

Annex 4. Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template)

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Enhancing Biodiversity Considerations and Effective Protected Area Management to Safeguard the Cook Islands Integrated Ecosystems and Species
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	6565
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Cook Islands
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Design (ProDoc)
5. Date	14 July 2022

Part A. Integrating Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach

This project aims to conserve ecosystems and species by mainstreaming biodiversity in the development planning process as well as by improving effectiveness of the protected area management. A human rights-based approach could provide a mechanism by which to achieve these goals by for example, strengthening the human rights' perspectives of traditional leaders and indigenous landowners and enhancing their awareness of the expanded choices and capabilities that might be possible when they have a greater say and involvement in what this process of expansion should look like. This approach focuses on human rights as a means of empowering those who will be affected by the project to make decisions about their own lives rather than being the passive objects of choices made on their behalf. The focus is not so much directed towards technical development that might only empower a few but focuses more so on important human development goals that will provide landowners and local communities with the appropriate tools and skills which will support meaningful and effective participation and ownership of the eventual outcomes of project activities, and thus, the sustainability of their development efforts. The participatory and inclusive approach proposed for the project design, development and implementation will empower community resource users and resource managers, thus ensuring the protection of the islands' natural and cultural heritage.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

Cook Islands society already values gender equality as a basic human right and a necessity for a sustainable world. Cook Islands has had a long history of women in its traditional leadership within the ariki and the aronga mana, which persists today. Gender equality is enshrined in its Constitution (1964) and the country was a signatory to the CEDAW in 1985 when it also developed its first National Policy on Women. This project will support and encourage the principles that underpin the "Cook Islands National Policy on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and Strategic Plan of Action (2019-2024)" which recognises that women and men are equal partners to the development of the Cook Islands, and places gender equality at the heart of economic and social progress, giving equal value to the roles and responsibilities of Cook Islands women and men in all aspects of life. Across society, women have leadership positions in community and political activities that enable them to contribute their perspectives into decisions that will affect their lives as well as the development of our country. Supporting the building of women's skills and knowledge will help to enhance this project as we move towards increasing technical capacity within government and community sectors to improve gender-balanced community-based management of our catchments and protected areas. The aim will be to continue to ensure equal contribution by both men and women in the decisions about how they themselves manage their biodiversity resources in the future.

To better inform how gender can be mainstreamed across the full range of project interventions, a gender analysis was undertaken during project preparation to determine the different roles of women in biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and marine resources use, natural resources management and food production. Results of the analysis were used to develop gender mainstreaming action plan consistent with a GEN-2 UNDP Gender Marker.

Gender disaggregated tracking of the beneficiaries will provide the basis for monitoring and evaluation of the project's impact on promoting gender equity and empowerment of women and youth. Gender disaggregated indicators have been included in the Project Results Framework. During implementation, additional data will be collected such as: (i) total number of male and female full-time project staff; (ii) total number of male and female Project Board members, etc. The project design has sought to ensure that financial and human resources are set aside to mainstream gender during project implementation and to monitor the effectiveness of this mainstreaming. The project will ensure equal opportunities for women and men to participate in training, decision-making, and all activities with potential opportunity to improve gender equality and gender empowerments. Steps will be taken to ensure that women's needs are addressed in management arrangements set up by the community, including women's active participation in community meetings and platforms involving project activities.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience

This project has the potential to transform biodiversity conservation and management of natural resources in the Cook Islands with a sustainability and resilience model that would not only be compatible with the expectations of existing conservation goals, but which could develop into a tool for "effective conservation decision-making during planning, implementation and management" (Massarala, 2021¹). This model is based on the premise that a better understanding of human or social dimensions of environmental issues will, in fact, improve conservation (Bennett, 2016²). Not only would this approach have a transformative impact on understanding and changing local community attitudes, values, and behaviour but it would help to create stronger communities. Contributing greatly to sustainability are the important messages and learnings that arise out of project activities, and how these are conveyed through regular and effective capacity building workshops and widely disseminated communication and information, to government personnel, traditional leaders, community leaders, men, women, youth, elderly and the disabled. The human rights-based approach would support this transformation, by focusing on enabling stakeholder access to technical conservation concepts and information in user-friendly and non-technical terms. This would facilitate greater stakeholder understanding and buy-in, and would encourage traditional leaders and landowners to want to share with other leading stakeholders their own indigenous community conservation and sustainability goals and objectives based on hundreds of years of traditional conservation methods - something that is very much the "missing link" for this project.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders

¹ Massarella, K., Nygren, A., Fletcher, R., et al. (2021). *Transformation beyond conservation: how critical social science can contribute to a radical new agenda in biodiversity conservation*, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, Volume 49, 2021, Pages 79-8.

² Bennett, N. J., Roth, R., Klain, S., et al. (2017). Conservation social science: Understanding and integrating human dimensions to improve conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 205, Pages 93-108.

The project worked closely with the islanders, including women groups, representation of ethnic groups through the House of Ariki/traditional leaders and Island Councils, youth, elders, differently-abled, and poor in rural areas that depend heavily on the islands' terrestrial and the surrounding areas' marine ecosystems to meet the basic necessities (food, clean drinking water, shelter, and livelihoods) through a participatory approach during the project design, development, and implementation phases to provide inputs in the development of the project activities and to ensure positive impacts reaches these communities during the implementation phase.

Key stakeholders listed above were engaged at an early stage in the development of this project via a PPG inception workshop, group consultations, council meetings, individual interviews, and a national dialogue, in which island council leaders from various islands, representatives of traditional leaders, various members of CSO's, private sector participants, as well as officials from ministries government agencies participated, ensuring political support in addition to traditional, private and community engagement. This provided an ideal setting to share ideas, aims and global goals to be achieved through this project, as well as overviews of social and environmental standards, including UNDP's grievance and redress mechanism which is describe in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan annexed to the Project Document. During the field missions conducted as part of the PPG, over 196 stakeholders (42% of whom were female) were consulted (see the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan).

An important component of accountability is measurement and the collection of data. Financial management is easily monitored and audited, but other project activities are not so easily evaluated as to what value they have brought to the social and environmental outcomes of the project, to the stakeholder individuals and groups who were involved in the activities as well as to UNDP and other partners who have sponsored this project.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.</i>	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 5</i>			QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High
Risk Description <i>(broken down by event, cause, impact)</i>	Impact and Likelihood (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate Substantial, High)	<i>Comments (optional)</i>	Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High
Risk 1 : <i>Efforts to halt/minimize land/forest degradation (most notably under project Outputs 2.3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 of the project) may unintentionally result in restriction to access to natural resources and/or affect the traditional use and livelihoods of local communities. In addition, the project proponent and/or executing entity(ies) may not effectively engage and ensure participation of all stakeholders, including women, and indigenous peoples and traditional local communities, during the implementation phase of the project resulting in violation of human rights.</i>	I = 4 L = 2	Moderate	While a catchment framework to safeguard indigenous species, natural ecosystems and food production systems from unsustainable land uses in Cook Islands is important for the overall national economy, it is especially critical for the local landowners who depends on her/his land and produce for the family's livelihood and well-being. A failure for a landowner regardless of gender, to	Assessment: During project design, consideration of the impacts (both direct and indirect) from the enforcement of certain restrictions (both on activities and on access to sites/natural resources) that may result as part of Outputs 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 has been undertaken. Based on the results of consultations with key project stakeholders, and in following UNDP SES principles and requirements, a model of community-managed conserved areas will be applied to all of the PA's supported under this project. This model should allow for the full realization of the rights and wishes of local PAPs. Top-down imposition of restrictions will thus be avoided by following this model.

