorporated into the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of JRF projects and activities. Periodic and annual performance reports and end of project closure reports will include information on E&S risk mitigation measures, and this information will be reported to senior management. The monitoring will achieve the following objectives:

- Verify that the project is implementing the mitigation measures committed to within the project proposal and (if Category A or B) ESMS;
- Assess the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and determine if additional measures are needed to minimize environmental and social impacts; and,
- Inform communication updates (to be prepared and disseminated by the communications team) for affected communities and interested stakeholders.

If necessary, monitoring activities will include suggestions for the development and oversight of corrective actions. Lessons learned through the monitoring and evaluation process will be fed into concept development for future programs to ensure the continuous improvement of JRF's programs.

Below are brief definitions of the types of reports that will incorporate or consist of E&S provisions<sup>7</sup>:

**Environmental and Social Screening Report:** This initial assessment document serves as a critical first step in the ESMS process. It systematically evaluates proposed project activities to identify any potential environmental and social risks or impacts, no matter how minimal. For Category C projects, this report particularly focuses on documenting why impacts are expected to be minimal or negligible. It includes a structured screening against key environmental and social criteria, helping to confirm the Category C classification and identify if any further assessment might be needed. The report typically includes basic project information, screening results, and initial recommendations for risk management.

<sup>7</sup> For more information, please refer to the table in the preceding section.

**Project Scoping Study:** The scoping study defines the parameters and focus areas for any subsequent environmental and social assessment work. For Category C projects, this study is typically brief but important, as it establishes the boundaries of potential impacts and identifies relevant stakeholders. The study outlines which aspects of the project require attention, even if minimal, and helps determine the appropriate level of assessment needed. It provides a clear rationale for focusing on certain areas while explaining why others are not considered significant for the project.

**Environmental and Social Assessment:** For Category C projects, this assessment provides a proportionate analysis of any minor impacts identified during screening and scoping. While less extensive than assessments for higher-risk projects, it still documents potential impacts, however minimal, and proposes appropriate management measures. The assessment includes baseline information about the project area, analysis of potential impacts, and recommendations for managing any minor risks identified.

**Public Consultation Report:** This report documents the stakeholder engagement process, recording how affected communities and other stakeholders were consulted about the project. It captures the methods used for consultation, key discussion points, feedback received, and how this input was considered in project planning. The report should demonstrate inclusive consultation practices, ensuring all relevant groups had opportunities to participate, and document how any concerns raised will be addressed.

**E&S Clearance:** This is a formal approval document that confirms all necessary environmental and social requirements have been met for the project to proceed. For Category C projects, it verifies that the minimal risk nature of the project has been properly documented and that any necessary management measures are in place. The clearance includes confirmation that appropriate screening and assessment have been completed and that stakeholder engagement requirements have been fulfilled.

**Progress Monitoring Reports:** These regular reports track the implementation of any environmental and social management measures during project execution. For Category C projects, they provide proportionate monitoring of minimal impacts and verification that activities remain within the expected low-risk profile. The reports include updates on any management measures implemented, stakeholder engagement activities conducted, and any new issues or concerns that may have emerged.

**ESMS Implementation Evaluation:** This final report provides a comprehensive assessment of how environmental and social aspects were managed throughout the project cycle. It evaluates the effectiveness of the ESMS process for the specific project, assessing whether management measures were appropriate and successful. The evaluation includes lessons learned and recommendations for improving environmental and social management in future projects, even for those with minimal impacts.

## 3.2. Feedback, Complaints, and Response [Grievance] Mechanism

The purpose of a grievance mechanism is to receive and facilitate the resolution of concerns and grievances held by Impacted Communities about the social and environmental plans or performance of a project. There are broadly five steps in the grievance management process:

1. Publicize the process
  2. Receive and register grievances
  3. Review and investigate grievances
  4. Develop resolution options, respond to grievances and close-out
  5. Report and evaluate
- **Institutional Level:** JRF has an established Feedback and Complaints Response Mechanism (FCM), which includes various reporting channels to ensure stakeholders can share feedback, lodge complaints, or **whistle blow** in a manner that feels safe and comfortable. Feedback/complaints are received by the Institutional Development Department and are processed in line with JRF's External Feedback Complaint Response Mechanism SOP, based on the nature, category, and urgency of the issue.

JRF FCM operates as a structured process encompassing the following steps:

1. **Publicizing:** JRF actively promotes its Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (FCM) reporting channels to beneficiaries through various actions, including displaying an FCM communication slide during all training sessions, placing roll-up banners and signs at each session, and incorporating the FCM into Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) assessment tools.
2. **Receiving:** JRF receives feedback and complaints from beneficiaries and stakeholders through several channels, including secure Feedback and Complaints Boxes at JRF HQ and centers (QRFCC and QRCEC), the JRF website ([www.jordanriver.jo/ar/contact-us](http://www.jordanriver.jo/ar/contact-us)), phone (+962 6 5933211), the 110 Helpline, email ([feedback@jrf.org.jo](mailto:feedback@jrf.org.jo)), and fax (+962 6 5933210). All submissions are accessed and processed exclusively by the Institutional Development Department.
3. **Analyzing:** Reviewing and categorizing submissions to determine their nature and required level of response.
4. **Escalating:** Forwarding cases to the appropriate Concerned Parties or the Investigation Committee, depending on the severity and type of issue.
5. **Communicating:** Keeping relevant stakeholders informed throughout the process.

This mechanism ensures that all cases are addressed promptly, and necessary corrective, preventive, or disciplinary actions are taken to uphold transparency, accountability, and trust.

