**Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)**

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Preventing Forest Loss, Promoting Restoration and Integrating Sustainability into Ethiopia’s Coffee Value Chains and Food System |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 10243 (GEF ID) 6304 (Agency ID) |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Ethiopia |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design (after endorsement; prior to DOA) |
| 1. Date | October 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 targets the coffee landscapes of Ethiopia, which are estimated to provide a livelihood for up to 15 million Ethiopians. 97% of Ethiopian coffee is produced by smallholder farmers who farm an average of between 0.5ha-2.5ha. Many of these farmers are poor and benefit little from the global coffee supply chain. Coffee is grown in specific geographies in Ethiopia, in Afromontane forested landscapes, which are the focus of forest protection to safeguard the only remaining natural habitat for wild Coffea Arabica gene pool. This project is designed to improve the production practices and value chains of agricultural producers in the target landscapes, with a view to ultimately increasing incomes and livelihoods of especially poor farmers. The project will also support a comprehensive process of integrated land use planning and will entail a multi-stakeholder consultative process to ensure that all types of land users and land uses are considered in decision-making and planning.  The Project design and execution rely heavily on community consultation and participation, making a deliberate effort to include marginalized and vulnerable groups in decision making and the mechanisms designed to ensure that affected populations benefit from the Project, particularly small-scale farming households headed by men and women in the forest-farming frontier zones of the coffee-growing areas of Oromia and SNNP Regions.  The main Project components incorporate strong community engagement procedures in their preparation, implementation and monitoring, such as participatory integrated land use planning and Participatory Forest Management. Further, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been prepared for the Project, and the social and environmental management instruments of the Project (i.e., Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAAP), Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), and Livelihood Restoration Framework (LRF)) include a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).  The Stakeholder Engagement Plan promotes and outlines processes respecting customs, traditions, culture and rights, and facilitates an inclusive and participatory process to ensure that all individuals and groups, regardless of sex, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, race or creed, are included and benefit from the project’s investments. The Grievance Redress Mechanism procedure follows principles of accessibility, and which are collaborative, expeditious, and effective in resolving concerns through dialogue, joint fact-finding, negotiation, and problem solving. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Overall, Ethiopia tends to score towards the middle and lower ends of the spectrum on various global indices of gender inequality, empowerment, and access to resources and economic opportunity, indicating that the country still has work to do in these areas, in spite of progress achieved in recent years. The following figures for the year 2017 in FAO’s *National Gender Profile of Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods:Ethiopia* (2019) illustrates this: i) Ethiopia ranked 121st out of 160 countries in the Gender Inequality Index, a composite measure reflecting inequality in achievement between women and men in three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment and the labor market; ii) the country ranked 115th out of 145 countries in the Global Gender Gap Index (GGI), which examines the gap between men and women in four categories (economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival, and political empowerment); and iii) out of 145 countries, Ethiopia had the following rankings in the Global Gender Gap Index: 43rd in labor force participation, 95th in wage equality for similar work and 74th in estimated earned income. With respect to the agricultural sector, the same report indicates: “… that women continue to face challenges of unequal access and control of productive resources and services. For instance, women own only 19.5% of land titles, 51% of women farmers have access to extension services compared to 62% of male, 19% women against 28% men use extension packages, and 15% female against 21% of male land holders have access to credit. Women also provide most of the unpaid labor, with a heavy workload due to their additional responsibilities in caring for the family and fetching water and firewood, while handling other productive responsibilities in the community. Women’s participation in rural institutions and markets is also lower than that of men” (p. vii).  The above situation occurs in spite of the existence of adequate policy and legal frameworks, as well as institutional commitments to achieve gender equality. This is due to prevailing strong customary norms cascaded through informal social institutions and limited capacities of formal institutions, all resisting the ideals of equality.  As part of the Project preparation process, a Gender Analysis was conducted and an Action Plan developed, attached as Annex 15 to the Project Document. The Gender Analysis provides an overview of the gender dimensions of land and natural resource management, agricultural production, forest restoration and coffee value chains in Ethiopia, emphasizing these issues in SNNP and Oromia Regions. In particular, with respect to the Project area, the Analysis identifies gender-related gaps and opportunities in access and control over resources, patterns of decision making and participation in environmental governance and access to socio-economic benefits and services, making a deliberate effort to examine gender issues in relation to each of the four Project components. In addition, the Gender Analysis summarizes the national policy, and the regulatory and institutional framework for land and natural resource management from a gender perspective.  