<p>Human Rights: P.2, P.5, & P.6 Accountability P.13, P.14, P.15 Standard 1: 1.2 Standard 4: 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4 Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7 & 6.9</p>			<p>safeguard the land, forests and coastal ecosystems from degradation stands the risk of losing part or the entire livelihood with implications on the family's economy and level of self-subsistence, which could result, in practical terms, in an economic displacement.</p> <p>All PA's supported by the project are community conserved areas, with affected communities instigating the restrictions on their own behalf.</p> <p>Only Output 3.3 will include new PA creation (whilst other project interventions at PA sites will be supporting pre-existing initiatives). The higher slopes of the Rarotongan mountains, including where the Cloud Forest PA is proposed, are classified as "un-investigated land", meaning that there are no individual landowners. The PPG team consulted with a wide range of stakeholders, including community groups and NGOs. It should also be noted that the proposed Cloud Forest PA would be established using a community conserved area approach, where the community will make decisions regarding access based on a culturally appropriate community decision-making process that reflects voluntary, informed consensus (in line with the requirements of UNDP SES 5, para. 15).</p>	<p>This risk has been assessed as having a low likelihood of occurrence given the fact that all PA's supported by the project will be community managed conserved areas. As such, community members and landholders will be responsible for instituting their own restrictions. All restrictions will be voluntarily put forward by the affected communities, and as such the need for a Process Framework is not foreseen as necessary at this stage.</p> <p><u>Management:</u></p> <p>To manage this risk a stakeholder analysis has been conducted, and a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan has been prepared during the project design, together with a gender analysis and gender action plan. These plans seek to ensure that Cook Islanders rights (including, but not limited to self-determination and customary rights, land tenure and traditional use rights) are considered and mainstreamed during implementation of the project.</p> <p>Given the context of the project, and the fact that the majority of Cook Islanders fall under UNDP S6 definition of Indigenous Peoples, a free-standing IPPF has not been developed. Rather, the elements for an IPPF have been included within the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The purpose of this is to ensure that the project adheres to UNDP S6 requirements, As part of the development of the SEP, a full screening/analysis of all project outputs/activities in light of the potential impacts on IPs was conducted.</p> <p>Livelihood measures have been integrated into the project's activities (most notably Activities 2.3.2 and 2.3.3).</p> <p>Extensive consultations have been conducted as part of the field missions during the PPG phase.</p> <p>The procedures for FPIC, that shall be followed during project implementation, have been included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Given the nature of the project, it should be noted that FPIC may need to be secured multiple times during the project timeline.</p> <p>The project has been designed with FPIC and consultation requirements embedded into relevant activities. For example, at a policy/upstream level, Activity 1.3.2 will require the project to facilitate <i>Pa Enua</i> consultations (which shall meet UNDP requirements for FPIC as stipulated in the project's SEP) in the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>socialization of the Islands Environmental Management Plans with local stakeholders. For downstream activities, FPIC requirements have been explicitly embedded into the design of Activities 3.3.5 and 4.2.3.</p> <p>The majority of project interventions will occur at pre-existing protected areas, as well as within catchments in Rarotonga. The exception will be the newly proposed Rarotonga Cloud Forest PA (Output 3.3). Under this output, a key activity has been formulated to ensure FPIC from PAPs, i.e. "Activity 3.3.5. Facilitate formulation of collaborative agreements involving female and male landowners, government, and traditional leaders – <i>including obtaining FPIC</i> for the establishment of the community conserved area."</p> <p>A culturally appropriate grievance redress mechanism (GRM) for the project has been developed based on the existing government and UNDP mechanisms. The GRM is described in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.</p>
<p>Risk 2: <i>The project could contribute to cumulative environmental or social impacts in the area through unintended negative consequences from policy or legislative changes, such as those proposed under Component 1.</i></p> <p>Human Rights: P.2 Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.14, 1.8 Standard 5: 5.4 Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7 & 6.9</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Environmental and social impacts are expected to be overwhelmingly positive. However, there is a possibility that upstream policy or legislative changes supported by the project may inadvertently have adverse social and/or environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>Mainstreaming safeguards to conserve biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services across key sectors, as stipulated by Component 1, will include the development and/or updating of several key regulatory/policy initiatives.</p> <p>Institutional capacities of the NES, Ministry of Agriculture, Infrastructure Cook Islands, and Cook Islands Tourism Corporation were assessed during the project preparation phase using an adapted version of the UNDP capacity development scorecard. The findings of the baseline institutional capacity assessments were used to inform the design of the capacity building activities to more effectively achieve durable mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation across key development sectors.</p> <p>To adequately assess the potential social and environmental impacts associated with upstream activities supported by the project, a scoped SESA will be required to be undertaken. The SESA will follow UNDP SES requirements and shall include within its scope Activities 1,1,1, 1,1,2, 1.3.3.</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>Project activities have been designed to consider the cumulative impacts that may emanate from 'upstream' policy initiatives such as those supported under Component 1. Project proponents will be trained on EIA best practice (under Activity 1.1.1) which will include key</p>