- JRF’s whistleblower policy provides people affected by any project with an accessible, transparent, fair and effective process for raising complaints anonymously about environmental or social harms caused by any such project. This allows JRF to effectively protect its interests, resources, and mission by detecting and mitigating financial and reputational risks as soon as possible. Stakeholders can lodge a complaint via JRF’s official reporting channels, also available on JRF’s website (see preceding sub-section).
- **Project Level:** JRF will ensure that projects potentially impacting affected communities develop and implement a grievance mechanism. The responsibility for establishing the project level grievance mechanism rests with the Executing Agency. The complexity and scale of the grievance mechanism should be appropriate to the scale of impact and size of affected population. Project level grievance mechanism guidance is provided in JRF’s External Feedback Complaint Response Mechanism.

### 3.2.1. Changes to JRF’s ESMS

JRF will periodically review this ESMS to ensure compliance with relevant national and international laws and alignment with requirements of major donors. The review will also ensure that the overall approach to assessing and managing E&S risk remains relevant and aligned with global best practices and standards.

## Annex I: Environmental and Social Exclusion List

JRF does not knowingly support projects involving the following:

- i. The production of, or trade in, any product or activity deemed illegal under JRF's national laws or regulations;
- ii. Trade in wildlife or production of or trade in wildlife products regulated under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora;
- iii. Transboundary movements of waste prohibited under international law (Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal);
- iv. Production of, or trade in, weapons and munitions, including paramilitary materials;
- v. Production of, or trade in, alcoholic beverages, excluding beer and wine;
- vi. Production of, or trade in, tobacco;
- vii. Gambling, casinos and equivalent enterprises;
- viii. Production of, trade in, or use of un-bonded asbestos fibers;
- ix. Activities prohibited by legislation of Jordan in which the project is located or by international conventions relating to the protection of biodiversity resources or cultural heritage (Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention), Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and Convention on Biological Diversity); and
- x. Shipment of oil or other hazardous substances in tankers that do not comply with IMO requirements (IMO, MARPOL, SOLAS and Paris MOU)<sup>8</sup>

In addition, as indicated above in the sub-section “**Screening and Categorization**”, JRF will not implement any activities

---

<sup>8</sup> Non-compliance with International Maritime Organisation (IMO) requirements: tankers that do not have all required International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) certificates (including, without limitation, International Safety Management Code compliance), tankers banned by the Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (Paris MOU), and tankers due for phase out under MARPOL regulation 13G. No single hull tanker over 25 years old should be used

## Annex II: Environmental and Social Screening Tool

### *Logic of the tool*

The E&S screening tool below should be used in the program design phase by the technical specialist/ consultant overseeing ESMS implementation for any GCF-funded program. The screening tool consists of 22 general level-1 questions (in bold) and around 70 detailed level-2 questions (below each level-1 question). They are categorized in eight thematic areas that correspond with the IFC's performance standards.

The level-1 questions need to be answered FIRST and they need to be answered ALL. Level-2 questions only need to be answered when the corresponding level-1 question triggered a 'yes'. **JRF will only implement GCF-funded programs considered low risk (Category C).** If any Level-1 questions are answered "yes" (indicating the project falls into a medium or high risk category), JRF will amend the project scope to reduce E&S risks to "low."

These are possible scenarios:

- If all level-1 questions are answered with a 'no' then the entire activity/intervention is considered of low risk.
- If at least one level-1 question is answered with a 'yes', move to the corresponding level-2 questions. All level-2 questions under a level 1 question that triggered a 'yes' need to be answered. The level 2 questions will indicate whether the activity/intervention is of 'low', 'medium' or 'high' risk.
  - If at least one level-2 question indicates a high-risk level, then the entire activity/intervention is classified as high risk.
  - If no level-2 questions indicate a high risk, but at least one level-2 question indicates a medium risk, then the activity/intervention is of medium risk.
  - If no level 2 questions are answered with a 'yes', then the activity/intervention is of low risk, even if some level-1 questions triggered a 'yes'.

Describe for each level-1 question in the 'Annotations' field why the answer is 'no' or 'yes'.

If a potential risk area is not covered by any of the level-1 or level-2 questions, it can be added at the end of the screening tool.

### *Scope of the questions*

All questions apply to all phases of the activity/intervention: project start-up, implementation and close-out. They apply to JRF and executing entities' projects funded through JRF. All questions apply to all components of the activity/intervention, regardless of whether the components are implemented by JRF or through executing entities.

JRF Environmental and Social Safeguards for Programme Activities

Part I: E&S Screening					
IFC E&S Standard 1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts			N/Y	Level	Annotations
<b>1</b>	<b>Could project activities impact community resources or dynamics?</b>				
if yes	1.1	Could business development activities affect local environments?		Medium	
	1.2	Could training programs create unintended social impacts?		Medium	
<b>2</b>	<b>Could the intervention alter the land cover of forests, wetlands, farming land, grazing land, or other landscapes of ecological or economic importance?</b>				<i>Examples:</i> the change of land cover could be intentional (e.g. conversion of rangeland or forest in agricultural land) or unintentional (e.g. refugees deforesting the area around refugee camp)
if yes	2.1	Could the intervention degrade, fragment, or convert the natural vegetation cover in an area (contiguous or cumulative) of 1 to 10 ha?		Medium	<i>Examples of degradation:</i> burning, thinning, felling, unsustainable pruning and harvesting from trees and other forest resources <i>Examples of fragmentation:</i> additional fencing, construction of new pathways or roads through a forest, further fragmentation of plots. <i>Examples of conversion:</i> clearance of forest for agricultural or constructions. Note that a road of 10m wide x 10km long covers 10ha.
	2.2	Could the intervention degrade, fragment or convert the natural vegetation cover in an area (contiguous or cumulative) of more than 10 ha?		High	

