

### AMERICAN JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY (AJASET)

### ISSN: 2158-8104 (ONLINE), 2164-0920 (PRINT)

VOL: 5 ISSUE: 2 (2021)







PUBLISHED BY: E-PALLI, FLORIDA, USA

The American Journal of Agricultural Science, Engineering and Technology (AJASET) is blind peer reviewed international journal publishing articles that emphasize research, development and application within the fields of agricultural science, engineering and technology. The AJASET covers all areas of Agricultural Science, Engineering and Technology, publishing original research articles. The AJASET reviews article within approximately two weeks of submission and publishes accepted articles online immediately upon receiving the final versions.

Published Media: ISSN: 2158-8104 (Online), 2164-0920 (Print).

Frequency: 2 issues per year (January, July)

Area of publication: Agricultural Science, Engineering and Technology. The subjects covered by the journal includes but not limited to:

Science and Engineering Agricultural Economics and Agri-business Agricultural Engineering **Agricultural Statistics** Agricultural Extension and Development Agroforestry and Ecotourism Agronomy Agro-tourism Animal Science and Nutrition Applied Agriculture **Applied Economics and Finance** Aquaculture **Bioinformatics Biotechnology and Biochemistry** Climate Change and Green Technology Collaborative Engineering Computer Science and Engineering **Computational Biology Crop Science and Production** Dairy Science & Poultry Science **Decision Support System** Entomology **Environmental Science and Extension** 

Dental and Medical Science IoT, AI, 4th IR, Computer Science, ICT Food science, Engineering and Technology Genetics Technology Geophysics GIS, GPS, and Remote Sensing Horticultural Science ICT for Agricultural Development Irrigation and Water Resource Engineering Land Use and Development **Mathematics** Modeling of Crop and Animal System Pathology and Plant Protection Fisheries Plant Breeding and Crop Science Post-harvesting Technique and Technology Precision Agriculture **Production Engineering** Social Science and Agricultural Development Soil Science **Tropical Agriculture** Veterinary Science and Technology

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

<u>Chief Editor</u> Dr Mamun-Or-Rashid Professor, Dhaka University, Bangladesh

#### **Board Members**

Dr. Sumit Garg, IL, USA Professor Dr. James J. Riley, The University of Arizona, USA Dr. Ekkehard KÜRSCHNER, Agriculture Development Consultant, Germany Professor Dr. Rodriguez Hilda, USA Professor Dr. Michael D. Whitt, USA Professor Dr. Wael Al-aghbari, Yemen Professor Dr. Muhammad Farhad Howladar, Bangladesh Dr. Clement Kiprotich Kiptum, University of Eldoret, Kenya Professor Dr M Shamim Kaiser, Professor, Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh Professor Dr Mohammad Shahadat Hossain, Chittagong University, Bangladesh

#### **Managing Editor**

Md. Roshidul Hasan Professor, Department of Computer Science and Information Technology, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Bangladesh



EXPLORING ENVIRONMENT AS CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE AMONG HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS ACTORS Arpan Gelal<sup>1</sup>, Prof Dr Maria Sassi<sup>2</sup>

DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5442907

#### ABSTRACT

Environment mainstreaming across the humanitarian operations and long-term development programs is imperative to the new way of working agreed in the World Humanitarian Summit (2016). Mainstreaming environment in Humanitarian-Development nexus is crucial to minimize the environmental impacts of humanitarian projects and to build long term resilience against environmental and climatic risks and vulnerabilities of communities. This study explores the current environmental mainstreaming strategies of humanitarian and development organizations at the institutional and operational level based on specific attributes. This study conducts the case study of leading humanitarian and development organizations, namely, WFP, IFRC, UNDP, and USAID, based on the conceptual framework on mainstreaming strategies derived from various literature. Multiple case study approach was employed based on information collected through various secondary sources and personal consultation with the organizations. The finding of this study signifies the presence of varying environmental mainstreaming practices within the studied organizations, and comparative analysis among them is also presented. Finally, this study suggests that joint contextual environmental (and climate) analysis by humanitarian and development actors and inclusion of environmental consideration in collaborative multi-year programming to minimize environmental damage in protracted crises.

**Keywords:** Environment Mainstreaming, Humanitarian-Development nexus, WFP, IFRC, UNDP, USAID

<sup>1</sup>University of Pavia, Italy, National College, Kathmandu University, Nepal <u>arpan.gelal@nationalcollege.edu.np</u>

<sup>2</sup> University of Pavia, Italy



#### INTRODUCTION

Environment is one of the main pillars of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development (UN, 2015). There is increasing concern among donors and bilateral agencies on mainstreaming environment in development cooperation for the achievement of sustainable development. However, environmental concerns are often sidelined in the humanitarian sector with a presumption of the environment being 'development issue' (JEU, 2014). However, several environmental impacts have been associated with humanitarian operations including deforestation, overexploitation of natural resources, water contamination among others (UNEP, 2008; Cravito et al., 2011; Weinthal et al., 2014). It is also evident that environmental factors (for instance climate change, natural disaster, and resource conflict) can exacerbate the risk and vulnerability of people and lead to a humanitarian crisis (Brooke & Kelly, 2015). This indicates there is a need to mainstream environmental concerns in efforts to reduce risks and vulnerabilities to people as well as deliver humanitarian assistance in an environmentally sound manner. Recognizing the accelerating protracted nature of humanitarian crises and long-standing divide among humanitarian and development actors in the field; the New Way of Working (NWoW) was agreed on World Humanitarian Summit (2016) among the UN agencies, donors, bilateral organizations, NGOs and others to work coherently for collective outcomes in a multi-year timeframe. This humanitariandevelopment nexus approach envisions not only meeting the emergency needs but also reducing the risk and vulnerabilities of people to meet the SDGs (OCHA, 2017). The current discussion around the nexus is inclined towards its operationalization, i.e., sequencing and layering humanitarian and development programs to address the most vulnerable people; and few small scale 'nexus-type' pilot programs. However, there is a minimal discussion on mainstreaming environment within the nexus programming. Given that environmental (and climatic) factors may trigger a humanitarian crisis as well as the environment may be negatively affected by emergency operations and longer-term development activities; it is crucial to mainstream environment in both humanitarian and development setup. This is to say that, within nexus-programming, emergency operations should be carried out with the least possible impact on the environment and longer-term development activities should strengthen capacity, infrastructure, and institutions to reduce vulnerabilities and improve resilience against environmental (and climatic) shocks. This study intends to explore the integration of environmental concerns in the institutional and operational mechanisms of humanitarian and development organizations. Although there are some studies on the environmental impacts of humanitarian operations (see Srinivas & Nakagawa, 2008; Mainka & McNeely, 2011; Oberhofer et al., 2013) and a range of studies on environmental impacts of development projects (see NESS, 2013; Oroda, 2015; K'Oyooh, 2015; FIPL, 2019); there is scare academic research on environmental mainstreaming strategies within humanitarian and development organizations. This study conducts the case study of selected humanitarian and development organizations to explore various environmental mainstreaming strategies and present the comparative analysis. Furthermore, mainstreaming strategies are also analyzed from the humanitarian-development nexus perspective. This is to inform the humanitarian and development workers on current practices and priorities along with available tools and assessment methodologies that might be of significance to mainstream environment within joint nexus programming. This study intends to fill the gap in the academic literature about the comparative analysis of environmental mainstreaming strategies of humanitarian and development organizations.



#### MATERIALS AND METHODS Theoretical framework

To build up a theoretical basis, this study adopted the following definition of environment mainstreaming slightly modified from Dalal-Clayton & Bass (2009). "informed inclusion of relevant environmental concerns into the decisions of humanitarian and development institutions that drive their policy, rules, plans, investment and action"

#### **Mainstreaming strategies**

Various strategies to mainstream a thematic concern within organizational mechanisms and activities have been identified in the literature. At the institutional level, regulatory mainstreaming can be initiated through the adoption or revision of policies and regulations on a specific issue (Wamsler, 2014; Wamsler et al., 2014; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Sitas et al., 2014). Mainstreaming can also take the form of managerial considerations, adapting and modifying the organizational management practices (Burch, 2010; Holden, 2004; Wamsler et al., 2014). Furthermore, organizations can also strategically collaborate among other organizations through inter-organizational mainstreaming to develop competence, knowledge sharing, or action taking to the mainstream topic under consideration (Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Pelling et al., 2008; Wamsler, 2014). At the operational level, mainstreaming a particular theme can take various strategies. First, it can take the form of programmatic mainstreaming by integrating the mainstreaming topic into its core activities, programs, and on-ground projects (Holden, 2004; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Wamsler et al., 2014). Second, through add-on mainstreaming, organizations can initiate new activities and practices that are not directly related to the organization's objective but focus on the topic being mainstreamed (Wamsler et al, 2014; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Holden, 2004). Based on these theoretical strategies for mainstreaming an issue under consideration derived from various literature, this study identifies specific criteria to explore the environmental mainstreaming within humanitarian and development organizations as elaborated in following table.

Table 1 Conceptual framework of the study					
Mainstreaming	Criteria/Categories to explore environment mainstreaming				
Strategy					
Regulatory	Policy Context				
mainstreaming	This criterion seeks to explore the environment policy and				
	environmental considerations in various plans, principles, priorities,				
	manuals, guidelines, and standards of organizations				
Programmatic	Country Programming and Emergency Operations				
mainstreaming	This criterion seeks to explore how environmental issues are				
	incorporated in country strategic plans or assistance frameworks of				
	organizations or emergency response protocols				
	Assessment and Integration Tools				
	This criterion explores what tools are available and used by				
	organizations to identify, prioritize and manage environmental impacts				
	in their operations				
	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting				
	This criterion seeks to explain how environmental issues are				
	incorporated in the monitoring and evaluation of programs, projects or				
	country performance				
Inter-organizational	Collaboration and Partnership				
mainstreaming	This criterion explores how organizations collaborate with other				
	organizations in terms of joint initiatives and experience sharing to				



	mainstream environmental issues			
Managerial	Environment Management System (EMS)			
mainstreaming	This criterion explores the practices of the organization that seeks			
	reduce the environmental impact of its in-house operations through			
	reduced greenhouse gas emissions, waste management, energy or			
	water use in its central, regional, country or field offices			
Add-on	Green Procurement / Reverse Logistics			
mainstreaming	This criterion seeks to explore the presence of green procurement			
	practice as an add-on strategy			

Source: Own elaboration based on Wamsler, 2014; Wamsler et al., 2014; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Sitas et al., 2014; Burch, 2010; Holden, 2004; Pelling et al., 2008

#### **Research methodology**

#### Multiple case study approach

This study followed the qualitative mode of inquiry. The explanatory nature of the topic seeking to answer 'how' regarding certain phenomena is best approached through qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2015). Moreover, the case study as a research methodology is more relevant to explore contemporary circumstances in a real-world context and answer how questions by exploring operational processes rather than frequencies or incidence (Yin, 2018). To explore how organizations' mainstream environment in their institutional and operational mechanisms fits this context.