The findings of the Gender Analysis guided the gender integration effort of the Project, articulated in the Gender Action Plan, to ensure that all Project interventions are gender-responsive and pursue gender-responsive outcomes, following the UNDP Gender Marker tool. The project’s contribution to gender mainstreaming and equality is rated as GEN 2 – i.e. project activities have gender equality as a significant objective - at the following levels: forestry and natural resources management, and agriculture; landscape; and policy. The identification of gender gaps and opportunities informed the strategic entry points in the Project to ensure equal opportunities for women and men to participate in, contribute to and benefit from GEF-financed activities. The Gender Action Plan indicates, by Project component, specific gender activities and, for each activity, corresponding actions; baseline, indicators and targets; institutional responsibilities; timeline; and budget. The gender-specific activities included in each Project component are the following:  Component 1(Development of integrated landscape management (ILM) systems in Oromia and SNNP regions). The following activities seek to address policy and institutional gender-related gaps in the areas of land use and administration systems: 1.1: Assess and incorporate gender perspectives/lens in land use and planning capacity building efforts to strengthen gender-responsiveness of institutions and capacities of land use experts; 1.2: Conduct capacity development program for female members of land administration and use committees to increase their knowledge, voice and agency; 1.3: Ensure engagement of Women, Children and Youth Affairs( WCYA) Structure at Zonal and Woreda level in multi-stakeholder platforms on land issues, and in coffee stakeholder podiums; 1.4: Ensure the recruitment and participation of female land use and administration experts in any capacity building opportunities/GIS trainings/Training of Trainers organized by the Project; and 1.5: Ensure land certification process benefits both men and women equally where polygamous marriage is practiced.  Component 2 (Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains across coffee zone of Oromia and SNNP). The following activities seek to improve the decision making position, working conditions and the value of women's work across the coffee value chain and food systems: 2.1: Support the cascading of orientation and implementation of standard guidelines and regulations to promote the participation of women in agricultural extension services as stipulated in the MoANR Gender Strategy 2017; 2.2: Advocate for the inclusion of gender equality agendas in the national and regional level Coffee Platform (linked with Activity 4.3); 2.3: Support women self-help and saving groups to digitalize accounting and bookkeeping systems in partnership with Jamiipay; 2.4: Target female headed households (FHH) with garden coffee farms for specialized extension support, increased productivity and market linkages; and 2.5: Engage with media to promote the recognition and the need to reduce women’s triple role, increase visibility of women’s contribution to agriculture and environmental conservation.  Component 3 (Conservation and restoration of natural habitats). The following activities seek to improve the roles and benefits of women and youth from forest conservation and restoration interventions: 3.1: Identify types of existing improved cooking stoves to select the efficient one for local production and distribution by vulnerable women and youth groups; 3.2: Organize vulnerable women and youth in nurseries and enrichment planting with indigenous tree species and useful species for sustainable harvesting and sale (e.g., forest spices); and 3.3: Organize capacity building training/experience sharing forum among female members of Participatory Forest management (PFM) to facilitate their participation in decision making processes.  Component 4 (M&E and knowledge management for replication and scaling-up). The following activities seek to produce new evidence and knowledge on gender issues to inform actions that enable closing the gender gaps: 4.1: Generate context specific woreda level gender analysis and participatory action planning during the Project’s baseline period; 4.2: Generate evidence on women’s land rights and land certification practice in the context of polygamous marriage; 4.3: Generate evidence on the status of women in coffee value chains, washing stations to inform advocacy efforts at the national coffee platform; and 4.4: Integrate a gender lens in any of behavioral studies planned to be conducted and/or supported by the Project. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| Environmental sustainability is at the core of the Project “Preventing Forest Loss, Promoting Restoration and Integrating Sustainability into Ethiopia’s Coffee Value Chains and Food System”. The design of the Project addresses the key development challenge of continued environmental degradation in Ethiopia’s 9-million-hectare coffee-producing area in the southwest of the country in Oromia and Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ (SNNP) Regions. The Project aims to support transformation towards deforestation-free coffee value chains and food systems in these Regions.  