3	<b>Could the intervention alter the quantity or quality of groundwater, surface water, or sea water?</b>				<i>Example:</i> the construction of dams of any type, creation or rehabilitation of water wells or boreholes, the creation of irrigation schemes
if yes	3.1	Could the intervention include the rehabilitation or construction of dams, weirs, reservoirs, or ponds that are more than 3m high/deep OR have a storage capacity of more than 400m <sup>3</sup> ?		Medium	
	3.2	Could the intervention include the rehabilitation or construction of irrigation schemes that cover more than 20ha OR withdraw more than 1000m <sup>3</sup> per day OR withdraw more than 10% of the average flow of a stream or river?		Medium	<i>Reference:</i> the 20ha threshold and 1000m <sup>3</sup> threshold are also used by FAO; the 10% threshold is important for the Green Climate Fund <i>Note:</i> if the answer to 2.2 is affirmative, also consider the risk of soil degradation or erosion (question 4)
	3.3	Could the intervention include the rehabilitation or construction of dams, weirs, reservoirs, or ponds that are more than 5m high/deep OR have a storage capacity of more than 10,000m <sup>3</sup> ?		High	
	3.4	Could the intervention include the rehabilitation or construction of irrigation schemes that cover more than 100ha OR withdraw more than 5000m <sup>3</sup> OR withdraw more than 50% of the average flow of a stream or river?		High	<i>Reference:</i> the 100ha threshold and 5000m <sup>3</sup> threshold are also used by FAO. <i>Note:</i> if the answer to 2.4 is affirmative, then also consider the risk of soil degradation or erosion (question 3), the risk to ecosystems (question 4), and the risk of creating conflict (question 19)

	3.5	Could the intervention involve groundwater extraction in arid or semi-arid areas?		Medium	<i>Definition</i> of arid and semi-arid: as per national classification; if this is not available, then as defined by the <u>Köppen climate classification</u> <i>Note:</i> extraction of groundwater in arid or semi-arid areas can easily lead to groundwater depletion; consider measures to control the amount of water withdrawn and measures to favour replenishment of groundwater
	3.6	Could the intervention contaminate water sources that are used for human consumption above national or WHO limits?		High	<i>Examples</i> of sources of contamination: wastewater discharge; overuse of agrochemicals. <i>Reference</i> for water quality: national legislation; if this is not available, then as defined by WHO. <i>Note:</i> if the risk exists that drinking water sources would be contaminated, also consider the risk of causing conflict (question 19)
<b>4</b>	<b>Could the intervention degrade soils, increase soil erosion, or increase sediment load in surface water flows?</b>				<i>Examples</i> of negative impacts on soil: increase in soil salinity due to excessive irrigation; reduction of fertile topsoil due to erosion; reduction in organic content of the soil due to degradation of vegetation
if yes	4.1	Could the intervention convert between 1 and 10 ha of land for agriculture or infrastructure, without introducing soil conservation measures appropriate to the topography of the landscape?		Medium	<i>Note:</i> a road of 10m wide x 10km long covers 10ha
	4.2	Could the intervention convert more than 10 ha of land for agriculture or infrastructure, without introducing soil conservation measures appropriate to the topography of the landscape?		High	
	4.3	Could the intervention rehabilitate or develop		Medium	<i>Examples</i> of mitigation measures: scheduled irrigation, planting of salt-absorbing grasses, creation of drainage canals, creation of

		irrigation schemes, without introducing measures to mitigate possible water logging and salinization?			raised beds
	4.4	Could the intervention introduce agricultural practices or agrochemical inputs that are likely to decrease soil quantity and quality?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> capacity building would be a mitigation measure to ensure sustainable practices and correct use of agrochemicals
<b>5</b>	<b>Could the intervention increase greenhouse gas emissions from fuel combustion, changes in land cover, or other sources?</b>				
if yes	5.1	Could the intervention lead to a permanent increase in the consumption of fuel (wood, charcoal, or fossil fuels) compared to the situation before the intervention?		Medium	<i>Examples:</i> intervention introduces an irrigation scheme with engine-powered pumping system; intervention introduces income-generating activity that requires a permanent input of fuel or wood
	5.2	Could the intervention degrade or convert the vegetation cover in an area (contiguous or cumulative) of 1 to 10 ha?		Medium	<i>Examples of degradation:</i> burning, thinning, felling, unsustainable pruning and harvesting from trees and other forest resources <i>Examples of conversion:</i> clearance of forest or wetland for agriculture
	5.3	Could the intervention degrade or convert the vegetation cover in an area (contiguous or cumulative) of more than 10 ha?		High	<i>Examples of degradation:</i> burning, thinning, felling, unsustainable pruning and harvesting from trees and other forest resources <i>Examples of conversion:</i> clearance of forest or wetland for agriculture



6	<b>Could the intervention expose more people to natural hazards or make some people more vulnerable to natural hazards?</b>				<i>Note:</i> this question intends to probe changes in exposure, resilience and vulnerability of people to natural hazards <i>Examples</i> of natural hazards: droughts, floods, cyclones, locust swarms
if yes	6.1	Will the intervention create infrastructure or assets that could increase the exposure of any person to natural hazards?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> a new dam that could easily break down under heavy rainfall increases the exposure of the people living immediately downstream of the dam <i>Note:</i> this question particularly applies to vulnerable groups
	6.2	Could the intervention change people’s behaviour or livelihood strategies, increasing their exposure to natural hazards?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> the intervention introduces water management techniques that are replicated incorrectly by the community, involuntarily increasing their exposure to floods <i>Note:</i> this question particularly applies to vulnerable groups
	6.3	Could the intervention make any person more dependent on assets that would likely be damaged by natural hazards in the next 5 years?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> farmers completely shifting to irrigated agriculture while the irrigation scheme is prone to floods or droughts; farmers planting water-intensive crops in rain-fed plots that are prone to future decrease in rainfall
	6.4	Could the intervention reduce the livelihood options of any person?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> intervention fencing off communal land used by some of the community members <i>Note:</i> this question particularly applies to vulnerable groups
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 2: Labor and Working Conditions</b>			<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
7	<b>Could the intervention affect labor conditions?</b>				
If yes	7.1	Could business development activities create occupational hazards?		Medium	