				<p>material and guidance on identifying impacts (including cumulative) and formulating mitigation measures for wetland, riparian and costal ecosystems. This training on EIA best practice will be informed by the SES policy of UNDP.</p> <p>In addition, various avenues for continued engagement with affected communities (from potential policy/upstream related impacts) has been included in the design of the project. Activity 1.3.2 for example will require the project to facilitate <i>Pa Enua</i> consultations in the socialization of the Islands Environmental Management Plans with local stakeholders. The development of these management plans will be based on the requirements of UNDP SES 1, ensuring compliance with the necessary stipulations.</p>
<p>Risk 3: <i>Given the context and siting of project activities (i.e. within critical habitats such as Suwarro National Park, Takutea Nature Reserve and the new Cloud Forest PA), poorly designed or executed project activities, could unintentionally damage critical or sensitive habitats and ecosystems, resulting from the implementation of land management malpractices.</i></p> <p>Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2 , 1.3.,1.8, 1.13</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The project could inadvertently select a sustainable management model that does not adequately address local issues or could produce counterproductive outcomes.</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>During the project preparation phase, baseline assessments were conducted of the protected areas targeted in the project, using the GEF-7 version of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Several shortcomings were identified through the baseline METT assessments, including the lack of or dated management plans, limited information on resource inventories, lack of staff, insufficient communication with landowners and local communities, and inadequate systems for monitoring and evaluating performance of PA management.</p> <p>The project design includes ecosystem audits (including assessment of nutrient cycling) to be undertaken at four priority catchments (Activity 2.1.1). UNDP SES 1 requirements will serve as a basis for the conduct of these audits. This will also include the delivery of training and wider awareness raising on the results of these audits.</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>Activity 2.1.3 of the project has been designed to assist in the continued assessment and monitoring of catchment audits. This activity of the project will enable support to be provided (and the necessary investment assistance) for strengthening the capacity for conducting catchment audits as well as follow-up monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>The project has also been designed to include collaborative/community driven intersectoral catchment management plans (Output 2.2), that will seek to utilize best practice in terms of sustainable land management ,</p>

