

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

CONTINGENT EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROJECT

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

JULY 2026

1. Overview

1.1. Context and Purpose

The Contingent Emergency Response Project (CERP) is a portfolio-level emergency financing mechanism designed to support a rapid response to an eligible crisis or emergency using available resources from eligible World Bank-financed Investment Project Financing operations. The CERP may operate for up to six years and may be activated more than once; each activation is expected to be time-bound and normally not exceed 12 months. Further details on activation, eligible expenditures and implementation arrangements are set out in the CERP Manual and Project Paper.

This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) sets out proportionate arrangements for stakeholder engagement, information disclosure and grievance management in accordance with the World Bank Environmental and Social Framework (ESF), with primary emphasis on ESS10. Because the CERP is an emergency instrument, direct engagement by the CERP Project will focus mainly on Government and institutional stakeholders responsible for readiness, activation and implementation. Public and beneficiary information will be delivered through existing national, state and sector emergency systems rather than through a parallel CERP consultation structure.

Detailed project content—including component descriptions, eligible activities and the Government Positive List, indicative host operations, disbursement arrangements, and detailed implementation arrangements—is set out in the CERP Manual, Project Paper and related Government project documentation and is not repeated in this SEP. This avoids duplication and maintenance risk if project arrangements change. The SEP therefore focuses on the ESS10 responsibilities and stakeholder engagement, information dissemination, disclosure and grievance arrangements for which the CERP Project is directly responsible.

1.2. SEP Implementation Arrangements

The Department of Finance and Administration (DOFA) is the implementing agency and the Central Implementation Unit (CIU) is the operational CERP-PIU. For this SEP, the CERP-CIU will coordinate institutional stakeholder engagement, project-document disclosure, grievance mechanism oversight, recordkeeping and reporting. The CERP-PIU is staffed with full-time E&S, financial management, and procurement specialists experienced in WB policies and procedures. The CERP-PIU will be responsible for day-to-day management of the CERP, facilitating the implementation of CERP activities, including coordination with relevant government departments, procurement, financial management, ensuring environmental and social compliance, as well as monitoring, reporting and evaluation.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will provide strategic oversight, and the Technical Working Group (TWG) will lead technical coordination across ministries and agencies. Relevant line ministries/departments, state governments, utilities and service providers will participate according to the activities proposed for activation. Detailed project implementation arrangements remain in the Project Paper and CERP Manual.

The CERP Project will not establish a parallel system for community-level consultations or public information. Responsible national, state and sector agencies will use existing emergency communication, service-delivery and stakeholder channels. Before each activation, the CERP-PIU will confirm applicable operating procedures, disclosure and grievance routes, and any ESS10 gaps requiring proportionate strengthening.

The objective of this SEP is to ensure that CERP stakeholder engagement is timely, proportionate to emergency conditions, transparent, adequately documented and consistent with ESS10 without delaying urgent response actions. Specifically, the SEP aims to: (i) identify the institutional stakeholders with whom the CERP Project will directly engage; (ii) define practical arrangements for engagement during readiness, activation and

implementation; (iii) disclose CERP project-specific documents and reports; (iv) leverage accessible grievance and referral mechanisms; and (v) support transparent coordination and accountability. Affected people, outer-island communities and disadvantaged or vulnerable groups remain important stakeholders of the emergency response, but information and engagement with these groups will be undertaken through existing country, state and sector systems rather than direct CERP consultations. This SEP represents a living document and will be updated as needed during project implementation.

2. Legal, Policy, and Institutional Framework for Stakeholder Engagement

This SEP is based mainly on the World Bank ESF, particularly ESS10 on stakeholder engagement and information disclosure. It is also informed by ESS1 for risk identification and management, ESS2 for labor and worker engagement, ESS4 for community health and safety, and ESS5 where temporary land use, access restriction, livelihoods, or temporary use of public/community spaces may arise during an emergency intervention.

The CERP preparation material highlights the flexibilities available for urgent situations and capacity constraints. These flexibilities support simplified preparation and rapid activation but do not reduce the need for proportionate consultation, disclosure, grievance handling, social risk management, E&S monitoring, or accountability.