The project’s goal is to address the problems of land degradation and forest loss, by transforming food systems and value chain to become deforestation-free through an institutionalization of land use planning and management that prioritizes the maintenance and protection of ecosystems and landscapes and the goods and services they provide to society and the planet. The project will support the restoration of degraded forest and agricultural landscapes, protect habitats and gene pools of important biodiversity (e.g. Coffea Arabica) and promote equitable beneficiation of the management of these landscapes and the natural resources and ecosystem services they provide for poorer, natural resource-dependent households and communities in the target landscape. The project will do this by integrating environmental sustainability and inclusivity into the coffee value chains, to ensure that Ethiopia coffee production pathway is sustainable for both the landscape in which it is produced, as well as socially-beneficial for the households and communities involved in its production, and is climate-smart, ensuring resilience of the sector itself and livelihoods of those dependent on it.  To institutionalize environmental sustainability into food systems and coffee value chains, the project will anchor its support in the ongoing national priority interventions for transforming the food and agriculture value chains and promote participatory land use planning processes; governance and decision-making processes and structures that are inclusive and participatory and are based on a scientific understanding of the state of the natural resource and the impacts of climate-induced shocks and stressors on it; and empower and capacitate land users, farmers and communities to adopt good agricultural practices and integrated landscape management approaches.  All four Project components involve interventions that either consist of or strongly promote practices and approaches for sustainable agricultural production and distribution, and natural resources management, together with associated capacity building, provision of equipment, establishment of planning and coordination mechanisms, etc. required to design and implement those practices and approaches. The following summary illustrates these points:  Under Component 1 (Development of integrated landscape management (ILM) systems in Oromia and SNNP regions), the proposed interventions include, among others: i) the adoption of the national land use planning policy, with systems and capacity in place for implementation (e.g., supporting EFCCC to get emerging land use policy endorsed/approved by the legislative body, developing directives and guidelines for implementation of land use policy once adopted, etc.); ii) provision of support to Oromia and SNNP Regions to establish systems and capacity for regional and zonal land use planning (e.g., providing training and developing Integrated Land Use Plans -ILUPs- in these two Regions, etc.); and iii) piloting of Integrated land use planning and landscape management activities in selected woredas and kebeles (e.g., strategic planning for watershed restoration, establishing, equipping and training Land Use Planning Teams; developing ILUPs; etc.).  Under Component 2 (Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains across coffee zone of Oromia and SNNP), the proposed interventions include, among others i) provision of support in greening of value chains to Agricultural Commercialization Clusters; ii) strengthening of farmer extension support system to maximize agroeconomic best practices (e.g., providing training courses to Development Agents on sustainable crop and livestock farming and agroforestry, rolling out improved extension by trained Development Agents through Farmer Training Centers and model farms, etc.); and iii) scaling up best practice extension for sustainable coffee.  Under Component 3 (Conservation and restoration of natural habitats), the proposed interventions include, among others: i) provision of support to the National Forest Sector Development Program, focusing on implementing sustainable management and protection of Afromontane forest across the Oromia and SNNP Regions (e.g., planning for Participatory Forest Management -PFM-, and coordinating between government and technical partners on a monitoring and information system for forest cover and land use); ii) bringing under PFM 20,000 ha of degraded ‘buffer zone’ of Coffee Forest Biospheres and 60,000 ha of communal forest for protection and restoration (e.g., conducting PFM training, developing site-specific PFM consultations and 15-20 structures, etc.); and iii) development of incentive schemes to promote conservation and restoration of natural habitats (e.g., establishing a Payments for Ecosystem Services scheme for community restoration efforts, etc.).  Under Component 4 (M&E and knowledge management for replication and scaling-up), the proposed interventions include, among others, the development of an on-line monitoring and reporting system to track and report economic, social and environmental results and impacts.  As described in Chapter II of the Project Document, the Project is in alignment with major multilateral environmental agreements and commitments, as well as national plans and policies dealing with environmental and natural resources management.  Based on the social and environmental screening conducted in Part B of this Annex, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Livelihood Restoration Framework were developed, which are enclosed as, respectively, Annexes 6b and 6c. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| UNDP promotes accountability to project stakeholders by (i) enabling active local community engagement and participation in decision-making, particularly those at risk of being left behind; (ii) ensuring transparency of programming interventions through provision of timely, accessible and functional information regarding supported activities, including on potential environmental and social risks and impacts and management measures; (iii) ensuring stakeholders can communicate their concerns and have access to rights-compatible complaints redress processes and mechanisms; and (iv) ensuring effective monitoring—and where appropriate, participatory monitoring with stakeholders—and reporting on implementation of social and environmental risk management measures.  