				the safe use and handling of agrochemicals, erosion prevention etc.
<p>Risk 4: <i>Prevailing gender biases could unintentionally discriminate against women, limiting or adversely impacting their possibilities for accessing opportunities and/or influence on project activities.</i></p> <p>Gender : P.9, P.10, P.11</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Although there has been remarkable progress on gender issues in the policy area in the Cook Islands, gender mainstreaming still needs to be actively promoted to ensure women's empowerment. If not actively pursued by the project, less engagement of women could potentially occur.</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>A comprehensive gender analysis has been undertaken to clarify relevant gender concerns and has enabled a better understanding of how mainstreaming of women into the project interventions can be ensured. During the project development phase specific consultations were undertaken with relevant women's groups and their representatives. During the PPG, the team held a consultation session specifically for the Vainetini (women's group) in Aitutaki where the discussion focused mainly on their involvement in agriculture and fishing as forms of income for themselves to help to support their families. Specific skills associated with the production of Maori medicine highlighted the need for conservation of healing plants and a nursery to ensure the sustainability of these special plants.</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>To manage such risks a comprehensive gender action plan has been developed. This has included the development of gender mainstreaming indicators in the project results framework, with periodical progress being monitored through PIRs, MTR and TE.</p> <p>In addition, gender considerations have been included throughout the design of project components. Most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activity 1.1.5. 'Deliver a series of gender mainstreaming training sessions, through seminar, webinar, or similar modalities, including to Pa Enea communities' - Activity 1.2.1. 'Carry out a gender-sensitive feasibility assessment for the national environment information system (NEIS).' - Activity 1.3.1. 'Develop and integrate gender-responsive Island Environmental Management Plans into Island Development Plans (Atiu and 3 other outer islands – Pa Enea).' - Activity 2.2.1 'Develop gender responsive intersectoral catchment management plans for the priority catchments in Rarotonga.' - Activity 3.1.1 'Develop new or updated gender responsive management plans for the target protected areas, through inclusive, participatory processes and based on updated resource inventories.'

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 2.3 'Improved gender sensitive natural resource management in priority catchments and the Manuae Managed Area achieved through adoption of innovative practices' - Output 4.1 'Gender responsive Knowledge Management and Communications Strategy developed and implemented, including annual action plans with targeted public awareness programmes to promote the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services' - Output 4.2 ' Gender sensitive knowledge and information products on processes, best practices, innovations, lessons learned and project findings developed and disseminated'
<p>Risk 5: <i>Use of agrochemicals³, including chemical fertilizers and pesticides, may pose a risk to community health, and lack of adequate guidelines on usage and storage of these chemicals could result in generation and release of hazardous waste through different migration pathways (soil, water, or air).</i></p> <p>Standard 3: 3.5 Standard 8: 8.1, 8.5</p>	I = 3 L = 2	Moderate	Agrochemicals, including chemical fertilizers and pesticides, potentially could be applied during the project activities (either directly or indirectly). This could potentially result in negative impacts on community health & safety and the receptor environment.	<p>Assessment: The intersectoral catchment management plans (under Output 2.2) will promote reduction and minimization of the use of agrochemicals. Only pesticides, herbicides and insecticides meeting internationally accepted standards will be supported by the project. Their storage and application will be subject to the health and safety guidelines</p> <p>Management: Management measures will include but are not limited to the following: 1) internationally or nationally banned or restricted agrochemicals will not be used, 2) workers and farmers working with agrochemical will be trained and equipped with appropriate personal protective equipment, and 3) national, provincial, and local guidelines and regulations on use and handling of agrochemicals will be followed.</p> <p>Activity 2.2.5 of the project has been designed to support capacity building and knowledge management activities for the safe handling and use of agrochemicals.</p>
<p>Risk 6: <i>The project will include support for the eradication of rats in target sites (Activities 2.2.6 and 3.1.5). The anticipated ecological benefits of the eradication activities are likely to be significant, as successful eradication of rats will contribute to the protection of globally significant biodiversity. Eradication methods may result in the poisoning (either primary or secondary)</i></p>	I = 3 L = 4	Moderate	The use of poisonous bait to control rats can lead to unintentional poisoning of wild animals. In addition, most of the chemicals typically used in rodenticides are persistent in the environment and accumulate in organisms (and in	<p>Assessment: Before the implementation of activities 2.2.6 and 3.1.5 a Rat Eradication risk assessment will be required to be undertaken. This risk assessment shall include an analysis of alternative pest management options, and shall assess (amongst others); the potential impacts on non-target species (examining both primary and secondary poisoning), impacts on human health, and receptor environmental impacts (i.e. on vegetation, soil, water, marine environment etc.). The risk assessment will be undertaken using UNDP SES</p>