In its national application, stakeholder engagement under the CERP must be sensitive to FSM's federal and state governance structure, state autonomy in service delivery, customary and traditional leadership where applicable, and the practical need to operate through national and state systems rather than establishing parallel systems during emergencies. Engagement will therefore involve DOFA/CIU, sector ministries/departments, state governments, municipalities, utilities, service providers, local leadership, churches, community organizations, and affected communities depending on the scope of the response.

3. Stakeholder Identification

3.1. Project-Affected Parties

The stakeholder groups relevant to CERP vary by the type and location of each emergency. For the CERP Project itself, the principal direct stakeholders are the Government institutions and operational entities responsible for deciding, coordinating and implementing an activation. These include DOFA/CIU, PSC/TWG members, line ministries/departments, state governments, emergency coordination bodies, utilities, service providers and relevant project implementation units. Parties affected by the CERP are detailed below in Table 1.

Stakeholder group	Why they matter	Engagement approach
Affected households and individuals	Primary intended beneficiaries of emergency support or essential services.	Public notices, radio, SMS/phone trees, municipal meetings, state focal points and grievance channels.
Users of essential services (health, water, schools, shelters, electricity, public safety)	May be affected by service disruption or benefit from continuity measures.	Targeted coordination through facilities, public advisories, utility notices and service-specific communication.
Women, female-headed households, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, youth and remote island residents	Higher risk of exclusion, mobility barriers and lower access to information or complaint channels.	Targeted outreach through health, social welfare, women's groups, churches, disability networks and local leaders.
Workers engaged in cash-for-work, debris removal, distribution, logistics or emergency response	May face occupational, labor, payment, safety or conduct issues.	Worker induction, notice boards, payroll disclosure, labor grievance mechanism and code of conduct.
Communities hosting temporary storage, distribution points, community kitchens, shelters or equipment deployment	May experience crowding, traffic, nuisance, noise, safety risks or temporary access disruption.	Site-specific notifications, meetings, complaint registers and local focal points.

Table 1 Project-affected parties and engagement approaches

3.2. Direct and Indirect Stakeholder Groups

Direct engagement by the CERP Project will be with the institutional stakeholders identified above. Indirect stakeholders include traditional and community leaders, outer-island communities, affected households and service users, and disadvantaged or vulnerable groups. These groups will receive information, raise concerns and participate through existing national, state, municipal, customary and sector emergency mechanisms operated by the responsible agencies. The CIU will not duplicate these systems but will coordinate with responsible institutions where an activation identifies a material ESS10 gap. The division of engagement responsibility is summarized in Table 2.

Stakeholder group	Relationship to CERP	CERP Project engagement	Public / beneficiary interface
DOFA / CIU	Direct	Lead SEP implementation, readiness and activation coordination, project-document disclosure, GRM oversight, recordkeeping and reporting.	CIU coordinates with responsible agencies; it does not create a parallel public information system.
PSC / TWG	Direct	Provide strategic oversight, technical review, activation coordination and resolution of cross-agency issues.	Not normally public-facing; any communication follows approved Government arrangements.
National ministries / departments and relevant PIUs	Direct when their sector or activity is proposed	Confirm roles, focal points, applicable procedures, operational constraints, E&S requirements and grievance routes.	Use existing sector and emergency communication channels and, where functional, existing PIU or agency GRMs for first-line complaints; refer CERP-wide or unresolved matters to CIU.
State governments and disaster coordination structures	Direct institutional engagement	Support activation-specific coordination, state focal-point confirmation and alignment with state emergency arrangements.	Use existing state, municipal and emergency channels for community-facing information.
Utilities and service providers	Direct when relevant to an activation	Coordinate service continuity, operational responsibilities, existing complaint channels and disclosure routes.	Use existing utility or service-provider channels for customers and affected users.
Traditional / community leaders and outer-island representatives	Indirect; engaged through responsible systems	The CERP Project will not establish parallel community consultations; CIU may coordinate with responsible agencies where needed to confirm accessible routes.	Existing state, municipal, customary and emergency channels.
Affected people and disadvantaged or vulnerable groups	Indirect	No separate CERP consultation structure; CIU confirms responsible focal points, accessible channels and any ESS10 gaps requiring proportionate strengthening.	Existing country, state and sector systems, with targeted accessibility measures by responsible agencies.