	7.2	Could training programs involve unsafe working conditions?		High	
	7.3	Could economic activities impact existing labor practices?		High	
<b>8</b>	<b>Could the intervention involve informal sector workers?</b>				
If yes	8.1	Could home-based business activities create health/safety risks?		Medium	
	8.2	Could training programs affect informal employment?		Medium	
	8.3	Could economic empowerment activities impact working hours/conditions?		Medium	
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 3: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention</b>			<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Could the intervention affect resource use?</b>				
If yes	9.1	Could business activities increase water consumption?		Medium	
	9.2	Could training facilities increase energy usage?		Medium	
	9.3	Could training facilities increase energy usage?		Medium	

<b>10</b>	<b>Could the intervention create pollution risks?</b>				
If yes	10.1	Could new businesses generate harmful emissions?		Medium	
	10.2	Could training activities produce hazardous waste?		Medium	
	10.3	Could economic activities impact local water quality?		Medium	
<b>11</b>	<b>Does the intervention involve substances or activities that could pollute the air, soil, or water?</b>				<i>Note:</i> consider the risk of pollution at all stages, from procurement and transport to use and disposal
if yes	11.1	Could the intervention lead to the pollution of the air, soil or water that is <i>temporary, limited in scale, and remediable?</i>		Medium	<i>Example:</i> occasional burning of waste; occasional overuse of agrochemicals at household level <i>References:</i> <a href="#">WHO air quality guidelines</a> ; <a href="#">FAO Soil Pollution</a> ; <a href="#">WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality</a> ; or national regulations if existent and stricter
	11.2	Could the intervention lead to the pollution of the air, soil or water that is <i>continuous OR large-scale OR irremediable?</i>		High	<i>Example:</i> continuous discharge of wastewater from a hospital; large-scale overuse of agrochemicals <i>References:</i> <a href="#">WHO air quality guidelines</a> ; <a href="#">FAO Soil Pollution</a> ; <a href="#">WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality</a> ; or national regulations if existent and stricter
	11.3	Could the intervention contaminate water sources that are used for human consumption?		High	<i>Examples</i> of sources of contamination: wastewater discharge; overuse of agrochemicals. <i>Reference</i> for water quality: national legislation; if this is not available, then as defined by <a href="#">WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality</a> . <i>Note:</i> if the answer to question 7.3 is affirmative, then also

					consider the risk of causing conflict (question 19)
	11.4	Could the intervention involve chemicals or materials that are subject to international bans?		High	<p><i>Definition of chemicals and materials subject to international bans: pesticides meeting the criteria of classes 1a or 1b of the <u>WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard</u>; chemicals in Annex III of the <u>Rotterdam Convention on Hazardous Chemicals</u>; pollutants governed by the <u>Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants</u>; asbestos as in the <u>Asbestos Convention</u>; mercury as in the <u>Minamata Convention on Mercury</u>; ozone depleting substances as in the <u>Montreal Protocol</u></i></p> <p><i>Note: strong risk management measures would have to ensure that these types of chemicals and materials are not used and correctly disposed of</i></p>
<b>12</b>	<b>Could the intervention generate waste (hazardous or non-hazardous) that cannot be reused, recycled, or adequately disposed of by the beneficiaries, JRF, or partners?</b>				
if yes	12.1	Could the intervention produce non-hazardous waste that cannot be reused, recycled, or adequately disposed of by the beneficiaries, JR, or partners?		Medium	<i>Examples of non-hazardous waste: plastic bags, tin cans.</i>

	12.2	Could the intervention generate any quantity of hazardous waste that cannot be adequately disposed of by JRF, partners or beneficiaries?		High	<p><i>Definition</i> of hazardous waste: all waste listed in annex I of the <u>Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal</u>;</p> <p><i>Examples</i> of hazardous waste: unused pesticides, engine oil, brake fluid, tyres, medical waste, used Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</p> <p><i>Note:</i> hazardous waste for which JRF as clear procedures (fluorescent lights, batteries, printer/toner cartridges) is not considered a risk</p>
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 4: Community Health, Safety, and Security</b>		<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Could the intervention affect community safety?</b>				
If yes	13.1	Could project gathering spaces or intervention areas create security concerns?		High	
	13.2	Could business activities or other interventions increase traffic or noise?		Medium	
	13.3	Could training facilities impact community infrastructure?		Medium	
<b>14</b>	<b>Could the intervention result in any individual or community health risks?</b>				
If yes	14.1	Could economic activities or other interventions affect public health?		Medium	
	14.2	Could business investment and development activities affect public		Medium	

		sanitation, waste disposal, or other use of resources?			
	14.3	Could training programs and community-level interventions create crowding concerns?		Medium	
<b>12</b>	<b>Could the intervention violate the rights of some people (whether beneficiaries or not) or discriminate them?</b>				
if yeS	12.1	Could the intervention violate or limit the rights of people granted to them by international rights standards and national law?		High	<i>References for international rights standards: <u>United Nations Charter</u>; <u>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</u>; <u>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</u>; <u>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</u></i>
	12.2	Could the intervention disregard fundamental labour rights or principles as defined by national and international standards?		Medium	<i>References: <u>ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work</u>; <u>ILO Convention 29 on Forced Labour</u>; <u>ILO Convention 105 on the Abolition of Forced Labour</u>; <u>ILO Convention 100 on Equal Remuneration</u>; <u>ILO Convention 111 on Discrimination (Employment and Occupation)</u>; and national labour laws.</i>
	12.3	Could the intervention reinforce the discrimination of individuals or groups?		High	Reference: <u>JRF Protection Policy</u>
	12.4	Could the intervention further limit vulnerable people's access people who have been identified as vulnerable to access assets?		High	<i>Example: a forest area used for hunting and recollection by indigenous forest dwellers is turned into protected area</i>
<b>14</b>	<b>Could the intervention lead to child labour?</b>				<i>Definition of child labour: <u>Jordanian law</u>; <u>JRF Protection Policy</u></i>