This study followed a multiple case study approach, as suggested by Yin (2018). Studying many individual cases helps to understand the processes in general and study the similarities or contrasts about the cases under consideration (Yin, 2018). Furthermore, this study considered mainstreaming mechanisms within selected humanitarian and development organizations as 'cases' of study and mainstreaming mechanisms within them were explored based on criteria as elaborated in Table 1 as 'themes' of the case study.

#### Selection of organizations

The individual organizations for this multiple case study were purposively selected to ensure that cases provide enough insights to explore the posed research objectives. Purposive selection is particularly essential when selected cases for study are rich in information and interesting phenomena (Palinkas et al., 2015). Organizations were selected based on their geographical coverage, proactiveness in incorporating environmental concerns in their institutional and organizational mechanisms, the adaptation of relevant environmental policy, and representation of both the humanitarian and development sector.

Organizational domain	in Selected organizations				
	World Food Program (WFP)				
Humanitarian	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)				
	United Nations Development Programs (UNDP)				
Development	United States Agency for International Development (USAID)				

Table 2 Or	ganizations	selected	for	the	case	study

#### **Data Collection and analysis**

This study is primarily based on a secondary desk study of the information gathered through various policy documents, guidelines, protocols, manuals, reports, briefings, and other relevant publications of the selected organizations. This information collection strategy makes sense for the research topic adopted as the aim is neither to explore the opinions of



people on environmental mainstreaming, nor the nature of information required demands extensive personal inquiry. Rather policy documents, reports, guidelines, practice notes, briefings, and other related documents of the aforementioned organizations provide accurate information on their practices, policies, instruments, and status of environmental mainstreaming. Yin (2018) mentions that documents and archival records are a prominent source of data in case study research. They provide systematic, evidential, highly inferential information as well as less chance of informational misleading, and correct interpretation of evidence. Nonetheless, an attempt has been made to contact the selected organizations wherever further explanation or specific information was required. Hence, information was gathered through documentary evidence and personal consultation with organizations wherever necessary.

The identification and analysis of information from various selected materials are based on the deductive category application approach (Mayring, 2000). In this approach, the aspects of analysis follow an application of prior formulated, theoretically derived categories (Marying, 2000). This process was organized in the following phases-

- 1. Seven categories (criteria) were defined based on theoretical literature on mainstreaming strategies (see Table 1)
- 2. Various documents and publications of all organizations for each criterion were identified and categorized along with personal consultation with the organization wherever required.
- 3. Relevant extracts and critical information from each document were identified and assembled under each criterion.
- 4. Exploration of critical insights on how environmental issues are incorporated into organizational mechanisms based on information extracted under each criterion.

#### RESULTS

#### Case study of humanitarian organizations

World Food Programme (WFP)

#### Policy context

Although the first environment policy entitled 'WFP and the environment' was developed as early as in 1998, it was barely operationalized (Kliest & Singh, 2012). Superseding the 1998 policy, a new comprehensive 'Environmental Policy' had been enacted in 2017. Currently, this policy addresses the impact of its operational activities in the environment while its Climate Change policy which addresses the effect of the environment in the food and nutrition security of beneficiaries (WFP, 2017a).

WFP's Climate Change Policy (WFP, 2017b) mandates the integration of climate change reduction measures in its activities. The policy emphasizes the incorporation of climate components in Country Specific Plans as the starting point. It also directs towards the selection of transfer modalities – food assistance or aid, tailored to the context to build the resilience of food vulnerable population against climate shocks. The policy instructs the deployment of climate risk analysis tool for food security analysis. It also emphasizes on implementation of climate shock responsive social protection and safety nets, and development of staff capacity and technical expertise for climate action (WFP, 2017b).

WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) sets the achievement of sustainable food systems as a strategic result indicator under one of its strategic objectives. This is to be achieved by promoting healthy ecosystems, improving land and soil quality, and enhancing adaptation capacity to climate change, extreme weather, and disasters. (WFP, 2017c). Moreover, WFP's Standards of Conduct include sustainable use of resources and particular attention to

environmental impacts while designing its activities (WFP, 2017c). WFP's Humanitarian Protection Policy (WFP, 2012b) and some fundamental environmental aspects are considered in its guidance manual for logistic, fleet management or facilities and administration.

#### Country programming and emergency operations

WFP's Emergency Preparedness Policy stress training staffs to ensure its operations do not generate negative environmental impacts on beneficiaries. It also states the need to integrate accountability for environmental impacts into its emergency operations (WFP, 2017e). However, the Standard Operating Procedure for the emergency response (WFP, 2012c) does not include any environmental considerations. WFP states that efforts are made to reduce environmental impacts of its emergency operations by transporting food through road and sea rather than airplanes to reduce greenhouse emissions, use of recyclable food packaging, ecodriving techniques, and staff behavioral change among others (WFP, 2016b). WFP's Policy on Country Strategic Plans briefly states the need for incorporation of environmental considerations and impacts of climate change in the formulation and implementation of Country Strategic plans (CSPs) (WFP, 2016a). The review of CSPs implemented since 2019 shows the systematic integration of environment and climate across the WFP's mandate of ending hunger, food security, improved nutrition, and sustainable agriculture. The CSPs also adhere to WFP's environmental and social standards. The CSPs envision reducing the environmental impacts of its food assistance programs through reduced packaging, bigger packages to reduce packaging wastes, and pooled transportation whenever possible. The CSPs mainstream climate-based adaptation and resilience-building through its flagship programs. In the Rural Resilience Initiative program, the prioritized activities include crop insurance, microcredit programs, village cereal banks, and improved crop harvest, storage, and processing practices to reduce climate vulnerability on food security. The Food for Assets (FFA) program intends to build community assets to mitigate climate hazards and reverse environmental degradation. In its Food for Training (FFT) programs, food assistance is conditioned upon receiving training for sustainable agriculture practices. The CSPs adopt climate contingency and seasonal livelihood planning support to host countries. As a part of country programming, CSPs incorporate strengthening government capacity to climate shock response through climate-smart productive safety nets, environmental policy support, meteorological equipment, and climate risk monitoring through technical support in climate data collection and analysis.

#### **Assessment and Integration tools**

Identifying the lack of system-wide environmental standards and integration tools, WFP has recently approved the Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework (ESSF) in late 2018 to be implemented in all its programs and operations as envisioned in Environment Policy (WFP, 2018c). While the implementation of the framework is being piloted in a few WFP country activities, the system-wide implementation is still underway. ESSF includes three tools: Environmental Standards (ES), Environmental Risk Screening and Categorization, and EMS. ES has set the minimum environmental standards to be considered in the policy, programmatic and operational activities under the following broad categories: Biodiversity and ecosystems, Sustainable natural resource management, resource efficiency and waste management, Pollution prevention and management, and Climate Change (WFP, 2018c). ESSF also includes environmental risk pre-screening of all activities related to CSPs in its earlier stages of planning.

#### Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

The Corporate Results Framework (CRF) of WFP for the first time stated the need to measure environmental consideration as a cross-cutting priority in its interventions. It includes one indicator to measure if targeted communities benefit from WFP programs in a manner that does not harm the environment. It is measured by the following indicator-

"proportion of activities for which environmental risks have been screened and, as required, mitigation actions identified" (WFP, 2018d, p.20)

However, in 2018, only 11 countries reported in this indicator out of 16 countries that used the screening tool—only eight reported screening 100 percent of eligible activities (WFP, 2019a). The new environment policy has recognized the need to include environmental indicators in monitoring systems of vulnerable countries. The compliance with the policy is to be accessed through standard project reports, and annual performance reports and indicators are to be developed to report EMS results in performance reports (WFP, 2017a). Moreover, annual performance reporting on the environment as a cross-cutting issue in annual country reports started only in 2018.

#### **Collaboration and partnership**

WFP partners with country governments, Rome based agencies, and the United Nations system to built-up capacity to strengthen environmental mainstreaming. It collaborates with partner governments to share lessons learned, provide environmental expertise in planning food and security interventions, and obtain technical services of ministries to acquire local knowledge on environmental issues (WFP, 2017a). At the international level, focal points from WFP, FAO, and IFAD collaborate to improve their sustainability services and environmental practices in using catering and stationery supply, energy provisions, and use of common contractors wherever possible. Each other's best practices are scaled up in Rome and the field (WFP, 2017a). Moreover, WFP served as a core group member for drafting the environmental and social sustainability framework in UN systems (UN, 2012) and was one of seven agencies to pilot it in 2015. WFP also participates in working groups led by Environment Management Group (EMG) and UNEP to advocate environmental sustainability.

#### **Environment Management System**

WFP is a leading agency in the UN system in terms of improving the environmental sustainability of in-house operations. It started initiatives to measure and reduce the emission of greenhouse gases from office buildings, vehicles, and travel since 2009. In 2015, it was declared to be a carbon-neutral agency (WFP, 2016c). Reporting for waste management started in 2016 (WFP, 2016b). The current orientation of WFP is towards the preparation of guidance documents and stepwise manuals to implement EMS as envisioned by its environmental policy update in late 2018. WFP committed to implement Environment Management System (EMS) with the UN in 2013 and was involved in the preparation of the UN system-wide EMS framework based on ISO 14001. In 2015 WFP was one of the four agencies to start piloting UN EMS in its Kenya country office. Apart from greenhouse gas emissions, the EMS includes environment-friendly systems in the use of water, energy, waste management, and staff training (WFP, 2018c). Learning from the pilot implementation at Nairobi office, WFP is still working to scale up EMS to cover all offices throughout the world and preparation of relevant EMS templates.