Table 2 CERP stakeholder groups and engagement responsibility

3.3. Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Individuals or Groups

CERP is expected to have an overall positive impact on targeted communities, however, disadvantaged and vulnerable individuals or groups may still face barriers to access, participation, information, or grievance channels. This could involve women and girls, female-headed families, elderly people, persons with disabilities, persons with chronic illnesses, young people, residents of remote islands, low-income households, people experiencing food and/or energy insecurity, informal economy participants, and socially marginalized people because of language, mobility, or cultural factors. The CERP-PIU will not directly consult vulnerable groups, but will need to confirm before activation that responsible systems include accessible information and grievance routes for these groups. These groups should receive targeted information on the nature of CERP activities, anticipated benefits and risks, and available grievance channels through existing channels for emergency support activities established by the relevant Ministries and agencies.

4. Stakeholder Engagement Program

4.1. Previous consultations undertaken

Given the nature of the CERP as an emergency preparedness and response instrument, stakeholder engagement during project preparation has, to date, focused primarily on national level institutional stakeholders rather than community-level consultations. This is due to the emergency nature of the project which focuses on readiness to respond promptly to eligible crises. Preliminary consultations were undertaken virtually between April and July 2026. These meetings served as the principal institutional consultation platform for discussion of the positive list, implementation arrangements, activation requirements, environmental and social documentation, and the respective roles of key government agencies and technical stakeholders. Details of some of the meetings held are provided at Table 4 below.

Discussions during project preparation focused on: (i) whether the proposed positive-list activities were appropriate to the FSM context, including the ongoing fuel crisis and possible future crises such as typhoons and service disruptions; (ii) the proposed implementation arrangement through DOFA and the CIU, with strategic oversight through a PSC and technical coordination through a TWG; (iii) the documentation and procedural requirements for CERP activation, including the Government request, Crisis Response Plan, list of host operations, and disclosure of ESCP and SEP; and (iv) the indicative institutional roles of sector agencies, state governments, utilities, and service providers in the delivery of CERP-financed goods and services.

Date of consultation	Stakeholders engaged	Key issues discussed	Outcomes relevant to the SEP
22 April 2026	World Bank team; FSM counterparts; DOFA/CIU; DECEM; DR&D; DTC&I; DoJ; and other relevant agencies identified in the preparation materials.	Introduction to the CERP; appropriateness of the proposed positive list for FSM; quick-disbursing expenditures for the ongoing fuel crisis and future emergencies; implementation arrangements; activation requirements; and required CERP documents, including ESCP, SEP, ESMP and CERP Manual.	Confirmed the CERP as a portfolio-wide instrument for FSM; confirmed that the SEP and ESMP would be required as part of preparation; identified DOFA/CIU as preferred implementation arrangement; identified main institutional stakeholders for oversight, delivery, disclosure and grievance handling.
29 April 2026	World Bank team; working group members; DOFA/CIU; DECEM; DR&D; DoJ; and other participating government stakeholders.	Update on preparation of the Project Paper; agency inputs on the positive list, host operations, implementation arrangements and legal actions; confirmation of CIU inputs on fiduciary management, E&S, and M&E; and discussion of next steps.	Confirmed working positive-list priorities later superseded by the 06 May 2026 confirmed Positive List; refined indicative governance structure and agency responsibilities; provided basis for updating stakeholder mapping and disclosure priorities.
06 May 2026	GoFSM and World Bank confirmation through Positive List document.	Final confirmation of eligible expenditure lines under Components 1, 2 and 3.	Replaced pending/working assumptions in this SEP with the confirmed Positive List and updated stakeholder implications accordingly.