<p><i>of non-target species. The application of rodenticides (i.e. anticoagulants) may also pose a risk to human health.</i></p> <p>Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 Standard 3: 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 Standard 7: 7.6 Standard 8: 8.1, 8.2, 8.5</p>			<p>extension the wider food chain).</p>	<p>requirements as the part of the basis of assessment (most notably SES 1, 3, 7 and 8).</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>To manage the identified risks, a Rat Eradication plan will be developed that is based on the findings of the risk assessment described above. As per the ProDoc, the rat eradication plan itself, as well as the agent (poison) release, will be required to be approved before the conduct of Activities 2.2.6 and 3.1.5.</p> <p>The plan will include baseline monitoring in preparation for the rodent eradication programme, as well as post-release monitoring (both during and after the eradication programme). In adhering to the requirements of UNDP SES 7, the rat eradication management plans will also include applicable elements of labour management procedures in order to ensure that labour and working conditions for project workers and compliant with UNDP SES requirements, and that the rights of project workers are respected in all instances.</p>
<p>Risk 7: Natural disasters and climate change may affect the implementation and results of project initiatives.</p> <p>Standard 2: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Climate change may negatively influence soil quality & fertility, moisture regime, dry up water sources and cause fragmentation of natural areas and their connectivity in the watersheds. Such climate impacts socioeconomic resilience of the communities and survival chances of species including crops.</p> <p>Climate change impacts could include shifting rainfall and seasonality of rainfall, temperatures, and lead to more extreme weather events including flooding, this climate uncertainties need to be added to sustainable land management models that will be selected for the project.</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>A Climate and Disaster Screening was carried out during the project preparation phase, building upon the initial screening conducted at PIF stage.</p> <p>Preliminary steps were taken to build resilience to climate change and disaster impacts in project activities such as development of intersectoral catchment management plans to safeguard ecosystem services, promotion of sustainable land management practices, improved management of protected areas.</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>Climate and disaster risk mitigation will be incorporated in the intersectoral catchment management plans developed under Output 2.2, as well as in the updated protected area management plans prepared in Output 3.1.</p> <p>The Climate and Disaster Risk Screening will continue to be monitored and updated (where necessary) as prescribed by Activity 4.3.5 of the project.</p> <p>Species for SLM demonstrations will be selected and recommended based on the highest climate resilience and biodiversity gains potential. Activity 2.3.3 will provide low-value grant assistance to implement innovative practices, e.g., the promotion of climate resilient crops, soil and water conservation practices, erosion control measures etc.</p>

<p>Risk 8: <i>People involved in project activities, project team members, and service providers may be at a heightened risk of exposure to COVID 19 through the stakeholder consultation meetings, workshops and field visits, etc.</i></p> <p>Standard 3: 3.4 Standard 7. 7.6</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>During the project preparation phase, the incidence of COVID-19 in the Cook Islands steadily increased as restrictions on international travel were relaxed.</p>	<p>Assessment: A COVID-19 analysis was undertaken during the project preparation phase and is included in the COVID-19 Analysis and Action Framework annexed to the Project Document. This analysis included a consideration of UNDP SES requirements as they relate to the potential spread of communicable diseases amongst both project workers and local communities. As part of the regular review of the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), COVID-19 related risks will be addressed, and specific mitigation measures will be updated and implemented.</p> <p>Management: Given travel restrictions and the continued prevalence of Covid-19, PPG activities have been undertaken by national consultants, supported remotely by international specialists and external UNDP staff. The potential for inter-island transmission will be reduced by the project including a high degree of devolution of implementation responsibility to the local level.</p> <p>Adaptive management measures will be put in place during project implementation, as needed, e.g., ensuring physical distancing, providing personal protective equipment, avoiding non-essential travel, delivering training on risks and recognition of symptoms, etc. Virtual meetings will be held where feasible.</p> <p>The project Knowledge Management and Communications Plan, to be completed during the first year of project implementation, will include specific considerations for communication, public awareness and exchange of information under these circumstances.</p> <p>The project's COVID-19 Action Framework also includes measures that address opportunities, e.g., promoting sustainable land management approaches that safeguard critical ecosystems and increase resilience of local communities.</p>
<p>Risk 9: <i>The project may involve interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices).</i></p> <p>Standard 4: 4.1, 4.3, 4.5</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The proposed intersectoral catchment management plans (Output 2.2) and improved SLM practices (Output 2.3) may impact cultural sites or intangible forms of culture.</p>	<p>Assessment: During the PPG phase , the project team undertook a preliminary assessment of risks to cultural heritage (both tangible and intangible). This was conducted through key consultations with local communities, traditional landowners, NGOs and government counterparts. Based on the preliminary assessment conducted, the main cultural heritage-related risks identified are with regards</p>