#### **Green Procurement/Reverse Logistics**

WFP is concerned about minimizing its carbon footprint arising from procurement activities. It applies the strategy of procuring food locally whenever possible to green its procurement practice by shortening the supply chain (WFP, 2019e). Considerations are made to minimize



environmental impacts through sustainable procurement based on the life cycle approach. However, WFP's suppliers screening criteria do not include any environmental considerations. Moreover, WFP's shift from food aid to food assistance has positive environmental benefits through the reduction of transportation emissions (WFP, 2017a).

WFP has been adopting supply chain waste management through reverse logistics approach by recycling, reusing, or upcycling its food packing materials and office equipment in some operations and country offices. Generally, considerations are made to reduce the size of the packaging of food, reducing colours in-printing, and avoiding plastic packaging (Beltrami, 2018). For instance, WFP Kenya started recycling plastic food packagings, whereas WFP Ethiopia started recycling old broken plastic pallets in 2019. WFP Uganda and Sudan started recycling tyres. Rainwater harvesting is practised in a few country offices. Upscaling of these fragmented practices is planned in all country offices and operations through recently prepared waste, water, and energy management guidelines.

#### International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) Policy context

IFRC has not prepared an independent environment policy yet, but operations are underway on its development. IFRC and its national societies are guided by its rules for humanitarian assistance. The rules include the need to address environmental sustainability as a crosscutting issue in the development of relief and recovery strategy by national societies (IFRC, 2013). Rules also abide IFRC to minimize any potential environmental impacts (do no harm to the environment) and consider international environmental standards in all its assistance activities. The IFRC Code of Conduct also states that further vulnerabilities to disasters are to be reduced by designing and managing its relief programs with distinct attention to environmental concerns (IFRC, 1994). IFRC has adopted Green Response Approach (GRA) to emergency response operations and has formed a Green Response Working Group in 2014. Green Response Approach guided by Green Response Strategic Plan (2019-2023) envisions improving the environmental impacts of life-saving operations rather than saving the environment itself. Long term outcomes of GRA are aimed three-fold -incorporation of environmental consideration in each stage of humanitarian response cycle; identification, and mitigation of environmental impacts resulting from the emergency response, and mainstream environment through policy, practice, and partnerships. Currently, the key considerations under this approach include greening supply chains, shelter and settlements, WASH operations, and training staffs (IFRC, 2018). IFRC's recently adopted Strategy 2030 acknowledges the principled approach to prioritize the sustainability of Earth's ecosystem. It recognizes climate and environmental crisis as a major threat for the next decade and the need to integrate climate risk and environmental management in its operations. It also envisions to reduce its environmental footprint (IFRC, 2019a). Also, IFRC's Global Plan 2020 stresses greening relief items as far as possible, focus on behavioral change of its staff to make greener choices and adopting sustainable ways to meet humanitarian needs (IFRC, 2019b).

#### **Country programming and emergency operations**

IFRC Plan and Budget 2016-2020 guides the preparation of country strategies and programmatic focus areas of its national societies. While disaster risk reduction through early preparedness, climate change advocacy, and early environmental warning systems are prioritized as major areas of focus, the plan does not state a significant focus on mainstreaming environment to reduce environmental impacts of its own operational activities. However, it directs national societies to align policy approaches that promote the environment as transversal concern and adaptation of greening strategies (IFRC, 2015).



Regarding the emergency response context, IFRC has been promoting Green Response Initiative (GRA) to identify, avoid, reduce, and mitigate environmental impacts. While there are no environmental standards and safeguards developed to be followed in emergency operations, GRA envisions to promote the local purchase of assistance materials, use of locally available sustainable materials to build shelters and develop local staff capacity for environmental sustainability (IFRC, 2017). IFRC has adopted a Plan of action for greening supply chain and shelter and settlements. Moreover, the trials for adopting a green approach in emergency solid water management through new technologies are underway in Nepal, Bangladesh, Lebanon, India, and Sweden (IFRC, 2019c). The common strategies for mainstreaming at country programming level are community-based early warning systems linked with local meteorological systems, public awareness campaigns on climate adaptation, aforestation, limited plastic usage and disposal, and climate adaptation training to local communities. Other strategies identified in operational plans include climate change information dissemination through community drama, folk songs and pamphlets, integration of climate action into disaster management planning process, and support preparation and implementation of national climate change adaptation plans. Across the livelihood and basic needs program area, the IFRC operational plans integrate environmental components like climate-resistant agricultural support including farming training, climate-resilient crop varieties, the establishment of seed banks, and promotion of community-based water management practices.

#### Assessment and Integration tools

The American Red Cross, along with WWF, has prepared a Green Response Toolkit to inform the humanitarian workers on environment-friendly strategies on post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. It includes training of various modules including a green approach to project design, M&E, EIA tools and techniques, site planning, supply chains, construction, and WASH among others (American Red Cross and WWF, 2010a). As a part of GRA, IFRC has prioritized the deployment of Environment Field Advisors (EFA) in its emergency response activities to enhance its environmental outcomes and reduce the cost of environmental externalities of emergency actions to the host country. Together with sector and project leads, EFA are expected to identify areas of significant environmental impacts of its emergency response and recovery activities and incorporate improved actions in the program plan. Recently, IFRC deployed EFA in its response to the refugee influx in Bangladesh. However, the effectiveness of deploying EFA is yet to be assessed (IFRC, 2019d). The ICRC and IFRC Emergency Assessment Guidelines do not incorporate significant consideration to assess the potential environmental impacts of its emergency operations (IFRC and ICRC, 2008). However, IFRC and ICRC network has been involved in the development of following assessment tools which attempt to capture the environmental dimension of its operations-

#### Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

The IFRC M&E Guide outlines the need to report activities and results achieved in environmental sustainability as a cross-cutting issue in all of its national societies' project/program management reports (IFRC, 2011a). The IFRC Framework for Evaluation has endorsed eight evaluation criteria for the evaluation of its humanitarian projects, programs, or policies. It includes environmental sustainability as one component of sustainability criteria to evaluate the long-term interventions. However, these sustainability criteria do not apply for emergency interventions (IFRC, 2011b). The IFRC's result matrix (2016-2020) intended to measure the performance of secretariat as well as national societies' does not include indicators to measure environmental outcomes of its operations and



activities. However, there is one outcome indicator that intends to measure the number of people reached through environmental education and awareness programs (IFRC, 2015).

#### **Collaboration and partnerships**

The IFRC acts as co-chair of the Global Shelter Cluster in the UN Interagency standing committee (IASC) Humanitarian Cluster System along with UNHCR and leads shelter cluster in natural disasters. As a cluster convener, it coordinates inter-agency shelter activities in emergency response as well as extends its deep expertise in location selection and technical design of environmentally friendly emergency settlements (IFRC, n.d.). IFRC, in collaboration with Catholic Relief Service, led the revision of Shelter and Settlement chapter of the Sphere Handbook which includes minimization of negative environmental impact as a minimum standard in shelter and settlement assistance (Sphere Association, 2018). The IFRC has been partnering with Swedish and Australian national societies and host governments to prepare environmental country profiles as a part of its GRA. These profiles aim to identify environmental context and major environmental issues as part of its emergency preparedness to be considered during disaster response (IFRC, 2019e). Furthermore, IFRC supports to strengthen the capacities of its national societies to adopt environment-friendly practices (IFRC, 2019e).

#### **Environment Management System**

While there is no standardized EMS within the IFRC network, it is committed to reduce the environmental impact and adore green practices in its in-house operations. IFRC maps and reports its GHG emissions on a timely basis. The particular focus of IFRC and ICRC is to limit energy use by shifting to renewable sources and sustainable management of water and waste in its office premises (IFRC, 2020). The ICRC's Framework for Sustainable Development prioritizes the need to reduce its environmental and climate footprint and preparation of road maps to implement environmental management in headquarters and field offices. The framework also includes the use of video conferencing to reduce paper use and travel, vehicle tracking system to optimize vehicle use, and management of hazardous and other waste in office premises as primary areas of intervention (ICRC, 2012). ICRC measures the environmental performance of its headquarter and delegations in certain indicators biennially. The key environmental footprints, diesel use, primary emergency consumption waste by type and disposal (qualitative indicator), and total water withdrawal (ICRC, 2017).

#### **Green Procurement/ Reverse Logistics**

Greening the relief supply chain is considered as an important component of its GRA. The IFRC has developed a plan of action for the greening supply chain, which prioritizes GHG emissions assessment on its supply chains. Some assessments are already taken, and the GHG accounting system is expected to be implemented in all its supply chains (IFRC, 2018). The IFRC and ICRC establish contract specifications to ensure construction materials and other relief items are sustainably sourced. As a criterion for supplier selection, it ensures the manufacturing company has implemented an EMS (ICRC, 2016). Moreover, procurement and logistics managers are trained to ensure the construction materials for emergency settlements are recyclable and reusable; and are procured from local sources to the possible extent to reduce the transportation distance. Also, considerations are made to reduce plastic and metal bands' packaging (American Red Cross and WWF, 2010a).