Table 3 Summary of preparation-stage stakeholder engagement

This SEP records the April 2026 preparation meetings and the 06 May 2026 positive-list confirmation as core preparation inputs, while recognizing that additional consultations will be required at activation depending on the geography and type of emergency.

Engagement measures in this SEP have been kept concise and focused on issues directly relevant to the Positive List which will be implemented through the CERP project. Activation specific communication should rely first on existing FSM country and state systems for disaster management, fuel, waste management, cash or payment systems, public information and essential-service continuity, with specific gap-filling measures identified only where existing systems are not adequate for the particular crisis.

Engagement should be realistic for emergency conditions and should not delay urgent response activities. Existing national systems must provide affected people with clear information and accessible channels to ask questions, raise concerns, and seek remedy.

4.2. Project Implementation/Activation

Project-level stakeholder engagement will focus on relevant national ministries and other relevant stakeholders on project design, implementation and activation. Table 4 below outlines the stakeholder engagement that the project will undertake by phase during implementation and activation.

Phase / timing	CERP purpose	CERP-led engagement	Lead / support
Preparation / before approval	Confirm SEP scope, institutional arrangements and project-document requirements.	Institutional meetings; review of SEP, ESMP, ESCP and CERP Manual; confirmation of responsibilities and key contacts.	DOFA / CIU with World Bank and participating agencies.
Readiness / no activation	Maintain preparedness and current institutional contact and GRM arrangements.	Periodic readiness coordination; update focal points; review communication and grievance mapping, current contacts and relevant SOPs or emergency protocols.	CIU with PSC / TWG and relevant agencies.
Activation decision	Confirm who is responsible for proposed activities and how ESS10 will be applied.	Activation-specific coordination on roles, applicable procedures, project-document disclosure, dissemination routes, first-line grievance channels, CIU fallback/escalation and any ESS10 gaps.	DOFA / CIU with PSC / TWG, states and responsible sector entities.
Implementation / coordination	Maintain institutional coordination without duplicating operational public engagement.	Targeted technical meetings; action tracking; coordination on CERP-related grievances and issues requiring escalation.	CIU with responsible ministries, states, utilities, service providers and relevant PIUs.
Closure	Close the feedback loop and record lessons.	Institutional closure review; status of CERP-related grievances; unresolved actions; lessons for future activations.	DOFA / CIU with PSC / TWG and responsible agencies.
Post-activation readiness update	Strengthen future readiness.	Update focal points, applicable procedures, GRM / referral routes and this SEP where needed, based on documented lessons.	CIU with relevant institutional stakeholders.

Table 4 CERP-led institutional engagement by phase.

Direct CERP engagement will be limited to institutional activities required for readiness, activation, implementation coordination and closure: meetings with DOFA/CIU, PSC/TWG, relevant ministries and departments, state governments, utilities, service providers, participating PIUs and other implementation entities; technical consultations on proposed activities and applicable procedures; coordination of project-document disclosure; review of communication and grievance routes; GRM oversight and escalation; and follow-up of material implementation issues.

The CERP Project will not conduct separate consultations or public information campaigns with affected persons or beneficiaries. Those engagements remain the responsibility of the relevant institutions and service-delivery entities under existing emergency and sector arrangements and existing systems to communicate information regarding activities activated to affected populations, including vulnerable groups and other interested parties, will be followed. The CIU will confirm, for each activation, that these systems provide timely, accessible information and grievance routes consistent with ESS10, and will agree proportionate gap-filling where needed.

During emergencies, public information will be disseminated through the existing disaster management communication framework established under the FSM National Disaster Management Plan and national Standard Operating Procedures for emergency and disaster response. Information will be coordinated through DECEM, the National Disaster Committee, National and State Emergency Operations Centres, State Disaster Committees, municipal authorities and community-level structures. Where telecommunications services are disrupted or unavailable, responsible agencies will utilise alternative state, municipal and community communication channels to ensure affected populations, including outer-island communities, receive timely

information regarding emergency assistance, eligibility criteria, grievance mechanisms and available support services.