The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) provides a formal avenue for affected individuals or communities to engage with the Project implementers or sponsors on issues of concern or unaddressed environmental and social impacts. It aims to manage and satisfactorily respond to the complaints of individuals or groups of people regarding the environmental and social performance of the Project.  The proposed GRM for the Preventing Forest Loss, Promoting Restoration and Integrating Sustainability into Ethiopia’s Coffee Value Chains and Food System Project consists of a two-stage process. The first stage will be the initial instance to try to resolve complaints at the woreda and kebele levels, where most Project activities will take place, using the already existing traditional conflict resolution mechanisms. If the traditional mechanisms are not successful, then the second stage of the GRM process will come into play, involving two formal Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs), one for each of the regions where the Project will be implemented. The GRM will be established at the initiation of project implementation (i.e. in the first 6 months) and if feasible a proposal (draft GRM) will be presented to the project Inception Workshop to be held after PRODOC signature by UNDP and government.  In Ethiopia, multiple traditional grievance redress processes have been in place for centuries, and some local communities give more recognition and acceptance to them than to formal legal structures (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, MoP, 2019). SNNP and Oromia, in particular the latter, are among the regions where these processes are very strong (Ibid, MEFCC, 2017). “… courts of law may be viewed as slow and involving somewhat complicated procedures. People may prefer such matters to be first handled by a ‘first instance’ mechanism, on the model of traditional dispute-resolution mechanisms.  The suggested composition of the two formal separate Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs) in SNNP and Oromia Regions is, at a minimum: i) a relevant Officer(s)/Specialist(s) at the respective PMU Satellite Office; ii) one representative of the PMU Headquarters; iii) one representative of the Zonal Department where the complaint originates responsible for, depending on the nature of the complaint, environmental protection, and land administration and use, or agriculture and natural resources; iv) one representative of the Woreda Department where the complaint originates responsible for, depending on the nature of the complaint, environmental protection, and land administration and use, or agriculture and natural resources; v) one representative of the Kebele Council where the complaint originates; and vi) one member of the community where the complaint originates. None of the members of the Committee should have a conflict of interest involving any complaint lodged and the Committee should have female representation.  The two formal GRM and the GRCs will be managed by the respective Officer/Specialist at the PMU Satellite Office in the corresponding region. The Environmental and Social Unit at the PMU Headquarters will keep copies of the files related to all formal GRM complaints. |

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6.* | | | **QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High.** |
| ***Risk Description***  ***(broken down by event, cause, impact)*** | ***Impact and Likelihood (1-5)*** | ***Significance***  ***(Low, Moderate Substantial, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High*** |
| Risk 1: As Ethiopia is an ethnically diverse country, with up to 85 ethnic groups, vulnerable or marginalized groups and ethnic minorities may be present in the project sites/catchment area. For instance, the Manja are a minority ethnic group living in Kaffa and Sheka zones of the SNNPR whose livelihood style is strongly linked with the forest. They are suffering from various kinds of discrimination e.g. out casting and marginalization by other ethnic groups (mainly by the Keffichos) because of their eating habits and customs.  Individuals, households and groups (e.g. associations and cooperatives)\_engaged in the coffee value chain, as well as in forest conservation, use and management are key stakeholders in the project, and are targeted as direct and indirect beneficiaries and so may also be negatively affected by the project interventions (in land use planning under Component 1, in the coffee value chain under component 2, and forest conservation and restoration under Component 3), even if they are designed to generate positive social and environmental outcomes.  (Principle 1: Q1, Q3, Q5, Q6, and  Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.6 and 6.9) | I = 4  P = 2 | **Moderate** | The project will directly engage with 440,000 individuals, the majority of whom, as smallholder farmers, are vulnerable and marginalized. Some of these may be involved in agricultural production and other non-agricultural uses of land and natural resources, including forest resources, that are rooted in their culture, history and tradition, and on knowledge that is now used in mainstream commercial activities such as coffee production, apiculture, carpentry, woodwork, basketry, weaving and others. | The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) prepared during the PPG outlined guidance on the process required to screen, scope and develop appropriate plans for implementation and compliance on all issues that are identified as social and environmental risks. The screening of activities will include an assessment of whether ethnic minorities are present at site level and which activities would impact them, their culture, traditions and livelihoods negatively. In response, appropriate action plans will be prepared, guided by existing UNDP Social and Environmental Safeguards Policies.  