#### Case Study of Development Organizations United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Policy Context

UNDP's Strategic Plan (UNDPSP) 2018-2021 commits on extending policy and capacity support to governments to ensure environmental sustainability. The Plan aims to enhance peoples' resilience to shocks and crises through building capacity of governments to respond to environmental degradation and climate change (UNDP, 2017a). Furthermore, the signature solutions for development contexts outlined in the UNDPSP include two environmental priorities: nature-based solutions and strengthened ecosystem management for food security and sustainable livelihood; and increasing access to affordable clean and renewable energy for sustainable solutions (UNDP, 2017a). UNDP has adopted environmental sustainability as an overarching policy to mainstream environment in all its programs and project to support sustainable development. The main environmental policy document 'Environmental and Social Standards' (ESS) sets systematic environmental mainstreaming objectives for UNDP to avoid, mitigate or minimize the adverse impacts; strengthen environmental outcomes, develop the capacity to manage environmental risk and effective stakeholder engagement in its programs and projects (UNDP, 2014a). UNDP seeks to achieve its principal mandate of reducing poverty and inequity while also integrating environment and climate change in the design of development cooperation with program countries and implementation partners. Added, a precautionary approach is prioritized to conserve the natural environment and enhance climate resiliency (UNDP, 2014a). UNDP has also prioritized environmental considerations in other sectoral policies. UNDP's Energy Strategy (2017-2021) stresses on the energy and environmental sustainability linkage. Realizing the impact of fossil fuels and biomass energy on GHG emission, global climate change, deforestation, and land degradation; the strategy mandates UNDP to partner with countries to advocate and extend technical expertise towards renewable energy sources (UNDP, 2016a). UNDP's strategy for working with the private sector acknowledges the need to work with the private sector in developing countries to promote inclusive markets in a way that addresses environmental sustainability. This strategy stress UNDP's medium-term engagement in pro-poor economic sectors and markets to develop enterprises focusing on climate resilient green agricultural commodities and energy (UNDP, 2012a).

#### **Country Programming**

UNDP has adopted a systematic approach to mainstream climate change into its country programming and national development processes. UNDP provisions country climate change mainstreaming team, which consists of UNDP country focal point, national climate change coordinator, and climate risk expert (UNDP, 2012b). This team is entrusted with preparing country climate profile and map of institutions and stakeholders involved in climate change related activities. Further, relevant country policy, framework, or project documents are selected for climate risk assessment, and finally, climate change is systematically mainstreamed into revised documents (UNDP, 2012b). UNDP has also prepared a detailed guideline for mainstreaming dryland issues in national development frameworks. The UNDP's approach to mainstream dryland issues includes identification of impacts, stakeholder and capacity assessment, building awareness and partnerships, and systematically integrating issues in national development frameworks (UNDP, 2008b).

#### Assessment and Integration Tools

Since 2015, UNDP has set the detailed Environment and Social Standards (ESS) to ensure its programs and projects strictly abide by the overarching principle of environmental sustainability. The ESS has outlined the project level ESS for all UNDP projects and assessment mechanisms to ensure standards are respected. The environmental standards are elaborated in Table 3.

Environment-related Standards in ESS	ESS requirements				
Standard I – Biodiversity conservation and	Precautionary approach, assessment, use of				
sustainable natural resource management	experts, siting preference, habitat				
	conservation, biosafety, water management				
Standard II - Climate Change mitigation	Climate change risk assessment, GHG				
and adaptation	emission reduction, emission tracking				
Standard VII – Pollution prevention and	Pollution prevention, waste management,				
resource efficiency	pesticide control, hazardous waste				
	management				

Fable 3	<b>Environment-relate</b>	d standards i	n UNDP's ESS
---------	---------------------------	---------------	--------------

#### (Source: UNDP, 2014a)

All UNDP funded projects are mandated to go through environmental screening and categorization processes during project design through the standard screening template. The template consists of questions to access the environmental impact, probability, and significance of environmental risks. Three assessment tools are advised for medium risk projects—first, Limited environmental assessment for identified specific risks like air quality or water resource impact study. Second, specific risk/hazard assessment like fire safety assessment. Third, environmental and social audits for the projects to determine the impact of the existing project before UNDP entered into it (UNDP, 2016b). For high-risk projects or programs, UNDP prioritizes two environmental impact evaluation tools. Strategic Environment and Social Assessment (SESA) tool is used to examine broader sustainability issues resulting from 'upstream activities' like policy change, plan, or programs (UNDP, 2016c). For the individual high-risk projects, Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) is recommended to examine impacts and risks in quantitative terms and design relevant mitigation measures (UNDP, 2016c). Environment Management Plans are prepared as part of these assessments and systematically integrated into the course of program or project (UNDP, 2016c). UNDP provisions all screening and assessment reports are prepared with the due engagement of stakeholders and affected populations. Relevant reports are disclosed early to the stakeholders to internalize their responses (UNDP, 2014a).

#### Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

UNDP lays out exclusive monitoring needs throughout the life cycle of funded projects against its ESS through the project monitoring plan. The monitoring need incorporates the tracking of implementation of environmental management plans required by SES, tracking of corrective measures against public grievances, and public disclosure of monitoring reports (UNDP, 2014a). UNDP provisions third-party review of its monitoring mechanism wherever required (UNDP, 2014a). Apart from the response mechanisms, UNDP has established the Social and Environmental Compliance Unit (SESU) in 2014 as an independent review body. The person affected by the UNDP funded program or project may file a complaint against non-compliance to its ESS or any environmental commitments, and in the case of non-compliance corrective measures are suggested, and implementation is monitored with detailed monitoring plan (UNDP, 2014b).

The UNDP M&E Guidelines also state the need to integrate the environmental performance of the programs and projects to be included in the M&E framework (UNDP, 2009). The UNDP Evaluation Guidelines outline the need to assess the short and long term environmental impacts (environmental sustainability) as well as performance against its Strategic Environment and Social Assessments (SESA) in its evaluation of programs or projects (UNDP, 2019).

#### **Collaboration and Partnership**

UNDP demonstrates an extensive partnership in environmental initiatives and capacity building projects with other UN agencies, governments, private sector, and civil societies. UNDP and UNEP jointly launched the Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) in 2005, which works extensively with governments, bi-lateral donors and civil society actors to develop an integrated approach for poverty reduction and natural resource management within periodic plans of countries and budget process (UNDP and UNEP, 2016). UNDP, FAO, and UNEP have been implementing the UN-REDD program which extensively partners with World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), donors, and governments to extend policy support, finance, and technical expertise to adopt an action plan to manage forests and deforestation for emission reduction (UNDP, FAO and UNEP, 2015).

UNDP has partnered with ILO, UNEP, UNIDO, and UNITAR in partnership of Action on Green Reverse Logistics (PAGE) initiative which operates in collaboration with donors and environment networks to extend policy advice, technical expertise, and capacity development to reframe countries' economic policies towards green Reverse Logistics and sustainability (PAGE Secretariat, 2020). UNDP has been partnering as the founding implementing agency for Green Environment Facility (GEF) to implement its small grants program for environmental sustainability around the world (UNDP and GEF, 2019).

#### **Environment Management System**

UNDP is committed to green its operations and day to day office activities to be resourceefficient and sustainable. The global UNDP operations have been climate neutral since 2015 (UNDP, 2020). The UNDP reports its GHGs emissions from travel, fuel consumption from vehicles and cooling and heating in offices. In September 2019, the UNDP launched the 'Greening UNDP Moonshot' program with a target of reducing its GHG emission by 25 percent within 2025 and 50 percent by 2050. It also includes the implementation of the waste management system and minimized use and re-use of natural resources in its premises (UNDP, 2020). UNDP has set up consistent monitoring and disclosing system on its environmental performance. It is a pioneer among UN agencies in reducing its power consumption using solar power (UN Environment, 2019). In 2019, more than 20 UNDP offices installed photovoltaic electricity systems. Other practices include green building renovations, bicycling programs, and staff training (Greening the Blue, 2019). UNDP envisions establishing a UNDP Challenge Fund to finance sustainability solutions in its offices (UNDP, 2020).

#### **Green Procurement/ Reverse Logistics**

UNDP prioritizes more sustainable production and consumption practices through the procurement of goods and services with the lowest environmental impact. UNDP's latest Procurement Strategy commits on more sustainable procurement through several strategies (UNDP, 2015). To the feasible extent, UNDP incorporates the environmental criteria in its purchasing evaluations and develop monitoring mechanisms to assure vendor compliance in its supply chains (UNDP, 2015). Other strategies include piloting innovations in supply chain management, and award criteria for best-performing contractors (UNDP, 2015). UNDP's



procurement policy extends the principle of 'Best Value of money' to incorporate life cycle costs and benefits as well as the fulfilment of its environmental objectives (UNDP, 2018).

The UNDP's primary procurement considerations include energy efficiency, reduced packaging and packaging take-back contracts, procurement of products prepared from recycled materials, and recycling potential of the products. In many cases, suppliers' environmental performance and capacities for green products are also considered (UNDP, 2008a). The UNDP supplier code of conduct requires suppliers to have an effective environmental policy along with waste and hazardous chemical management systems, and emission monitoring (UNDP, 2013).

#### United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Policy context

USAID Policy Framework strives its programs extend 'do no harm' principle to the environment by adopting environmentally sound design and management of its projects (USAID, 2019a). As a federal agency, the USAID operations are abided by the US national laws. The National Environment Protect Act (NEPA) of the USA requires USAID to access the environmental impacts of its proposed action and conduct a public review before making decisions. Added, USAID is also endured to comply with NEPA and access the environmental impacts of its bilateral actions by the Executive Order of the US president. The US Federal regulations (22 CFR 216) under the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA), 1961 incorporates the environmental procedures to be followed by USAID and its implementing partners. The FAA mandates USAID to assess the impact of its activities on the environment and provide special considerations to natural resources, tropical forests, and endangered species in country strategies, operational decision making, and implementation processes.

The policy directive of USAID (ADS) incorporates its environmental requirements and compliance mechanism across agency programming and operations. The ADS Chapter 204-Environmental Procedures, states the requirement of environmental coordinators at the agency, mission, and bureau level. It also provisions mandatory environmental assessments like Initial Environment Examination (IEE) or EIA (USAID, 2013a). However, it exempts disaster response operations from compliance to environmental procedures for up to one year (USAID, 2013a). The ADS Chapter 201 'Program Cycle Operational Policy' details the procedures of environmental examination in planning processes and adaptive measures to be adopted in the program or project cycle (USAID, 2020a).USAID has prepared the sectoral environmental guidelines for twenty-one sectors to minimize the impact of its activities on the environment and climate change through preventive or mitigative measures in its program design and implementation processes (USAID, 2020b).