If Component 1 cash transfers are proposed for activation, the Government will need to establish acceptable delivery, communication and grievance arrangements before implementation. These arrangements should be documented in the CERP Manual or activation-specific procedures and must meet ESS10 requirements.

4.3. Institutional Responsibilities Matrix

Institution / actor	Primary stakeholder engagement role	Minimum accountability	Reporting line
DOFA	Overall policy oversight and government-facing decisions on disclosure and engagement standards.	Ensure stakeholder engagement remains aligned with national policy and emergency decision-making.	Government / World Bank.
CIU (CERP-PIU)	Day-to-day implementation of SEP, disclosure, grievance handling oversight, reporting and readiness updates.	Maintain records, coordinate state focal points, ensure activation-specific engagement actions are issued.	DOFA / PSC.
PSC	Strategic oversight and approval of key activation decisions.	Review major issues, unresolved grievances with policy implications, and engagement performance summaries.	Government / DOFA.
TWG	Technical coordination, sector validation, rapid problem-solving and operational support.	Ensure activity-specific communication and engagement measures are feasible and implemented.	PSC / DOFA / CIU.
State governments and state focal points	State-level disclosure, local coordination, complaint intake, and liaison with affected communities.	Ensure information reaches local stakeholders and vulnerable groups; maintain local issue logs.	CIU / relevant state authority.
Line ministries and delivery agencies	Activity-specific implementation and technical communication.	Disclose operational details, schedules, eligibility rules, safety requirements and points of contact.	TWG / CIU.
Utilities and service providers	Service-continuity communication and operational delivery.	Communicate essential-service priorities, service limitations, duration and complaint routes.	Relevant line agency / CIU.
Contractors, consultants and suppliers	Public-facing conduct, site notices, worker engagement and compliance with codes of conduct.	Implement relevant SEP, LMP, ESMP and GRM requirements in contracts.	CIU / line agency.

Table 5 Institutional responsibilities for stakeholder engagement

5. Information Disclosure

The Government of FSM commits to disclosing the following project documents:

- The CERP Manual (including all annexes) on the Department of Finance and Administration website, and the World Bank project page
- The Crisis Response Plan (CRP) for each activation, prior to activation approval
- Semiannual progress reports.

6. Grievance Mechanism and SEA/SH-sensitive Complaints Handling

The CERP will use the DOFA/CIU portfolio-wide grievance mechanism as the central project-level intake, fallback, oversight and tracking route, together with existing grievance or complaint systems of participating PIUs, responsible agencies, utilities, payment systems and service providers. CERP-specific, cross-agency, systemic or unresolved complaints—and any complaints received directly by DOFA/CIU—will be logged and tracked through the CIU portfolio-wide system, screened for relevance and sensitivity, referred to the responsible entity and followed through to resolution or closure, and escalated where necessary. Before each activation, the CIU will confirm the designated CERP/portfolio GRM focal point and current contact and referral details. A project-specific GRM will not be established for the CERP.

Where cash transfers are activated, mechanisms to enable the update and resolution of grievances related to cash transfers will need to be outlined in the CERP Manual for payment-related queries and complaints, in line with ESS10 principles. Unresolved, systemic or CERP-wide issues will be referred to the DOFA/CIU portfolio-wide GRM for tracking, coordination, and escalation

For other activity-specific grievances, the first-line channel will be the existing GRM or complaint mechanism of the responsible ministry or agency, participating PIU, utility or service provider where that channel is functional and accessible. A participating PIU GRM may therefore be used for complaints arising from an activity it implements, while the DOFA/CIU portfolio-wide GRM remains the fallback and escalation/tracking route for CERP-related matters.

For each activation, the CIU will review the applicable protocols, SOPs and reference documents through the mapping process in Section 5, assess accessibility, transparency and accountability against ESS10, and agree on proportionate strengthening where needed. CERP-related cases referred from other systems will be recorded or summarized in CIU tracking using only the minimum necessary information and appropriate confidentiality safeguards.