The Stakeholder Engagement Plan and the Gender Action Plan developed during the PPG (and annexed to this document) already outline specific actions to facilitate integration of strong stakeholder engagement and empowerment activities and interventions, as well as a Grievance Response Mechanism to enable an accessible, collaborative, expeditious and effective process for resolving concerns through dialogue, joint fact-finding, negotiation, and problem solving. These plans are envisaged to facilitate inclusive and participatory processes that leave no one behind and empower those that are marginalized to actively participate and to also benefit from decisions and actions that the project finances.  The project has made budgetary provisions for a full-time Environmental and Social Safeguards Officer, whose role is to oversee and monitor the development and implementation of the all ESS plans and through the Project Manager, report to the Project Steering Committee.  With regards to ethnic minorities, a framework for addressing risks related to ethnic minorities will be prepared at inception, following relevant UNDP SES guidance. This framework will outline procedures that should be followed to identify ethnic minorities at the beginning of implementation and to assess the potential impact of activities. If the screening process determines that FPIC is a requirement prior to implementation of key activities at site levels, then consultations will be carried out with the objective of achieving initial consent from the specific rights-holders, as appropriate and in line with Standard 6 requirements. The Ethnic Minority Group Plan will then be developed, and the current Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Grievance Response Mechanism revised as appropriate, to ensure that the key issues affecting the ethnic minority groups are specifically addressed. |
| Risk 2: The capacity of duty bearers and rights-holders to claim their rights and meet their obligations are also limited due to inadequate resources and technical capacity. The local land use planning process under Component 1 is expected to lead to local level dialogues and deeper level engagement with the issues of land tenure, land use and management and raise an awareness at the local level, about national policy views on land use and governance. Currently, capacities for engaging on these issues, at both regional, zonal, woreda and kebele levels, is limited, and so how the land use planning process will turn out is highly dependent on these capacities, including within formal institutions and within local communities.  At the same time, national and local governments (sub-national level) institutions, as well as community-level decision-making structures have different/unequal power and access to decision-support tools and so the outcomes of these processes will inevitably yield different outcomes for different groups.  (Principle 1: Q5, Q6) | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | Currently there is a gap in policies; overlapping and conflicting policies; and weak implementation of national policies at provincial and district levels – due to capacity gaps, compounded by a sectoral approach to decision-making. This results in inadequate forest governance; continuing deforestation and degradation of land and other ecosystems and weak enforcement of laws and regulations including different interpretations at the local level.  There is a limitation in availability of avenues/multi-stakeholder platforms for equitable access to decision-making structures and processes to address cross-sectoral issues.  Currently there are limited incentives for adoption of socially- and environmentally sustainable practices by actors in the food system and commodity production value chains. In fact, there are perverse incentives for businesses to continue with business as usual practices that have both social and environmental impacts. Where there are rules and laws there is weak enforcement. |
| Risk 3: The development of new land use plans at zonal, woreda and kebele levels could result in new and different stakeholder relations and different, potentially conflictual outcomes about land and land use. There is a history of land use conflict in Ethiopia, and particularly so in the Oromo Regional State where the project will be implemented. Some of these conflicts have led to violent protests that have resulted in loss of life. Some of these conflicts have been between communities who felt disenfranchised and excluded from economic opportunities as a result of investment decisions of the businesses operating in the area (including commodities such as coffee). The land use planning processes could potentially trigger these sentiments and result in further perceptions that the new approaches to land use allocations and management could worsen the situation and potentially lead to economic displacement and/or changes to property rights.  Placing under a PFM regime 10 sites located within the Biosphere Reserves and community forests may restrict access to those sites by some families that currently derive part of their livelihoods from the utilization of natural resources present in the affected areas. In addition, potential conflicts over benefit sharing among participants in PFM activities may arise.  (Principle 1: Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q8; Standard 1: 1.3; Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4) | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | The project will support local level land use planning at kebele, woreda and zonal levels under Component 1. Under Component 3 the project will promote forest conservation and management including within and adjacent to protected areas. These major interventions and activities are designed to be highly participatory and consultative. Local communities themselves will be involved in implementation of the activities for soil and water conservation forest and landscape restoration and support an increased enforcement of forest laws and regulations. | As outlined in the ESMF and ProDoc, a Strategic Social and Environmental Assessment (SESA) approach will be applied to develop the policy and ILUPs under Component 1.  Where downstream risks cannot be fully avoided through the SESA approach (i.e. ILUP design), an ESMF will be prepared for the relevant individual ILUPs (scoped appropriately; e.g. if the only risk is economic displacement, then the ESMF could instead be a Livelihood Restoration Framework). |