#### **Country Programming**

USAID's country priorities and strategies are guided by its Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS). The process of developing and approving individual CDCS systematically incorporates rigorous environmental analysis. As a part of the CDCS preparation, USAID missions are obliged to conduct mandatory country climate change analysis to identify context-specific climate-related risks and vulnerabilities of all the countries. The evidence from this analysis is used to inform the strategic environmental screening of projects and activities in their design phase. Furthermore, CDCS assesses opportunities for GHG emission mitigation and integrate them at strategic level decision making (USAID, 2019c).

Moreover, tropical forests and biodiversity analysis is also mandatory for the preparation of CDCSs. The USAID mission needs to access the status and challenges for the conservation of biodiversity and tropical forests in their jurisdiction (USAID, 2019c). This assessment also

includes the identification of necessary actions for tropical forests and biodiversity conservation as well as the analysis if proposed USAID activities are line with conservation efforts (USAID, 2019c).

#### Integration and assessment tools

Environmental assessment is mandatory for all the USAID funded activities. Environmental procedures are incorporated early in the project design process to identify potential environmental risks. USAID provisions no activity under its funding are approved without environmental documentations (USAID, 2018). The first step of Environment Compliance Procedure (ECP) is the screening of proposed activities into environmental risk categories. The emergency activities and very-low risk activities are categorically exempted from further investigation. All other activities requiring further investigation are required to undergo an Initial Environment Examination (IEE). The IEE examines if the significant adverse impacts are likely from the proposed activity and outline the mitigation and monitoring strategies. However, if the screening process finds proposed action with high environmental risks, a detailed Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) study is undertaken. The EIA study analyses the impact in detail and may recommend alternatives for the impact. EIA study also prepares a detailed environmental management plan and monitoring requirements throughout implementation (USAID, 2018).

USAID has provisioned environmental officers to foresee and ensure the implementation and compliance of its environmental compliance procedure, as stated in its operational policy (ADS). At the agency-wide level, the Agency Environmental Officer (AEO) coordinates agency-wide implementation of environmental requirements and procedures (USAID, 2013a). There is also the provision of Bureau Environmental Officer (BEO) in all regional bureaus of the USAID. The BEO oversees and ensures compliance with environmental requirements and procedures in all operating units and ensures staffs in the bureau are trained on the agency's environmental procedures (USAID, 2013a). At the country level, the Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) and Regional Environmental Advisors (REA) assist and advise across operating units on preparing environmental documentation, undertake compliance auditing and compliance evaluations (USAID, 2013a).

#### Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

USAID implements detailed environmental compliance monitoring against the baseline conditions and reporting system in all funded activities with detrimental environmental impacts. The environmental assessments (IEE or EIA) before the approval of projects or projects lead to the preparation of Environmental Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) for systematic adaptation of mitigation measures against identified environmental impacts (USAID, 2013b). The EMMP is incorporated with a project or program operational plan. The EMMP also sets the indicators and criteria for monitoring the progress on implementation as well as the effectiveness of mitigation measures. It also enlists the timing and responsible party of the monitoring needs. The results from monitoring are recorded in an EMMP template (USAID, 2013b).

As the reporting mechanism, Environment Mitigation and Management Report (EMMR) needs to be submitted annually or as specified in EMMP by the project or program implementer (USAID, 2013a). EMMR is incorporated into routine activity implementation performance reports. At the project or program closeout, the implementing mission or partner needs to prepare Record of Compliance (RoC) to assure environmental compliance during its lifecycle (USAID, 2020c).



#### **Collaboration and Partnership**

USAID's partnership is primarily with country governments, local implementing NGOs, and civil society organizations at the country and community level. Moreover, USAID is a partner in various collaborative environmental initiatives listed in the UNSDGs Partnership platform. The USAID has partnered with GIZ, UNDP, SPREP, and DFAT among other agencies to implement the Choiseul Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Programme (CHICCHAP) in Solomon Islands (UN, 2014). The USAID has been partnering with Credit Suisse AG and Athelia Ecosphere for the development of a market-based financing mechanism for sustainable agroforestry and ecosystem conservation and sustainable development bonds in around 20 countries (UN, 2015). Another notable USAID partnership is with SIDA, BMZ and others in 'Powering Agriculture: An Energy Grand Challenge for Development initiative' to identify and develop sustainable solutions to accelerate clear energy for increasing agriculture productivity in developing countries (UN, 2012).

USAID's Public-Private Partnership Database reports 189 partnership initiatives implemented in the environment sector since 2001 around the globe (USAID, n.d.). The resource partners include public companies like Coca Cola and Google, UN agencies, bilateral donors, private consulting companies, research institutions, universities, Lions club, governments, and ministries among others (USAID, n.d.).

#### **Environment Management System**

USAID's Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan outlines the agency's strategy to enhance the environmental performance of in-house operations. The agency's sustainability program includes the use of environmentally favourable electronic equipment and environmentfriendly practices in disposing them (USAID, 2017b). This also extends to the adoption of a policy on reduction of energy usage and shift to alternative energy in overseas missions. Sustainable practices like waste and water consumption reduction are also adopted (USAID, 2013c). USAID Washington reports GHG emissions and subsequently plans to reduce emissions by minimizing business air travel and other commuting. Green infrastructure practices and life cycle cost analysis of buildings are incorporated in the design, construction, and operation of buildings and facilities. In 2016, USAID completed the first green-rated overseas building in South Africa where 60% of the steel used for construction had recycled or re-used components (USAID, 2017b). USAID offices adopt a recycling mechanism for their paper, aluminum, and plastic wastages (USAID, 2017b). However, compiled GHG emissions from USAID overseas missions is not reported.

#### **Green Procurement/Reverse Logistics**

The significant policy gap to foster green procurement mechanisms was observed in the USAID policy guidance. The ADS Chapter 533 (USAID, 2014) which is the agency's policy on Purchasing for USAID Overseas Activities do not include any environmental criteria for procurement of power systems, office furniture, or vehicles. Similarly, ADS Chapter 300 (USAID, 2019d) Agency Acquisition and Assistance (A&A) Planning Policy do not incorporate environmental consideration in procurement contracts.

#### DISCUSSION

#### Institutional and operational mainstreaming strategies

At the institutional level, mainstreaming can be initiated through the creation or revision of existing policies, regulations, or corporate plans (Wamsler et al., 2014; Wamsler, 2014; Roberts & O'Donoghue, 2013; Sitas et al., 2014; OECD, 2014). While WFP, UNDP, and USAID have independent environment policy; IFRC is currently developing its environmental policy. The operational plans of organizations prioritize environmental

mainstreaming to achieve their organization-specific mandates. WFP's strategic plan (2017-2021) aligns its strategic objective of achieving food security through the promotion of healthy ecosystems, improved land, and soil quality and adaptation to climate change. IFRC strategy 2030 prioritizes the integration of climate risk and environmental management in its DRR activities; recognizing climate and environmental crises as a major threat for the next decade. Meanwhile, UNDP's strategic plan (2018-2021) envisions to integrate environment and climate change in development cooperation through policy and capacity support to the governments. USAID's guidelines on Environment and Natural Resource Management Framework (ENRMF) states the prioritized considerations on sustainable natural resource management, conservation of land marine and coastal areas, and conservation crime across all sectors of agency investment. While the USAID and UNDP have a long-standing history of environmental policy initiatives; WFP prepared its environment policy only in 2017 whereas IFRC is still on the process of preparing it.

At the operational level, mainstreaming can take programmatic form through the integration of cross-cutting issues into core activities, programs, or on-ground projects (Holden, 2004; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Wamsler et al., 2014). This was evaluated using three criteria - environmental considerations in country programming and emergency operations; provision of assessment and integration tools; and monitoring, evaluation, and reporting mechanisms. The country plans of all organizations integrate environment and climate considerations among their prioritized working areas. The common areas of concern are climate-based adaptation, sustainable natural resource management, disaster risk reduction, and early preparedness. USAID carries out separate climate risk screening, assessment, and mitigation plans for each of its country's outcome areas as part of its individual CDCS development. Both the development organizations were found to carry out country-level climate risk assessment profiles as part of country plan formulation; which is not mandatory in WFP and IFRC. While the approach of WFP and IFRC is more towards building climate adaptation and natural disaster risk reduction capacity at the community level; UNDP and IFRC take country capacity development and policy advocacy approach towards better environmental governance and climate change mitigation.

The deployment of environment officers is one of the tools used to integrate environmental consideration during project or program planning and ensure environmental compliance during implementation. While IFRC recently started deploying environment field advisors as part of its Green Response Initiative; USAID has permanent provisions of environment officers at the agency, bureau, regional, and mission offices.

Regarding major environmental integration tools; there is a distinct difference between humanitarian and development organizations. While in most of the cases, emergency response is exempted from environmental compliance; development agencies have systematic environmental assessment requisite and procedure. Recently, WFP prepared and has been piloting its Environment and Social Safeguard Framework in few countries which incorporate minimum programmatic and operational environmental standards; environment risk screening and categorization process, and EMS. IFRC started the green response initiative in 2014, thereby expanding 'do no harm' principle to environment and ecosystems. IFRC strives to deliver environment-friendly humanitarian assistance, especially in logistics, supply chain, shelter and settlements, and WASH operations. However, USAID has been implementing its Agency Environment Procedure since 1976. All USAID funded activities are obliged for environmental procedures, including environmental screening, impact assessment, and mitigation plans. UNDP has set up Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) in 2015. ESS includes the minimum environmental standards and requirements for its activities across various environmental domains. UNDP requires a compulsory environment



impact screening and categorization for all its funded activities with the requirement of extensive SESA or ESIA for higher-risk categories.