					<u>&amp; Child Safeguarding POLicy</u>
if yes	14.1	Could the intervention involve the paid or unpaid employment of minors below 14 years in light work?		High	
	14.2	Could the intervention involve the paid or unpaid employment of minors of less than 18 years in activities that could jeopardise their health, safety or morals?		High	
<b>20</b>	<b>Could attitudes towards staff or partners affect acceptance and success of the intervention?</b>				
if yes	20.1	Are there perceptions that the staff of JRF or partners do not behave appropriately in the field?		Medium	
	20.3	Could the staff of JRF or partners be perceived as aligned with any of the factions in a conflict?	N/Y	High	<i>Examples: local staff are disproportionately representing one political party, or religious or ethnic group; the association with government or other donors, stakeholders could affect acceptance in the community</i>
<b>18</b>	<b>Could the intervention increase tension or conflicts within the community, between neighboring communities, or between refugees/IDPs and host communities?</b>				

If yes	18.1	Could the selection of locations result in a focus on, or the exclusion of, any specific ethnic, religious, political or other group, and reinforce existing grievances?		Medium	<i>Examples:</i> the intervention benefits one faction in a pre-existing conflict
	18.2	Could the targeting coincide with key divisions in the conflict and have an impact on tensions or risks of conflict?		High	<i>Example:</i> targeting criteria select farmers in a context of farmer-herder conflict; targeting criteria based on marginalised status, where this overlaps with group identity
	18.3	Could the intervention provide different benefits to different groups, or reinforce the power of one group over another in any way?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> reinforcing economic benefit of any group over another through supporting specific roles in value chains; project resources or outputs are captured by elites to promote or reinforce their own patronage networks
	18.4	Could power relations in the community influence the intervention?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> participatory processes are unintentionally organized in such a way that marginalized groups are unable to challenge the powerful people; food inputs provided to recipients are re-shared among the community
	18.5	Could the intervention change tenure arrangements in such a way that they create, reinforce, or exacerbate socio-economic inequalities or conflicts?		High	<i>Definition</i> of tenure: The set of formal or customary rules for ownership of, access to, and usufruct of natural resources, including land. <i>Reference:</i> <u>Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests</u> <i>Examples:</i> the activity changes land tenure arrangements in an area where land ownership is already subject of conflict; the development of an irrigation scheme on land that is contested by different families

	18.6	Could the intervention exacerbate existing conflict or create new conflict between IDPs/refugees and host communities?		High	
	18.7	Could the timing of intervention coincide with periods of heightened tensions or events?		Medium	
	18.8	Could enhanced infrastructure create risks for communities?		High	<i>Example:</i> infrastructure such as roads enhance opportunities for predation by armed actors, or increase the likelihood of confrontation between armed actors locally
<b>21</b>	<b>Could the work arrangements in the intervention pose a risk to the health or safety of the people involved in the intervention?</b>		N/Y		
if yes	21.1	Could the intervention involve pregnant or lactating women that, through their involvement, would suffer negative health impacts?	N/Y	Medium	
	21.2	Could the intervention pose a risk to the health or safety of people through the use of heavy equipment, heavy means of transportation, or hazardous materials?	N/Y	Medium	
	21.3	Could the intervention cause permanent injury or the death of people through the use of heavy equipment, heavy means of transportation, or hazardous	N/Y	High	

		materials?			
22	<b>Could the intervention have a negative impact on the health of the community as a whole?</b>		N/Y		
if yes	22.1	Could the intervention facilitate the spread of endogenous or existing diseases in the community?	N/Y	Medium	<i>Example:</i> increase in respiratory diseases due to the introduction of a new food processing technique that generates dust
	22.2	Would the intervention develop water infrastructure that could facilitate the spread of water-borne diseases?	N/Y	Medium	<i>Example:</i> the construction of dams or water ponds could increase the development of mosquitos and hence diseases like malaria
	22.3	Could the intervention introduce new diseases in the community	N/Y	High	<i>Example:</i> the inadequate management of food distribution points could spread COVID-19; the use of alien workforce could introduce new communicable diseases
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 5: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement</b>			<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
	<b>Could the intervention affect land use?</b>				
	Could business activities require space reallocation or the resettlement of any individuals?			Medium	
	Could training facilities and/or activities impact existing land uses?			Medium	
	Could economic activities affect property rights?				



13	<b>Could the intervention lead to the involuntary resettlement (either physical or economic) of people resettlement?</b>				<p><i>Definition</i> of economic resettlement: people having to move to a new area because they lost access to productive assets or livelihood resources</p> <p><i>Definition</i> of physical resettlement: people having to move to a new area because they lost their shelter or the land on which they lived</p>
if yeS	13.1	Could the intervention lead to the involuntary economic or physical resettlement of up to 20 people?		Medium	<p><i>Reference:</i> the same threshold is used by IFAD</p> <p><i>Note:</i> forced physical resettlement without lawful compensation and clear implementation procedures is strictly prohibited</p> <p><i>Note:</i> any form of resettlement requires a resettlement plan</p>
	14.2	Could the intervention lead to the involuntary economic or physical resettlement of more than 20 people?		High	<p><i>Reference:</i> the same threshold is used by IFAD</p> <p><i>Note:</i> forced physical resettlement without lawful compensation and clear implementation procedures is strictly prohibited</p> <p><i>Note:</i> any form of resettlement requires a resettlement plan</p>
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 6: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources</b>			<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
	<b>Could the intervention impact natural resources?</b>				
if yes	Could business activities or other project interventions affect local biodiversity?			Medium	
	Could economic development impact protected areas?			High	
	Could training programs affect resource management?			Medium	