| Risk 4: Women in most societies are not treated equally to men and receive the least benefits from agriculture and other economic activities, and in most cases negatively impacted by decisions on land use more than men. In Ethiopia women are most affected by tenure insecurity and lack of land ownership, in the coffee sector receive the smallest benefits from the coffee value chain and in the agriculture sector in general are not targeted as beneficiaries of training, skills improvements and farming inputs and services. The interventions by the project, while they seek to improve the benefits to all stakeholders, if not implemented well, could inadvertently reproduce or perpetuate some of these discriminations. Furthermore, women in Ethiopia experience a high-level of Gender-based violence (GBV), which may be exacerbated by shifting power dynamics as a result of gender-focused and gender-transformative within the project design and as part of the GAAP.  (Principle 2: Q3) | I = 3  P = 2 | **Moderate** | During the PPG, women raised some of these concerns, noting that the project must deliberately make efforts to ensure that women are included in decision-making and in the design, implementation and monitoring of project activities, as must benefit from interventions that specifically seek to improve the situation of women in society, in productive activities and policy making and decision-making (i.e. the project should be gender-responsive at least and gender-transformative at best). | A comprehensive Gender Analysis was conducted during the PPG, and is response a strong Gender Action Plan has also been prepared (annexed as separate documents but also integrated into the CEO ER and the PRODOC) and gender-responsive indicators and targets are part of the Project Results Framework and budget. Specific interventions that target women have been included in the project activity workplan *(see PRODOC Annex 11 - Outputs and Activities, with Output-Level Indicators).*  The project has also made budgetary provisions for the recruitment of a full-time Gender Officer as part of the PMU whose role will be to coordinate all gender mainstreaming interventions (including sensitization around GBV issues) and ensure the implementation of the Gender Action Plan and associated monitoring and reporting. |
| Risk 5: The Project includes activities in two UNESCO Biosphere Reserves: Kafa and Yayu Forests  (Standard 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.6) | I =3  P = 2 | **Moderate** | A total of 20,000 ha of degraded forest in the two UNESCO Biosphere Reserves will be placed under Participatory Forest Management (PFM). The proposed activities will take place only within designated buffer zones of both Reserves, thus not affecting their core zones. The project will support restoration activities (e.g. felling exotic trees, demarcating boundaries, enrichment planting of indigenous trees and spices), including youth and women in an additional 60,000 hectares of communal forest landscapes.  The proposed interventions consist of forest restoration activities and implementation of sustainable forest management practices according to traditional and scientific knowledge.  The management measures summarized in the next column, including strong community involvement and training, strict delineation and characterization of areas of intervention, as well as robust monitoring, enforcement and reporting procedures, will prevent the induced intensification of uses in the buffer zones. | The Project design incorporates the following measures: i) identification and mapping of sites and their condition; ii) conduct of PFM training in 15 to 20 sites, based on traditional and scientific knowledge; iii) development of 15 to 20 site-specific PFM consultations, together with restoration plans and targets; iv) implementation of sustainable forest management practices (e.g. densification with indigenous tree seedlings, etc.); and v) establishment of PFM monitoring and enforcement protocols, and reporting mechanisms.  As indicated in the ESMF, the Project design includes a strong participatory approach to the development of PFM practices, including:   * Consultation with vulnerable and marginalized groups. * The Livelihood Restoration Framework - as the initial management plan that provides guidance on, among other aspects, the timeline and procedures for the preparation of the Livelihood Action Plan (LAP) for the Project, participation of individuals and communities in decisions potentially impacting them and their livelihoods, compensation and rehabilitation assistance, applicable legal framework, and monitoring and evaluation.   Other measures, some of which are already included in the design of the Project, involve:   * Plan and operate the forest to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits to all community members, and to not exacerbate economic disparities within the community; * Implement constant community consultations and consensus building on benefits and costs, responsibilities of management and benefit sharing arrangements; * Avoid appropriation of land or eviction of households; * Provide for intercropping, agroforestry and other measures that will accelerate the flow of benefits to, and support of, local communities; * Avoid infringing on protected natural sites, watersheds and critical wildlife habitats or areas with significant biodiversity (e.g., wetlands); * Draw upon local cultural knowledge and values in planning and operating the forest; * Select sites where the benefits from the proposed interventions can help reduce illegal or unsustainable uses of nearby forest areas; * Avoid existing land use areas that are economically productive or important for subsistence or traditional livelihoods; * Consider as sites for tree planting already cleared or barren lands, or sites currently used unsustainably. |