<p>Standard 6: 6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7& 6.9</p>			<p>Traditional knowledge will be drawn upon for project activities 3.1.3 and 4.2.3.</p>	<p>to intangible cultural heritage (i.e. the use of traditional knowledge).</p> <p>Project activities that will include the use of traditional knowledge include; Activity 3.1.3 (integration of traditional management systems into PA management though inclusive consultations with traditional leaders), and activity 4.2.3 (document traditional knowledge in biodiversity conservation using culturally important methods, ensuring voices of both females and males).</p> <p>Management:</p> <p>Guidelines for safeguarding cultural heritage may need to be developed at the start of the project and staff, consultants and government officers will be trained around risks to cultural heritage (most notably through the training provided as part of Activity 3.1.2 on project social and environmental safeguard instruments, gender mainstreaming, UNDP social and environmental standards, and national standards and regulations).</p> <p>Concerning Activities 3.1.3 and 4.2.3, where traditional knowledge might be utilized by the project, FPIC and inclusive consultations and engagement will be required before the implementation of those activities can proceed. These activities will follow the project's FPIC procedure as outlined in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.</p>
<p>Risk 10: <i>Activities funded under low-value grant assistance delivery mechanisms may be carried out without full adherence to UNDP SES.</i></p> <p>Principles and Project-Level Standards: All</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The potential impact is assessed as Intermediate due to the low value of the grants envisaged, and the limited scope of each individual grant.</p>	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>Low-value grants are included in the project budget (and shall be implemented under Activity 2.3.4) , to support implementation of livelihood activities.</p> <p>The Implementing Partner will be obliged to follow the On-Granting Provisions, which are annexed to the Project Document and require adherence to the requirements of UNDP's SES. As part of the grant process under Activity 2.3.3, all proposals will be screened using the SESP template in order to ensure that any potential unwanted impacts of these activities are anticipated, avoided, reduced, or mitigated. Each grant request will be rated by risk category (low, moderate, high) in line with the SES requirements for the SESP, which will determine what further action is required. Any proposed activities categorized as High will be disqualified (unless the activities can be redesigned to fully avoid the High risk) and will <i>not</i> be undertaken.</p>

				<p>Management:</p> <p>The grant proposals will be reviewed by the Project Manager, with support by the other project team members, for compliance with UNDP SES. Grant agreements will be reviewed by UNDP prior to signature by the Implementing Partner and the grantees.</p> <p>The project team will monitor and evaluate the activities in the field for compliance with UNDP SES, as well as other specifications described in the grant agreements. Progress and completion reports submitted by the grantees will document compliance.</p>
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?			
	Low Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Moderate Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project has been categorized as Moderate risk. Given the risk profile of the project, assessment and management/mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of project activities. The project has produced a robust Stakeholder Engagement Plan which includes the required procures for obtaining FPIC within the auspices of the project. The project has also undertaken a Gender Analysis and Action Plan.</p> <p>The project includes a dedicated activity (i.e. 3.1.2) for the delivery of training on project social and environmental safeguard instruments, gender mainstreaming, UNDP social and environmental standards, and national standards and regulations.</p>	
	Substantial Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	High Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)			
	Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High Risk projects			
	<u>Is assessment required? (check if "yes")</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Status? (completed, planned)
	<i>if yes, indicate overall type and status</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Targeted assessment(s)</p> <p>Completed: Gender Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, COVID-19 risk and opportunities analysis, Climate and Disaster Risk Screening</p>