	<b>Could the intervention lead to increased use of resources in ways that could impact community access?</b>				
If yes	Could the project activities increase local water consumption?			Medium	
	Could the project lead to increased energy consumption in community facilities?			Medium	
	Could training or business activities impact local resource availability?			High	
	<b>Could the intervention affect water resources?</b>				
If yes	Could project activities impact local water quality?			Medium	
	Could business development activities affect water availability?			Medium	
	Could training facilities or community centers impact local water infrastructure?			High	
<b>4</b>	<b>Could the intervention negatively affect natural habitats, ecosystems, or biodiversity?</b>				<i>Examples:</i> the reduction of an area that is known to be the habitat of an endangered species; the reduction of the population of a local species
if yes	4.1	Could the intervention interfere, fragment, and/or significantly reduce or degrade natural habitat of autochthonous animal, plant or insect		Medium	<i>Examples:</i> the conversion of forest or wetland to farmland could destroy the habitat of certain species

		species?			
	4.2	Could the intervention lead to an increase in unregulated or unlicensed collecting, hunting, or fishing?		Medium	
	4.3	Could the intervention negatively affect endangered or protected animal, insect, or plant species, or their habitats?		High	<i>References:</i> for endangered species, see the <a href="#">IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</a> ; for protected species, see national legislation
	4.4	Could the intervention alter the migration corridors of endangered or protected animals or insects?		High	<i>References:</i> for endangered species, see the <a href="#">IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</a> ; for protected species, see national legislation
	4.5	Could the intervention introduce species that are alien or genetically modified?		Medium	
	4.6	Could the intervention introduce alien or genetically modified species that may be invasive?		High	<i>Definition</i> of invasive alien species: non-native species that thrive in the host ecosystem and threaten the native biological diversity <i>References:</i> <a href="#">IUCN Global Invasive Species Database</a> ; <a href="#">CABI Invasive Species Compendium</a>
5	<b>Could the intervention lead to negative impacts in protected areas?</b>				<i>Examples:</i> national parks, biosphere reserves, heritage sites, indigenous people’s territories <i>References:</i> sites could be protected by national law or by international agreements such as <a href="#">UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves</a> ; <a href="#">Protected Areas</a> ; <a href="#">Ramsar Sites</a> ; <a href="#">UNESCO World Heritage Sites</a>
if yes	5.1	Could the intervention take place in the buffer zone of an area that is protected		Medium	<i>Reference:</i> buffer zone as per national or international legislation

		by national or international law or conventions?			
	5.2	Could the intervention take place within, or have impacts on, an area that is protected by national or international law or conventions?		High	<i>References:</i> sites could be protected by national law or by international agreements such as <u>UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves</u> ; <u>Protected Areas</u> ; <u>Ramsar Sites</u> ; <u>UNESCO World Heritage Sites</u>
<b>IFC E&amp;S Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples</b>			<b>N/Y</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
		<b>Could the interventions have a negative impact on minority and vulnerable populations and communities?</b>			
If yes		Could project benefits exclude certain ethnic, minority, or otherwise vulnerable groups?		Medium	
		Could economic activities impact traditional practices?		Medium	
		Could training programs, interventions, or other activities impact cultural norms and/or traditional practices		Medium	
		Could the intervention be implemented in territories belonging to, managed by, or claimed by indigenous peoples?		Medium	<i>Note:</i> If indigenous peoples are involved, an engagement plan is needed that describes how their Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) was obtained and will be maintained. <i>Reference:</i> Following the <u>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRP)</u> , indigenous peoples have a right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) to any intervention that may affect them or their territories.

IFC E&S Standard 8: Cultural Heritage					
15	<b>Could the intervention negatively affect any cultural heritage (either tangible or intangible)?</b>				<i>Examples</i> of tangible cultural heritage: sacred sites, burial grounds, temples, paintings, monuments, etc.
If yes	15.1	Could the intervention negatively affect tangible or intangible cultural heritage in a <i>temporary AND remediable</i> way?		Medium	<i>Examples:</i> the intervention will develop a value chain for a plant species that is considered sacred by one ethnic group (but not other groups) in the area;
	15.2	Could the intervention negatively affect any tangible or intangible cultural heritage with implications that are <i>permanent OR irremediable</i> ?		High	<i>Examples:</i> a road is planned through land that is considered sacred by at least one ethnic group; the intervention will collect knowledge from indigenous peoples about their environment without giving them control over the use of this knowledge
		Could the intervention affect cultural sites?		High	
		Could the intervention result in economic development that changes traditional practices?		Medium	
		Could training programs impact cultural values?		Medium	
		Could training facilities or community centers impact local water infrastructure?		High	
<b>Other (non-IFC) E&amp;S Standard: Accountability to Affected and Vulnerable Populations</b>			N/Y	Level	<b>Annotations</b>

<b>17</b>	<b>Could the intervention lead to gender-based inequalities, discrimination, exclusion, unwanted workload and/or violence?</b>				<i>Reference:</i> JRF interventions and interventions must not create, exacerbate or contribute to gender inequalities or discrimination, and must mitigate risks of gender-based violence (JRF Gender Policy)
If yes	17.1	Could the intervention lead to increased unpaid work (including domestic and care work) for women and/or girls?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> girls needing to carry more water; women needing to spend more time preparing food, women needing to look after new crops introduced by the intervention
	17.2	Could the intervention amplify gender inequities in decision-making in households and/or communities?		Medium	<i>Example:</i> creation of cooperatives for commercialization of crops in which women are not represented
	17.3	Could the intervention amplify existing conditions for gender-based inequalities or create new conditions for inequalities?		High	<i>Examples:</i> creation of assets that only benefit men or men-headed households; increase in income for men deriving from work carried out by women; girls taken out of school because the school has moved or the road is not safe anymore
	17.4	Could the intervention exacerbate or lead to gender-based violence?		High	<i>Example:</i> wo/men experiencing acts of violence because they carry out work that is socio-culturally unacceptable for wo/men; women being subjected to violence (or threats), because they are increasingly mobile in their communities <i>Reference:</i> JRF Gender Policy; Safeguarding/Protection Policy
<b>18</b>	18.1	<b>Could the intervention create or exacerbate gender inequalities?</b>			
If yes	18.2	Could training programs create barriers for women's participation?		Medium	