| Risk 6: Under Component 2, two of the Project outcomes are sensitive to potential impacts of climate change, namely the strengthening of smallholder farmer support systems to adopt sustainable intensification with diverse shaded coffee farming, and the facilitation of increased investments in sustainable coffee value chains and new entrants to specialty markets.  Component 3 on PFM, which includes some restoration interventions, is also vulnerable to climate change impacts.  (Standard 2.2) | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | Ethiopia is vulnerable to climate change, in particular the agricultural and agroforestry sectors. The country is experiencing a warming trend, with a mean annual temperature increase of 1.3 ˚C between 1960 and 2006, at an average rate of 0.28 ˚C per decade.[[1]](#footnote-1) “Some of Ethiopia’s coffee growing areas are already poorly suited for growing coffee, and it is mainly these areas that have been impacted by climate change and will continue to be so in the future”.[[2]](#footnote-2) In the business as usual scenario, without appropriate adaption and mitigation measures, the current coffee growing areas of Ethiopia will decrease considerably by the end of this century. “At the other extreme, with active migration and intervention, there could be a substantial increase in the coffee farming area…”.[[3]](#footnote-3) | A detailed Climate Risk Analysis *(see Annex 9b)* was conducted for the project and adaptation and mitigation measures integrated into the design of the project, to ensure that the impacts of climate change are minimized and the resiliency of project beneficiaries, landscapes and ecosystems is strengthened.  The Project design includes a series of measures aimed at building resilience and promoting adaptation to climate change in the agricultural and agroforestry sectors. In particular, there is a component devoted exclusively to the conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Component 3), focused on the furtherance of sustainable forest management practices, as well as activities in two other components aimed at the development and implementation of integrated land use planning and landscape management plans and practices, and the restoration of degraded agricultural lands and implementation of sustainable agricultural practices.  The project’s Component 2 on small-scale farmer support is focused in 8 coffee-producing Zones in the South West and South East coffee sub-regions, which include high-altitude Afromontane and Moist Forest and are projected to become more suitable for coffee as the climate changes, and not in the North, Rift and Harar sub-regions which are projected to become increasingly unsuitable.  The attached Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) elaborates on the potential risks posed by climate change and provides prevention, mitigation, management, monitoring and capacity building measures to address those risks. |
| Risk 7: Health and safety risks during the implementation of agricultural practices and PFM activities, and the potential application of chemical pesticides in the cultivation of some crops  (Standard 3.7) | I = 2  P = 1 | **Low** | The Project does not involve the construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure (i.e., roads, irrigation systems, etc.) or new structures such as buildings (training and extension activities will take place in already existing offices and farmer training centers, although these may undergo slight cosmetic renovations).  In addition, the Project targets smallholder farmers who apply largely traditional and low-tech sustainable agricultural practices and does not include the adoption of new technologies or machinery unfamiliar to farmers. Further, the PFM and restoration activities are communal and participatory in nature, using mainly manual tools (e.g., machete, pruning tools, etc.) familiar to participants. As a result, the likelihood of occurrence of occupational or community health and safety accidents or incidents during the performance of these activities is very low.  Coffee production in the two beneficiary regions does not involve the application of synthetic pesticides and targeted smallholding crop production utilizes chemical pesticides at a very limited scale or not at all. Although the Project will not promote the use of synthetic pesticides, their use even at a small scale poses health risks to both farmers who apply them and to consumers who may eat contaminated vegetables. | The Project design includes training in and monitoring of watershed management activities, and sustainable agricultural and PFM practices.  Although the significance of this risk is low, the attached ESMF includes requirements for identification of hazards and provision of training in safe work practices in watershed management, sustainable agricultural, PFM and forest restoration. In addition, the ESMF includes guidelines for Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and safe use of chemical pesticides and monitoring of pesticide use. |