At the institutional level, inter-organizational mainstreaming strategy leads to enhanced competence, share experience, and take collective actions to mainstream topics under consideration (Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Wamsler, 2014; Pelling et al., 2008). All studied organizations hold an extensive partnership with host country governments, NGOs, civil society and the private sector to extend policy support, capacity building, and technical expertise in environmental and climate issues. WFP as the lead agency for global logistics humanitarian cluster and IFRC as the lead for shelter cluster in natural disasters can play a significant role to mainstream environment within respective clusters. The organizations also collaborate through various working groups within UN-EMG or UNEP. Efforts have also been made to mainstream environment through joint initiatives like the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative and the UN-REDD program. Furthermore, mainstreaming at the institutional level can also take place through alteration or modification of organizational management practices (Burch, 2010; Holden 2004; Wamsler et al., 2014). This study explored the environmental management practices in organizations to reduce their in-house carbon footprint. All the organizations had some sort of waste, waste, and energy management systems. However, only WFP and UNDP have been carbon neutral until now. There are timely reporting mechanisms on GHG emissions within WFP, IFRC, and UNDP. However, in USAID, no compiled GHG emission reporting from its overseas mission was found. At the operational level, through add-on mainstreaming, organizations can initiate new practices to mainstream specific issue (Wamsler et al., 2014; Roberts and O'Donoghue, 2013; Holden, 2004). Increasing concern on green procurement policy among humanitarian and development organizations can be categorized under add-on mainstreaming. The common strategies identified among organizations are local food procurement thereby shortening the supply chain, life cycle approach on evaluation of procurement items and considerations to supply chain waste management through reverse logistics. UNDP adopts the inclusion of environmental criteria in purchasing evaluation to the feasible extend and monitoring mechanism to assure vendor compliance in the supply chain. However, no significant policy on greening procurement practice was observed in USAID.

#### Humanitarian-development nexus perspective

While the nexus approach of collective programming is still through initial discussion around its operating and funding modalities; there is no significant attention towards mainstreaming environment as a cross-cutting issue in nexus briefings and documentation. One of the underlying humanitarian-development divides in environmental mainstreaming comes from the widespread assumption that the environment does not fit within the mandate and time-frame of humanitarian action (JEU, 2014). However, increasing protracted nature of the crisis and multi-year operations of humanitarian assistance (ICRC, 2016) has raised the need to integrate the environment within nexus modality comes from the fact that the integrated relief, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction can have a significant impact on the natural environment as well as environmental issues like climate change and natural disasters can accelerate the crisis and need for longer-term relief and recovery (Brooke and Kelly, 2015).

Two mainstreaming approaches analyzed in this study are of significance regarding the NWoW. The provision of environmental safeguards, frameworks, and environment assessment mechanisms to assure the minimum environmental standards in their operations by humanitarian and development actors ensures managing the needs of people while also protecting the environment. The technical and institutional capacity building of host governments (towards environmental governance, climate change adaptation, natural resources management, disaster risk management, and early warning systems among others)



aligns with the humanitarian-development imperative of not only managing immediate needs but also reduce risk and vulnerabilities in the longer term to build resilience.

The NWoW envisions the joint risks and vulnerability analysis as a part of collaborative planning (OCHA, 2017). This can be operationalized through the joint context-specific environmental and climatic risk analysis to plan collaborative actions for disaster management and climate adaptation in environmental and other crisis settings. The environmental field officers of humanitarian and development organizations can play a crucial role in common environmental risk and vulnerability analysis to inform the development of a contingency plan for emergency assistance and longer-term recovery programs.

#### CONCLUSION

There is a need to link emergency relief and rehabilitation efforts with the development activities due to the increasing protracted nature of crises. This notion of joint humanitariandevelopment was accepted by stakeholders during the World Humanitarian Summit (2016). However, there is little discussion on strategies to mainstream the environment within the collaborative multi-year programming. At the institutional level, the organizations have been prioritizing the environmental concerns in their strategic plans either to reduce environmental footprints of emergency assistance or to integrate environment along with climate change, disaster risk management, or sustainable natural resource management aspects in development cooperation. The collaboration among organizations, governments, NGOs, civil society was evident in the studied organizations to launch joint initiatives, development of assessment tools or methodologies, experience sharing, or scaling up best practices. Regarding in-house operations, though only WFP and UNDP were found to be carbon neutral, there is increasing efforts to reduce in-house GHG emissions and adopt waste, water, and energy management practice in office premises of other organizations.

At the operational level, country programming documentation could be an entry point to examine the environmental mainstreaming efforts of organizations. The common areas of concern in the country plans of all organizations are climate-based adaptation, sustainable natural resource management, disaster risk reduction, and early preparedness. While the focus of the humanitarian organization found to be at the community level; the development organizations adopt the country capacity building and policy advocacy approach towards better environmental governance and climate change adaptation. Distinct environmental integration tools incorporating various environmental safeguards and frameworks have been developed in all organizations, although in most cases emergency operations are excluded from environmental compliance. Whereas, in the case of development organizations, rigorous environmental impact assessment is needed as part of project and funding approval. However, there is a humanitarian-development divide on monitoring and reporting mechanisms on environmental performance. While there is constant environment compliance monitoring and reporting throughout the life cycle of projects within development agencies; no proper environment compliance monitoring provisions and practice were found among humanitarian operations. There are also growing concerns on green procurement practices, including supply waste management through local food procurement, shortened supply chains, and reverse logistics. Concerning nexus programming, the environment should be included in the common country analysis to identify the environmental risks and associated vulnerabilities. The current environmental safeguards and standards of humanitarian and development actors along with the environmental impact assessment tools and methodologies can be adapted according to the applicability to specific contexts based on the joint working framework. Moreover, the framework should focus on building the capacity of government and institutions through policy and technical support to enhance resilience to environmental



hazards and associated climatic risks. This study, to a large extent, explores the current environment mainstreaming strategies within the humanitarian and development organizations, which can provide an overall picture to refer to during nexus programming. However, it does not examine the effectiveness of such strategies to the mainstream environment or identifies their pros and cons. Hence, future research work can evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies to provide a more comprehensive perspective on environmental mainstreaming.

#### **REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- American Red Cross and WWF. (2010a). Green response and recovery: Training toolkit for humanitarian aid. Retrieved April 10, 2020, from https://c402277.ssl.cfl.rackcdn.com /publications/1101/files/original/Combined\_GRRT.pdf?1507656721
- American Red Cross and WWF. (2010b). Green guide to environment impact assessment tools and techniques. Training Module. Retrieved April 10, 2020, from https://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/GRRT%203%20-%20Environmental %20Impact%20Assessment%20Tools%20and%20Techniques.pdf
- Barrett, E., Murfitt, S., & Venton, P. (2007). Mainstreaming the environment into humanitarian response: An exploration of opportunities and issues. London: DFID. Retrieved March 22, 2020, from https://postconflict.unep.ch/humanitarianaction/documents/01 01-03.pdf
- Beltrami, S. (2018). Rethinking packaging, reducing waste: What environmental sustainability means for the world's largest humanitarian organization. WFP Blog. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from World Food Programme Insight: https://insight.wfp.org/rethinking-packaging-reducing-waste-43be4a82eeff
- Brooke, R., & Kelly, C. (2015). Mainstreaming environment and climate change into humanitarian action. Topic Guide. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from http://dx.doi.org/10.12774/ acd.ta.iwna2015 humalwartal

eod\_tg.june2015.brookeretal

- Burch, S. (2010). Transforming barriers into enablers of action on climate change: Insights from three municipal case studies in British Columbia, Canada. *Global Environment Change*, 10, 287-297. Retrieved May 8, 2020, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.11.
- Cravito, A., Lantana, C. F., Lantagne, D. S., & Nair, G. B. (2011). *Final report of the independent panel of experts on the cholera outbreak in Haiti*. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Full Report 525.pdf
- Creswell, J., & Creswell, J. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches. London: Sage publications.
- Cue, W. (n.d.). Joint UNEP/OCHA environmental unit at environmental and humanitarian crossroads. Geneva: OCHA.
- Dalal-Clayton, B., & Bass, S. (2009). A guide to environmental mainstreaming. London: International Institute for environment and development. Retrieved March 25, 2020, from

https://www.environmentalmainstreaming.org/documents/Guide%20to%20EM%20(Part%201)%20DRAFT%2020%20Jan%2009).pdf

- DANIDA. (2017). The world 2030: Denmark's strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action. Copenhagen: Danish International Development Agency.
- DFID. (2013). *DFID environment guide: A guide to environmental screening*. London: Department for International Development.

- ELAW. (2008). Environmental impact assessment for Hugh Parkey's Belize Adventure Island (formerly Spanish Bay Resort). Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide. Retrieved March 25, 2020, from https://elaw.org/system/files/Hugh%20Parkey%20EIA.pdf
- Emergency capacity building project. (2007). Impact measurement and accountability in emergencies: The good enough guide. Oxford: Oxfam GB. Retrieved March 26, 2020, from https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/wp-content/uploads/ECB-Good-Enough-Guide\_0.pdf
- European Commission. (2006). Environment fact sheet: Industrial development. Retrieved<br/>MarchRetrieved<br/>from
- https://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/wssd/pdf/fs\_industrial\_development.pdf European Commission. (2016). *Buying Green! A handbook of green public procurement (3rd edition)*. Belgium: EU publication office.
- European Environment Agency. (2005). Environmental policy integration in Europe: State of play and an evaluation framework. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Union.
- Fanning, E., & Fullwood-Thomas, J. (2019). The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus: What does it mean for multi-mandated organizations? Oxford: Oxfam GB. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from http://hdl.handle.net/10546/620820
- FAO. (2016). Integrating Agriculture in National Adaptation Plans Programme (NAP-Ag): Safeguarding livelihoods and promoting resilience through National Adaptation Plans. Rome. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5038e.pdf
- FIPL. (2019). Final Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report: Development of 8 lanes (Greenfield Expressway) from Firozpur Jhirka (Ch. 79.394 Km) to Itawa (Ch. 284.000 Km). Retrieved May 19, 2020, from http://environmentclearance.nic.in/writereaddata/EIA /31012019DMPSMPVBFinalEIAReport.pdf
- GCF. (2020). *GCF Handbook: Decisions, Policies and Frameworks*. Incheon City: GCF. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/gcf-handbook.pdf
- Greening the Blue. (2019). *Greening the Blue*. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): https://www.greeningtheblue.org/what-the-un-is-doing/united-nations-development-programme-undp
- Holden, S. (2004). *Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in Development and Humanitarian Programmes.* Oxford: Oxfam Publishing.
- IASC. (2012). Guidance Note: Humanitarian Indicator Registry. Geneva: OCHA.
- IASC. (2014a). Overview of the progress of mainstreaming environment into humanitarian guidance and tools. Geneva: OCHA.
- IASC. (2014b). Strategic response planning guidance. Geneva: OCHA.
- IASC. (2015a). *IASC reference module for the implementation of humanitarian programme cycle.* Retrieved March 28, 2020, from https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system /files/hpc\_reference\_module\_2015\_final\_.pdf
- IASC. (2015b). Multi-sector initial raip assessment guidance. Geneva: OCHA.
- ICRC. (2012). Framework for Sustainable Development at the ICRC. Geneva: ICRC. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from http://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/2012/sustainable-development-icrcframework-2012.pdf
- ICRC. (2016). *Protracted conflict and humanitarian action: some recent ICRC experiences.* Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross.