	18.3	Could economic activities reinforce gender roles?		Medium	
<b>19</b>		<b>Could the intervention affect refugee-host community relations?</b>			
If yes	19.1	Could benefit distribution impact social cohesion?		Medium	
	19.2	Could economic activities create tensions between populations?		Medium	
<b>20</b>		<b>Is there a risk that the voice of some key stakeholders would not be heard in the design, implementation or monitoring of the intervention?</b>			<i>Reference: Community Engagement Strategy</i>
If yes	20.1	Could some relevant stakeholders feel that they have not been adequately consulted?		Medium	<i>Examples: in refugee contexts, both refugees and host communities need to be consulted; in contexts where different ethnic groups live together, all ethnic groups need to be consulted</i>
	20.2	Could some relevant stakeholders, in particular people or groups who are already prone to marginalization, be pressed not to participate in the consultations?		Medium	



	20.3	Could some relevant stakeholders, in particular people or groups who are already prone to marginalization, have difficulties filing complaints or feedback?		Medium	<i>Examples:</i> some people cannot file complaints in their native language
--	------	---	--	--------	--

## Part II – Assessment of Risk Level, Categorization of Project and Type of E&S Assessment Required

Drawing on the responses to Part I, and the risk framework described below, the Project Proponent should complete the following questions:

- What are the potential environmental and social risks?
- What is their likelihood and consequence?
- What is the significance of the risk?

The following risk approach should be applied when completing these tables:

### Definition of Consequence<sup>9</sup>

**Critical** – Significant adverse impacts on human populations and/or the environment. Adverse impacts high in magnitude and/or spatial extent (e.g. large geographic area; large number of people affected; transboundary impacts; cumulative impacts) and duration (e.g. long-term, permanent, and/or irreversible); areas impacted include areas of high value and sensitivity (e.g. priority ecosystems; critical habitats; critical cultural heritage sites; legally protected areas); adverse impacts to rights, land, resources and territories of Indigenous Peoples; involve significant displacement or resettlement; generates significant quantities of greenhouse gas emissions; impacts may give rise to social conflict.

**Severe** – Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of medium to large magnitude, spatial extent and duration more limited than critical (e.g. predictable, mostly temporary and reversible). The potential risk impacts of projects that may affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples at a minimum potentially severe.

**Moderate** – Impacts of low magnitude, limited in scale (site-specific) and duration (temporary) can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated with relatively uncomplicated accepted measures.

**Minor** – Very limited impacts in terms of magnitude (e.g. small affected area, very low number of people affected) and duration (short), may be easily avoided, managed or mitigated.

<sup>9</sup>Note, this risk format draws heavily upon the approach designed by the UNDP in their Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (2014)

**Determining significance of risk:**

	Consequence				
Likelihood	Slight	Not Likely	Moderately Likely	Highly Likely	Expected
Critical	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Severe	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red
Moderate	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Minor	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Negligible	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green

Green = Low Risk  
 Yellow = Medium Risk  
 Red = High Risk

What are the potential environmental and social risks (as identified through the screening process in Part I)?	What is the likelihood and consequence of the risk before mitigation measures are applied?	What is the significance of the risk? (low, medium or high)?
1		



2			
3			

What is the overall project categorization based on the potential risk and impact profile?	
	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Category A</b> - Projects with the potential to cause significant adverse social and / or environmental impacts that are diverse, irreversible or unprecedented.	
<b>Category B</b> – Projects with the potential to cause limited adverse social and/or environmental impacts that are few in number, generally site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed through mitigation measures	
<b>Category C</b> – Projects that include activities with minimal or no risks of adverse environmental and social consequences	

## Annex III: E&S Report Template

This screening report will be accompanied by the completed screening tool above, and appended to all M&E and regular monitoring reports for GCF-funded projects. As needed, additional E&S reports will be submitted to the GCF, however it is not anticipated that this will be required given that JRF intends to only implement Category C projects.

Project ID#: \_\_\_\_\_

### Environmental and Social Screening Report

Key Project Information			
Project Name			
Estimated Project Duration	Start:	Completion:	Months:
Primary Donor (s) & amount			Total Project Amount:
Key Partners (in delivery)			
Beneficiary/ies countries			
Has a screening or ESIA been done before?	<i>If yes, provide details</i>		
Screening Questionnaire completed by:	<i>Name, organization and function, and date</i>		
Screening Questionnaire reviewed by:	<i>Name, organization and function, and date</i>		

## Annex IV: E&S Safeguarding – Position TOR

### Environmental & Social Safeguards Specialist

#### Background

The Jordan River Foundation (JRF) is pursuing accreditation with the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and is working to build their engagement in order to develop and implement GCF-funded projects. As part of this process, JRF requires dedicated expertise to ensure compliance with environmental and social safeguards. The Environmental and Social (E&S) Specialist will be responsible for implementing JRF's Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) and ensuring alignment with GCF's Environmental and Social Standards.

This position will initially be a part-time consultancy, to be engaged on an as-needed basis until JRF's engagement with the GCF mandates full-time responsibilities.

#### Position Summary

The E&S Specialist will lead the environmental and social risk management of GCF-funded activities at JRF, ensuring compliance with both institutional and GCF requirements through screening, monitoring, and reporting activities.