6.1. Entry Points

Recognizing that connectivity, literacy, mobility, and remoteness differ throughout FSM, stakeholders can provide their grievances in a variety of channels. Points of entry will be:

- (i) appointed national and state focal points, by telephone, SMS, email and in person;
- (ii) the DOFA/CIU grievance channels, such as the corresponding webpage, email, QR-code-enabled complaint access, or any contact details specific to activation disclosed under the CERP Manual;
- (iii) referrals via municipal and community leaders, churches, clinics, social assistance offices or other known community structures; and
- (iv) the independent worker grievance program which is provided by the labor management procedures regarding complaints made by workers.

To facilitate easy access, the grievance information shall be made available in plain language and where possible through a combination of different channels such as public notice, radio, mobile communication, churches, community notice boards, and focal point briefings. Special consideration will be given to providing access to women, older adults, persons with disabilities, low-literacy families, and remote island communities.

GRM entry points will be aligned with the grievance handling procedure and may include state offices, PIU/CIU focal points, the DOFA grievance portal, the FSM-GRS short link, complaintsWB@gov.fm, feedbackWB@gov.fm, QR-code-enabled complaint access, telephone or in-person reporting, and activation-specific focal points. For outer islands where communication networks are down, grievances may be lodged through trained state or municipal focal points, local leaders, churches, clinics or other agreed community structures. These actors should record the complaint in a simple hard-copy log and transmit it to the responsible GRM focal point as soon as communication is restored. Local and community focal points will act as intake and referral points only and should receive a brief orientation on confidentiality, non-retaliation, escalation routes, recordkeeping and SEA/SH-sensitive handling.

If local leaders, churches, clinics, schools or municipal focal points are used as grievance intake points, they should receive a short orientation before or immediately after activation. The orientation should cover complaint recording, confidentiality, non-retaliation, escalation to the formal GRM, and the requirement that SEA/SH complaints must not be handled through community resolution.

6.2. GRM Process and Escalation Hierarchy

The GRM shall follow a clear and documented process, including receipt and registration of complaints, screening and categorization, acknowledgment, review and resolution, escalation where necessary, and closure following action or reasoned response. Urgent complaints involving life, health, safety, exclusion from emergency support, or severe service disruption shall be prioritized for immediate action. Non-project-related complaints shall, where appropriate, be referred to the relevant authority, with such referral recorded.

Step	Action	Indicative service standard	Responsible entity
1. Receipt and registration	Receive a complaint through the disclosed first-line channel (responsible agency, PIU or service provider) or through the DOFA/CIU portfolio-wide GRM; record the minimum necessary details and route CERP-related matters to CIU tracking.	Receipt same day where feasible; registration within 2 working days where feasible.	First-line receiving entity; DOFA/CIU portfolio GRM focal point for direct, fallback, cross-agency, systemic or escalated CERP matters.
2. Screening and sensitivity check	Confirm CERP relevance, urgency, responsible entity and whether a confidential SEA/SH or other sensitive referral pathway is required.	Within 2 working days where feasible; immediately for urgent or sensitive cases.	CIU grievance / safeguards focal point.
3. Acknowledgment and referral	Acknowledge receipt where contact details are available, assign or refer the case, and protect confidentiality.	Within 2 working days where feasible.	CIU, in coordination with the responsible agency or service provider.
4. Review and action	Review the issue, seek relevant facts and undertake corrective action or provide a reasoned response; systemic issues are flagged for escalation.	Within 10 working days where feasible; provide an update if more time is required.	Responsible agency / service provider with CIU oversight and tracking.
5. Response and escalation	Communicate the outcome through an appropriate channel; escalate unresolved or systemic CERP issues through CIU / DOFA and, where appropriate, TWG or PSC.	As soon as the review is complete; urgent matters remain subject to immediate escalation.	CIU and responsible entity.
6. Closure and learning	Record the action and status, close the case after response or reasoned decision, and use non-identifying trends to inform corrective action and future readiness.	After action or reasoned response; trend review through routine CERP reporting.	CIU grievance focal point.