				Planned: Catchment Audits, Rat Eradication Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)	Planned: Scoped SESA to cover <u>Activities 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.3.3.</u>
Are management plans required? (check if "yes")	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>If yes, indicate overall type</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others)	Completed: Gender Action Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, COVID-19 Action Framework Planned: Intersectoral Catchment Management Plans, Rat Eradication Plan, Island Environment management Plans (IEMPs)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework)	
Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?			Comments (not required)	
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind				
Human Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Risk 1 Risk 6 Risk 11	
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Risk 4 Risk 11	
Accountability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Risk 6 Risk 11	

	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 1 Risk 2 Risk 3 Risk 6 Risk 11
	2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 7 Risk 11
	3. Community Health, Safety and Security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 6 Risk 8 Risk 11
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 1 Risk 10 Risk 11
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 1 Risk 11
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 1 Risk 10 Risk 11
	7. Labour and Working Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 6 Risk 11
	8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Risk 5 Risk 6 Risk 11

Final Sign Off

Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor		UNDP staff member responsible for the project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		
INSTRUCTIONS: The risk screening checklist will assist in answering Questions 2-6 of the Screening Template. Answers to the checklist questions help to (1) identify potential risks, (2) determine the overall risk categorization of the project, and (3) determine required level of assessment and management measures. Refer to the SES toolkit for further guidance on addressing screening questions.		
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind		Answer (Yes/No)
Human Rights		
P.1	Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
P.2	Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	Yes
P.3	Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	Yes
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.4	adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
P.5	inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? ⁴	Yes
P.6	restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	Yes
P.7	exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
P.8	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.9	adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	Yes
P.10	reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	Yes
P.11	limitations on women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	Yes
P.12	exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? <i>For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.</i>	No
Sustainability and Resilience: Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below		

⁴ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender and transsexual people.

Accountability		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.13	exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	Yes
P.14	grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders?	Yes
P.15	risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project?	Yes
Project-Level Standards		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
1.1	adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	Yes
1.2	activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes
1.3	changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	Yes
1.4	risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)?	Yes
1.5	exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade?	No
1.6	introduction of invasive alien species?	Yes
1.7	adverse impacts on soils?	No
1.8	harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	Yes
1.9	significant agricultural production?	No
1.10	animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.11	significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms? ⁵	No
1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) ⁶	No
1.14	adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	Yes
Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
2.1	areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions?	Yes

⁵ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#).

⁶ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Nagoya Protocol](#) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

2.2	outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters? <i>For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes</i>	Yes
2.3	increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	Yes
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
3.1	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams)	No
3.2	air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?	Yes
3.3	harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)?	No
3.4	risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health?	Yes
3.5	transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	Yes
3.6	adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities' health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)?	Yes
3.7	influx of project workers to project areas?	No
3.8	engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities?	Yes
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
4.1	activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site?	Yes
4.2	significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes?	No
4.3	adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	Yes
4.4	alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance?	Yes
4.5	utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes?	Yes
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
5.1	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	No
5.2	economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	Yes

5.3	risk of forced evictions? ⁷	No
5.4	impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	Yes
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
6.1	areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.3	impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to screening question 6.3 is "yes", then the potential risk impacts are considered significant and the project would be categorized as either Substantial Risk or High Risk</i>	Yes
6.4	the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	Yes
6.5	the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.6	forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above</i>	Yes
6.7	adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	Yes
6.8	risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.</i>	Yes
Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)</i>		
7.1	working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments?	Yes
7.2	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	No
7.3	use of child labour?	No
7.4	use of forced labour?	No
7.5	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity?	No
7.6	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle?	Yes
Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		

⁷ Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights.

8.1	the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	Yes
8.2	the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	Yes
8.3	the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals?	No
8.4	the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Montreal Protocol, Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention</i>	No
8.5	the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	Yes
8.6	significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No