#### Key Responsibilities

##### ***E&S Screening and Assessment***

- Conduct environmental and social screening of all GCF-funded activities following GCF's Environmental and Social Policy
- Categorize projects based on GCF's risk categories (A, B, C)
- Prepare environmental and social impact assessments (ESIA) when required
- Develop environmental and social management plans (ESMP) for identified risks and impacts
- Ensure integration of gender considerations in line with GCF's Gender Policy

##### ***Monitoring and Reporting***

- Implement monitoring programs for environmental and social safeguards
- Conduct regular site visits to assess compliance with ESMPs
- Prepare periodic E&S monitoring reports for GCF-funded activities
- Document and track grievances through JRF's FCM and grievance redress mechanism
- Maintain comprehensive E&S documentation and records

##### ***Stakeholder Engagement***

- Design and implement stakeholder engagement plans
- Facilitate meaningful consultations with project-affected people and stakeholders
- Ensure proper documentation of stakeholder engagement activities
- Coordinate with project teams to address stakeholder concerns

##### ***Capacity Building***

- Provide training on E&S requirements to project staff
- Develop guidance materials on E&S procedures
- Support the integration of E&S considerations into project design
- Build capacity of implementing partners on E&S requirements

**Compliance and Quality Assurance**

- Ensure compliance with GCF's Environmental and Social Policy
- Monitor adherence to national environmental regulations
- Review contractor E&S performance
- Conduct internal audits of E&S management system
- Coordinate external E&S audits when required

**Required Qualifications**

**Education**

- Master's degree in Environmental Science, Environmental Engineering, Social Sciences, or related field
- Professional certification in Environmental Impact Assessment an advantage

**Experience**

- Minimum 5 years of experience in environmental and social safeguards
- Demonstrated experience with international donor requirements, particularly GCF
- Experience in conducting ESIA's and developing ESMPs
- Proven track record in stakeholder engagement
- Knowledge of Jordan's environmental regulations

**Skills**

- Strong analytical and report writing skills
- Excellent communication and facilitation abilities
- Proficiency in both Arabic and English
- Strong computer skills including MS Office
- Experience with E&S management software an advantage

**Competencies**

- Strong attention to detail and analytical thinking
- Ability to work independently and as part of a team
- Strong interpersonal and diplomatic skills
- Problem-solving orientation
- Cultural sensitivity and awareness

**Reporting Relationships**

- Reports directly to the MEL Director
- Works closely with project implementation teams
- Coordinates with GCF focal points
- Liaises with external stakeholders including government agencies

**Performance Indicators**

- Timely completion of E&S screening and assessments

- Quality of ESMPs and monitoring reports
- Effectiveness of stakeholder engagement activities
- Compliance with GCF requirements and national regulations
- Resolution of E&S issues and grievances

***Duration and Location***

- Full-time position based in Amman, Jordan
- Regular travel to project sites required
- Initial contract period of one year with possibility of extension

**Additional Requirements**

- Must be familiar with the following GCF policies and standards:
  - Environmental and Social Policy
  - Environmental and Social Standards
  - Gender Policy
  - Indigenous Peoples Policy
  - Information Disclosure Policy
- Understanding of international best practices (IFC Performance Standards, World Bank ESF)
- Knowledge of relevant Jordanian environmental and social regulations

## Annex V: Project Level Grievance Mechanism Guidance

Where a project is likely to generate adverse impact to affected communities and/or the environment, a simple grievance mechanism should be implemented right from the beginning of project activity on the ground. The grievance mechanism should be considered part of the suite of engagement tools used by the project, and should not replace other stakeholder engagement activities. Similarly, the project needs to explain to affected communities that their use of the grievance mechanism does not inhibit their access to legal or judicial recourse processes. Processes to receive, track, and respond to project grievances must align with JRF's existing policies including the Internal Complaints Processes, Feedback and Complaints Mechanism SOPs, External Feedback Response Mechanism, and Whistleblower policy (JRF Code of Ethics).

The key principles of a grievance mechanism<sup>10</sup>:

- Proportionality – The project level grievance mechanism should be scaled to the size and stage of the project. Grievances are likely to be relatively few in the development stages and most frequent during the construction, operation and closure stages of a project.
- Cultural Appropriateness – A project level grievance mechanism needs to take into consideration specific cultural attributes as well as traditional mechanisms for raising and resolving grievances. Accessibility – The level of accessibility of a grievance mechanism is influenced by: clarity of communication; and ease of use. Consideration of language, locations for receiving complaints, literacy and education levels and gender issues should inform the grievance mechanism design at project level.
- Transparency and accountability – All complaints must be taken seriously and treated fairly and there should be consistency and predictability in the process. The project should commit to a certain timing of responses to grievances and should monitor and share grievance resolutions (where appropriate).
- Appropriate protection – The project must ensure that there is no retribution for use of the grievance mechanism, protect the identity of individuals who file grievances, provide information on mechanisms to escalate grievances and ensure stakeholder's understand their rights to use alternative remedies to resolve their grievances.

A grievance can be submitted by a person or group of persons who has/have been or may be affected by adverse impacts of a JRF funded project or on the complainant's behalf by the complainant's duly authorized government or representative.

---

<sup>10</sup>Adapted from IFC (2014) A Strategic Approach to Early Stakeholder Engagement, [www.ifc.org](http://www.ifc.org)

## The Grievance Management Process

JRF already has a comprehensive grievance mechanism in place for all activities implemented and overseen by JRF. Detailed procedures and steps for JRF's Grievance redress and investigations mechanism can be found in the following documents:

- Internal Complaints Process SOPs
- External Feedback and Complaint Response Mechanism
- HR SOPs

At the project level however, JRF will ensure that the below procedures are followed:

- The GRM is made public, and all project staff, beneficiaries, and stakeholders are made aware of it.
- All implementing partners will be trained on the GRM, and regular site visits and spot checks will occur to ensure that implementation at the project sites are running smoothly and efficiently.
- Any complaints or grievances submitted will be received with confidentiality.
- JRF will conduct regular self-assessments of the effectiveness of the GRM on an annual basis during project implementation, in line with the SOPs and procedures detailed above, and to ensure compliance with any updates or changes to GCF standards and procedures for grievance redress.