Table 6 CIU portfolio-wide GRM process for CERP-related grievances

6.3. SEA/SH-sensitive Complaints

Sexual exploitation and abuse or sexual harassment (SEA/SH) grievances will be referred to the relevant local GBV service provider in that state. The key primary psychosocial and counselling referral services available for SEA/SH survivors in each state are as follows. Before each activation, CERP-PIU will need to confirm and update contacts and also include these contacts in the staff induction materials and confidential response protocols.

State	Primary Psychosocial / Social Support Service
Chuuk	Tongen Inepwinew Counselling Centre (TICC), through the Chuuk Women's Council (https://www.cwcfiinchuuk.org/)
Kosrae	Behavioural Health & Wellness, Kosrae State Hospital ((+691) 370 3012)
Pohnpei	Individual Counsellor (Canita), Kolonia ((+691) 320 2112)
Yap	Behavioural Health & Wellness, Yap State Hospital ((+691) 350 2110)

Table 7. State-based service providers

The Micronesia Legal Services Corporation (MLSC) is also a national GBV-related service provider and may provide legal assistance to GBV survivors.

SEA/SH-related complaints will be handled using a survivor-centred approach based on safety, confidentiality, informed consent, respect, dignity and survivor agency. Project staff will not investigate or verify SEA/SH complaints. They will record only non-identifying information and, with survivor consent, refer the complaint to appropriate services.

6.4. Disclosure of the GRM

The existence and operation of the GRM shall be disclosed through the responsible agencies and activation-specific communication channels during preparation and activation. Information disclosed shall include the types of complaints that may be submitted, how and where to submit them, who will receive and process them, expected timelines, the right to appeal, and the availability of confidential channels for sensitive complaints.

6.5. Summary of grievance handling

The table below provides a summary of grievance handling in relation to CERP activities:

Grievance Type	Who Can Submit	Intake Channels	Handling & Resolution	Logging & Reporting Rules
Community & Beneficiary Grievances	Affected communities, beneficiaries, general public	- Existing GRMs of responsible ministries, agencies, PIUs, utilities, or service providers - National and state focal points (telephone, SMS, email, in person) - DOFA/CIU channels (webpage: complaintsWB@gov.fm; feedbackWB@gov.fm; QR code) - Referrals via municipal and community leaders, churches, clinics, or social assistance offices	- Managed by the responsible first-line agency using existing systems and SOPs - Escalated to CERP-PIU if unresolved, cross-agency, or systemic - Acknowledged within 2 working days; routine grievances resolved within 10 working days; urgent cases (life, health, safety, protection) escalated immediately	- Logged by first-line agency and in CIU portfolio-wide GRM system - Non-identifying summary reported to CIU for monitoring - Trends used for learning and readiness improvement
Project Worker Grievances (non-SEA/SH)	Project workers, consultants, surge/activation staff	- Supervisor or implementing agency focal point - Independent worker grievance program under the Labor Management Procedures outlined in the ESMP - CIU grievance/safeguards focal point	- Addressed in line with ESMP and ESS2 requirements - Acknowledged within defined timelines - Strict no-retaliation policy applies	- Logged separately as worker grievances - Reported in aggregate in E&S monitoring reports
SEA/SH-Related Complaints (Community or Workers)	Survivors or third parties (with survivor consent)	- Direct referral to named state-level service provider - Any project or government channel (for safe referral only) as identified above	- No investigation or verification by project staff - Immediate, survivor-centred referral to state-level service provider - Handled in accordance with	- Not entered into standard GRM logs - Only anonymised case counts reported if required

			survivor-centred principles: safety, confidentiality, informed consent, and survivor agency	
Anonymous Complaints	Any person	Any available intake channel (telephone, SMS, email, QR code, in-person via community leader or focal point)	- Assessed to determine whether action is possible without further information - Minimum necessary information recorded; no obligation to respond directly	- Logged as anonymous, without personal data - Included in aggregate GRM reporting to CIU

7. Monitoring and Reporting

The CERP-PIU will include a summary of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken, as well as the number of types of complaints received, in the project's six-monthly reports on the environment, social, health and safety (ESHS) performance.