- ICRC. (2016). Reference of Manufacturing Standards for Relief Items Production. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://www.icrc.org/en/document/referencemanufacturing-standards-relief-items-production
- ICRC. (2017). Biennial Report on Sustainable Development 2015-2016. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/sustainabledevelopment-icrc-2015-16.pdf
- IFRC and BRE. (2014). Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters: Guidance Manual 2014. Watford: BRE Global.
- IFRC and ICRC. (2008). Guidelines for Assessment in Emergencies. Geneva: IFRC.
- IFRC. (1994). The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NonGovernmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/disasters/code-of-conduct/code-english.pdf
- IFRC. (1999). Post-Emergency Rehabilitation Policy. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/07/postemergency-policy\_EN.pdf
- IFRC. (2003). Food Security and Nutrition Policy. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/07/food-securitypolicy EN.pdf
- IFRC. (2011a). *Project/Programme Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Guide*. Planning and Evaluation Department. Geneva: IFRC Secretariat.
- IFRC. (2011b). *IFRC Framework for Evaluation*. Planning and Evaluation Department. Geneva: IFRC Secretariat.
- IFRC. (2013). Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/policies-key-commitments/
- IFRC. (2015). International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Plan and Budget 2016-2020. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 8, 2020, from https://www.ifrc.org/Global

/Publications/general/IFRC\_Plan\_and%20Budget\_2016\_2020-EN.pdf

- IFRC. (2018). *Green Response Snapshot*. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018/08/Green-Response-Snapshot-March-2018.pdf
- IFRC. (2019a). Development of Strategy 2030 Adoption of the strategy. Geneva: IFRC.
- IFRC. (2019b). *IFRC Global Plan 2020*. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/document/ifrc-global-plan-2020/
- IFRC. (2019c). Green Response. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 9, 2020, from https://www.dgecho-partners-helpdesk.eu/\_media/ec2019/presentation\_gardestedt.pdf
- IFRC. (2019d). Environmental Field Advisor deployment in an Emergency Response Activity (Booklet). Geneva: IFRC.
- IFRC. (2019e). Annual Report 2018. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 11, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2019/08/IFRC-2018-Annual-Report.pdf
- IFRC. (2020). Ambitions to address the climate crisis: International Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. Geneva: IFRC. Retrieved April 12, 2020, from https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2020/02/Movement-Climate-Ambitions-2020-final.pdf
- IFRC. (n.d.). The Shelter Cluster- The shelter coordination team (SCT) (website). Retrieved<br/>April11,2020,from

61

https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/Shelter%20Coordination%20Team%20%28SCT%29.pdf

- Jerkins, B. (2016). From mitigation to sustainability: The evolution of incorporating environmental factors into development decisions in Australasia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 11(6), 920-929.
- JEU. (2014). Environment and humanitarian action: Increasing effectiveness, sustainability and accountability. Geneva: Joint UNEP/OCHA Environment Unit. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from

https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/EHA%20Study%20webfinal\_1.pdf

- JEU. (2014). Environment and Humanitarian action: Increasing effectiveness, sustainability and accountability. Geneva, Switzerland.
- JICA. (2010). Guidelines for environmental and social considerations. Tokyo: Japan International Cooperation Agency. Retrieved March 29, 2020, from https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our\_work /social environmental/guideline/pdf/guideline100326.pdf
- Kelly, C. (2013). Mainstreaming environment into humanitarian interventions A synopsis of key organizations, literature and experience. Retrieved March 22, 2020, from http://dx.doi.org/

10.12774/eod\_hd053.jul2013.kelly

- Klarin, T. (2018). The concept of sustainable development: From its beginning to the contemporary issues. Zagreb International Review of Economics & Business, 21(1), 67-94. doi:10.2478/zireb-2018-0005
- Kliest, T., & Singh, G. (2012). Review of the World Food Programme's Humanitarian and Development Effectiveness 2006-2011. OECD. Retrieved April 4, 2020, from https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/50540181.pdf
- Kliest, T., & Singh, G. (2012). Review of the World Food Programme's Humanitarian and Development Effectiveness 2006-2011. OECD. Retrieved April 4, 2020, from https://www.oecd.org/dac

/evaluation/dcdndep/50540181.pdf

- K'Oyooh, O. K. (2015). Environmental impact assessment project report for proposed construction of water and sanitation structure in Bengale, Tana North sub county, Tana River county. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/ngo-evaluations/2015 /environmental-impact-assessment-project-report-for-proposed-construction-of-waterand-sanitation-structures-in-bangale/
- Mainka, S. A., & McNeely, J. (2011). Ecosystem Considerations for Postdisaster Recovery: Lessons from China, Pakistan, and Elsewhere for Recovery Planning in Haiti. *Ecology and Society*, 16(1), 13. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss1/art13/
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. Forum: Qualitative content analysis, 1(2), Art. 20.
- Neefjes, K. (2000). *Environments and Livelihoods: Strategies for sustainability*. London: Oxfam publication.
- NESS. (2013). Environmental Impact Assessment Study of Kabeli 'A' Hydroelectric Project. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/314741468291671202 /pdf/E28360V70REV0P0Box379847B00PUBLIC0.pdf
- Nunan, F., Campbell, A., & Foster, E. (2012). Environmental Mainstreaming: the organizational challenges of policy integration. *Public Administration and Development*, 32, 262-277. doi:10.1002/pad.1624

Oberhofer, P., Blanco, E., & Craig, A. J. (2013). Carbon Efficiency of Humanitarian Supply Chains: Evidence from French Red Cross operations. *ESD Working Paper Series*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle

/1721.1/102968/esd-wp-2013-10.pdf?sequence=1

- OCHA. (2017). New Way of Working. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Retrieved February 12, 2020, from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files /NWOW%20Booklet%20low%20res.002\_0.pdf
- Ochoa, K. B., Harrison, L., Lyon, N., & Nordentoft, M. (2012). *Implications and* opportunities for Cash Transfer Programming in humanitarian response. Retrieved March 23, 2020, from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/cashenvironment\_-\_implications\_and opportunities%20%281%29.pdf
- OECD. (2014). Mainstreaming Cross-cutting Issues: 7 Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved May 8, 2020, from http://www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews/mainstreaming-cross-cutting-issues.htm
- OECD. (2020). DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus. OECD. Retrieved March 20, 2020, from https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/643/643.en.pdf
- Oroda, A. S. (2015). The environmental and social impact assessment and the environmental and social management plan (ESMP) report for the Gambia agriultural value chain development project (AVCDP). African Development Bank Group.
- Overseas Environmental Cooperation Center. (2000). Environmental Impact Assessment for International Cooperation: Furthering the Understanding of Environment Impact Assessment Systems for Experts Engaged in International Cooperation Activities. Japan: Environment Agency.
- PAGE Secretariat. (2020). A New Decade of Action: Accelerating a Fair and Green Economic Transformation. Geneva: PAGE. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from https://www.un-page.org/files/public/page\_brochure\_final\_mar\_20\_web.pdf
- Palinkas, L., Horwitz, S., Green, C., Wishdom, J., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and policy in mental health*, 42(5), 533-544.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: integrating theory and practice (Fourth Edition)*. California : SAGE publications.
- Pelling, M., High, C., Dearing, J., & Smith, D. (2008). Shadow spaces for social learning: a relational understanding of adaptive capacity to climate change within organisations. *Environment and Planning*, 40, 867-884. doi:10.1068/a39148
- Perret, L. (2019). Operationalizing the Humanitarian–Development–Peace Nexus: Lessons learned from Colombia, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia and Turkey. Geneva: IOM. Retrieved Februaru 12, 2020, from https://publications.iom.int/fr/system/files/pdf/operationalizing hdpn.pdf
- Roberts, D., & O'Donoghue, S. (2013). Urban environmental challenges and climate change action in Durban, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanization*, 25(2), 299-319. doi:10.1177/0956247813500904
- SIDA. (2002). *Guidelines for the review of environmental impact assessments*. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. Retrieved March 28, 2020,

from

.pdf

https://www.sida.se/contentassets/e1a8301ff0b74e7da37f5a1e67d4ddb8/13060.pdf

- Sitas, N., Prozesky, H. E., Esler, K., & Reyers, B. (2014). Exploring the Gap between Ecosystem Service Research and Management in Development Planning. *Sustainability*, 6, 3802-3824. doi:10.3390/su6063802
- Sphere Association. (2018). *The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response*. Geneva: Sphere Association. Retrieved March 29, 2020, from www.spherestandards.org/handbook
- Sphere Association. (2018). The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. Geneva: Sphere. Retrieved April 11, 2020, from https://www.spherestandards.org/handbook/
- Srinivas, H., & Nakagawa, Y. (2008). Environmental implications for disaster preparedness: Lessons learned from the Indian Ocean tsunami. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 89(1), 4-13. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2007.01.054
- UN Environment. (2019). Greening the Blue Report 2019: The UN System's Environmental Footprints and Efforts to Reduce it (website). UN Environment. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from http://greeningtheblue.org/sites/default/files/GreeningtheBlue2019.pdf
- UN. (2012). A Framework for Advancing Environmental and Social Sustainability in the United Nations System. Geneva: Environment Management Group. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2738sustainabilityfinalweb-
- UN. (2012). *Powering Agriculture: An Energy Grand Challenge for Development*. Retrieved April 23, 2020, from UNSDGs Partnership Platform: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership /?p=949
- UN. (2014). Choiseul Integrated Climate Change Programme (CHICCHAP) (website). Retrieved April 23, 2020, from UNSDGs Partnership Platform: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=7540
- UN. (2015). Conservation Finance Product Development (website). Retrieved April 23, 2020, from UNSDGs Partnership Platform: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=10929
- UN. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. New York: UN.
- UNDP and GEF. (2019). The GEF Small Grants Programme Annual Monitoring Report 2018-2019. New York: GEF. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from https://sgp.undp.org/innovation-library/item/1986-the-gef-small-grants-programmeresults-report-2018---2019.html
- UNDP and UNEP. (2016). The Poverty-Environment Initiative in the Context of the Sustainable Development Goals: Relevance and Experience for National and Subnational Implementation. Nairobi: UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/sust ainable%20land%20management/Factsheet-PEI.pdf
- UNDP, FAO and UNEP. (2015). UN-REDD Programme Strategic Framework 2016-2020 Revised Draft. UN-REDD programme. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\_docman&view=document&alias=140 96-un-redd-pb14-2015-strategic-framework&category\_slug=session-3-strategic-andpolicy-issues&Itemid=134

- UNDP. (2008a). Environmental Procurement: practice Guide Volume I. Procurement Support Office. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from https://www.greeningtheblue.org/sites/default/files /UNDP-Environmental%20procurement 0.pdf
- UNDP. (2008b). Mainstreaming Drylands Issues in National Development Frameworks: Generic Guidelines and Lessons Learnt. Nairobi: Drylands Development Centre. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy /sustainable%20land%20management/GUIDE%20english%20final.pdf
- UNDP. (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.* New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from http://www.undp.org/eo/handbook
- UNDP. (2011). Practitioner's Guide: Capacity Development for Environmental Sustainability. Bureau for Development Policy. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/dam/aplaws/publication/en/publications/environmentenergy/www-ee-

library/mainstreaming/cdes/UNDP%20Practitioner's%20GuideWEB.pdf

- UNDP. (2012). *Environmental and social screening procedure for UNDP projects*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- UNDP. (2012a). *Strategy for Working with the Private Sector*. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Partnerships /Private%20Sector/UNDP-Private-Sector-Strategy-final-draft-2012.pdf
- UNDP. (2012b). Mainstreaming Climate Change in National Development Processes and UN Country Programming: A guide to assist UN Country Teams in integrating climate change risks and opportunities. Environment and Energy Group. New York: UNDP.
- UNDP. (2013). *The UNDP Supplier Code of Conduct*. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/dam/cambodia/docs/Operations/UNDP%20Supplier%2 0Code%20of%20Conduct updated.pdf
- UNDP. (2014a). United Nations Development Programme- Social and Environmental Standards. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home

/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-standards/

UNDP. (2014b). Investigation Guidelines: Social and Environmental Compliance Unit. Office of Audit and Investigations. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from http://www.undp.org

/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Social-and-Environmental-Policies-and-Procedures

/SECU%20Final%20approved%20Investigation%20Guidelines%20and%20SOPs.pdf UNDP. (2015). UNDP Procurement Strategy 2015-2017. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/sweden/Procurement%20Strategy%20Final%20Jul y

%201%202015.pdf

UNDP. (2016a). Delivering Sustainable Energy on Changing Climate: Strategy Note on Sustainable Energy 2017-2021. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from https://www.undp.org

/content/dam/undp/library/Climate%20and%20Disaster%20Resilience/UNDP%20En ergy%20Strategy%202017-2021.pdf

- UNDP. (2016b). Social and Environmental Screening Procedure. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Social-and-Environmental-Policies-and-Procedures/UNDP-Social-Environmental-Screening-Procedure-1January2015.pdf
- UNDP. (2016c). Guidance Note UNDP Social and Environmental Standards: Social and Environmental Assessment and Management. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from

https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES\_Toolkit/SES%20Document%20Library/Uploade d%20October%202016/Final%20UNDP%20SES%20Assessment%20and%20Manag ement%20GN%20-%20Dec2016.pdf

- UNDP. (2017a). UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from https://undocs.org/DP/2017/38
- UNDP. (2018). *Procurement Methods*. Procurement Support Office. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 16, 2020, from https://popp.undp.org/UNDP\_POPP\_DOCUMENT\_LIBRARY/Public /PSU\_Procurement%20Methods\_Procurement%20Methods.docx?web=1
- UNDP. (2019). UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. Independent Evaluation Office. New York: UNDP. Retrieved April 17, 2020, from http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents /PDF/UNDP\_Evaluation\_Guidelines.pdf
- UNDP. (2020). Environmentally Sustainable Operations. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from UNDP Accountability: https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/accountability/social-and-

environmental-responsibility/sustainable-operations.html

- UNEP. (2008). Destitution, distortion, and deforestation: The impact of the conflict on the timber and the woodfuel trade in Darfur. Geneva: UNEP. Retrieved May 2019, 2020, from https://postconflict.unep.ch/publications/darfur\_timber.pdf
- UNHCR. (2005). UNHCR Environmental Guidelines. Geneva: UNHCR.
- UNSDG. (2019). United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF). New York: UNSDG. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/UN-Cooperation-Framework-Internal-Guidance-Final-June-2019\_1.pdf
- USAID. (2013a). ADS Chapter 204 Environmental Procedures. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/204.pdf
- USAID. (2013b). The Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring Plan (EMMP). USAID. Retrieved April 22, 2020
- USAID. (2013c). ADS Chapter 528 Energy Management and Planning Program for USAID Buildings. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/528.pdf
- USAID. (2014). ADS Chapter 533 Purchasing for USAID's Overseas Activities. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 23, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/533.pdf
- USAID. (2017a). Green Infrastructure Resource Guide. Washington: USAID.
- USAID. (2017b). USAID Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan Summary. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/07/24/document\_cw\_01.pdf

USAID. (2018). Regulation 216: Processes and Documentation. Global Environment Management Support. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites

/default/files/documents/1860/Session3Presentation.pdf

USAID. (2019a). USAID Policy Framework: Ending the Need for Foreign Assistance. Washington DC: U.S. Agency for International Development. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from

https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/WEB\_PF\_Full\_Report\_FI NAL\_10Apr2019.pdf

- USAID. (2019b). Environmental and Natural Resource Management Framework. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865 /USAID ENRM FRAMEWORK.pdf
- USAID. (2019c). Process for Developing and Approving a Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) - A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 201. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/201mag.pdf
- USAID. (2019d). ADS Chapter 300 Agency Acquisition and Assistance (A&A) Planning. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 23, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files /documents/1868/300.pdf
- USAID. (2020a). ADS Chapter 201- Program Cycle Operational Policy. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/201.pdf
- USAID. (2020b). Sector Environment Guidelines and Resources. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from USAID: https://www.usaid.gov/environmental-procedures/sectoralenvironmental-social-best-practices/sector-environmental-guidelines-resources
- USAID. (2020c). ADS Chapter 302: USAID Direct Contracting. Washington: USAID. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/302.pdf
- USAID. (n.d.). USAID Public-Private Partnerships Database (website). Retrieved April 23, 2020, from https://partnerships.usaid.gov/home
- Wamsler, C. (2014). Critical Introductions to Urbanism and the City: Cities, Disaster Risk and Adaptation. London: Routledge.
- Wamsler, C., Luederitz, C., & Brink, E. (2014). Local levers for change: Mainstreaming ecosystem-based adaptation into municipal planning to foster sustainability transitions. *Global Environmental Change*, 29, 189-201.
- Weimer, D., & Vining, A. (2017). *Policy analysis: concepts and practice*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Weinthal, E., Troell, J. J., & Nakayama, M. (2014). Water and post-conflict peacebuilding. London: Routledge. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849775809
- WFP. (2012a). WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management: Building Food Security and Resilience. Policy, Planning, and Strategy Division. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2012b). *WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy*. Policy, Planning, and Strategy Division. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2012c). Emergency Preparedness and Response Package. Emergency Preparedness and Response branch. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups /public/documents/resources/wfp251892.pdf

- WFP. (2015). *Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition*. Policy and Programme Division. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2016a). WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2016b). Quick Guide to Greening WFP. Environmental Sustainability Unit. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents /d0101eaee3964621aa4fb33c54196f86/download/
- WFP. (2016c). Environmental Management at WFP (Booklet). Environmental Sustainability Unit. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents /306174a7dd814562be089f5abead98d5/download/
- WFP. (2017a). Environmental Policy. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2017b). WFP's Climate Change Policy. Policy and Programme division. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2017c). WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2017d). Ecuador Country Strategic Plan (2017–2021). Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2017e). Emergency preparedness policy: Strengthening WFP emergency preparedness for effective response. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api
- /documents/WFP-0000050509/download/ WFP. (2018a). *Nepal country strategic plan (2019–2023)*. Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2018a). Kenya country strategic plan (2019–2023). Rome: WFP. (2018b). Kenya country strategic plan (2018–2023). Rome: WFP.
- WFP. (2018c). WFP Environmental Policy Update to the Executive Board. Policy and Program Division, Rome. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents /3chbd02f7th4f9da46bda74b3c91a0b/download/
  - /3cbbd02f2fb44f9da46bdc74b3c91a0b/download/
- WFP. (2018d). *Revised Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021)*. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000099356/download/
- WFP. (2019a). Annual performance report for 2018. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 5, 2020, from https://www.wfp.org/publications/annual-performance-report-2018
- WFP. (2019b). *Nepal Annual Country Report 2018*. Nepal: WFP. Retrieved April 4, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000104287/download/
- WFP. (2019c). *Kenya Annual Country Report 2018*. Kenya: WFP. Retrieved April 4, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000104194/download/
- WFP. (2019d). *Ecuador Annual Country Report 2018*. Ecuador: WFP. Retrieved April 4, 2020, from https://it.wfp.org/operations/annual-country-report?operation id=EC01&year=2018#/12488
- WFP. (2019e). Food Procurement Factsheet. Rome: WFP. Retrieved April 6, 2020, from https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP0000110514/download/?\_ga=2.239627716.6 56829510.1585743044-1228897524.1570646091

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods (sixth edition)*. California: SAGE publication.