| Risk 8: Under Component 2 of the project which supports the intensification of production in Ethiopia’s coffee zones through work with small-scale farmers and Component 3 of the project which will recruit forest rangers, these activities carry the risk of violation of ILO standards, including child labour and underpayment. The last ILO survey/study on child labour in Ethiopia seems to have been conducted in 2001/2 and further supported by ILO background note on wages and working conditions in the coffee sector in Ethiopia, made the following conclusions: ‘Child labour is a pervasive problem in Ethiopia. A national Child Labour Survey conducted in 2001 with ILO assistance indicated that 52 per cent of children aged 5 – 17 years were economically active (49 per cent of those aged 5 – 14 years, or 7.4 million). A further 33 per cent were engaged in non-economic housekeeping activities, with half of them not attending school. Overall, 85 per cent of children aged 5 – 17 years were involved in economic or housekeeping activities that prevented or impeded school attendance or performance.’  The definition of a child in Ethiopia refers to ‘a "minor" of either sex who has not attained the full age of 18 years.’  Regarding compensation, minimum wage in Ethiopia is among the worst in Africa, and often below $2 per day although it is estimated that payments and wages in the forestry and natural resources management sector are generally better.  (Standard 3.8 and Standard 7.3) | I=3  P=2 | **Moderate** | As per the ILO study, the need for labour assistance of children in family business, and the desire to supplement household income are the two most important reasons that drive children to work. Thus, a significant proportion of children in urban areas work to assist themselves and to get work experience. On the other hand, the majority (89 per cent) of children living in rural areas and engaged in productive activities were working in elementary agricultural and related activities, such as herding cattle and helping adults in farming. | The project support to recruitment of forest rangers will follow government employment guidelines and target youth and adults only. Youth in Ethiopia are defined as those that have attained 18 years.  The project has also budgeted a minimum wage of $2 for forest rangers (see budget note 19) which reads as follows: *$1,200,000 to make cash payments, coordinated with Agroforestry Support Coordinators in the 2 satellite offices and with Forest Rangers - to cover restoration labour costs for Output 3.2 to be disbursed to local villagers in and around PFM sites, at a minimum of $2 per day for 10 sites - $120,000 each could thus cover 60,000 person days. Calculated over 6 years this would be 10,000 person days per year. If 100 people worked in parallel this would mean 100 days of work per person per year.*  Furthermore, to supplement the site-level ESMPs prepared as part of the ESMF implementation for the project, a Labour Management Plan will be prepared to mitigate risks around wages and working conditions, with particular monitoring of the use of Child Labour, and accompanying sensitization and mitigation measures.  The project Safeguards Officer, working together with the Agroforestry Support Coordinators, will ensure that the recruitment of forest rangers is well planned in line with the project safeguards plans and UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. The UNDP Risk Long will specifically monitor these risks related to PFM interventions, and the project Safeguards Officer is responsible for reporting on it to the Project Manager as appropriate. |
| Risk 9: The PFM activities under Component 3 will include the recruitment of Forest Rangers to support implementation of forest restoration activities and enforcement of forest byelaws, regulations and codes of conduct and use by local communities and other users of forest resources, including those agreed at community level as part of the PFM process. The enforcement role of these forest rangers means that in principle they are security personnel, and if not well trained and supervised on how to discharge their duties and how to interact with local communities, their role could pose a risk to the health and safety of communities.  (Standard 3.9) | I=3  P=3 | **Moderate** | Recruitment and deployment of forest rangers is a key aspect of facilitating community-led and participatory forest management and these rangers will be appointed from within the communities living in and around the forest who have user-rights in that forest. The interventions under this package of work are planned to be led by an experienced NGO that has been involved in PFM in Ethiopia with established methods and approaches that have been proven to have some success in Ethiopia from a social, environmental and economic point of view. | Prior to deployment, the forest rangers will be trained not only on forest conservation and management, monitoring etc., but also on social and environmental safeguards related to participatory forest management. Budgetary provisions have been made for training and continuous monitoring of PFM activities, as all other activities from a social and environmental safeguards perspective, including through the Safeguards Officer and internal project M&E plans, and through the PSC.  As outlined in the ESMF process, the activities under this Component will also be screened for risks and the appropriate risk mitigation tools and plans prepared before activities are undertaken. In this case, an ESMP for PFM activities will be prepared since this intervention is rated as risky (Moderate rating) with potentially serious consequences. As discussed under Risk 1, 2 and 3 above, the project will adopt participatory and inclusive processes approaches to conducting all EMSF processes to ensure that decisions that may introduce potential risky and harmful activities are avoid/excluded and those that are necessary are accompanied by appropriate risk mitigation measures (e.g. Livelihoods Action Plan, Ethnic Minority Group Plan). |
| Risk 10: Arabica coffee has been used in Ethiopia as a food and beverage for many hundreds, if not thousands, of years. It has many uses, and these uses differ from region to region and season to season and differ according to ceremonies and traditions, religion and cultural practices of each group. Although coffee drinking is now a very modern practice in Ethiopia, as elsewhere in the world (e.g. similar to Italian versions of espresso and macchiato), these traditional uses of coffee remain, largely because coffee grown and produced in Ethiopia is still largely consumed within Ethiopia (an estimated 60%).  The intangible forms of culture around coffee production and use form key modern commercial and marketing traits for Ethiopian coffee, facilitating access to niche and specialty markets and fetching a higher premium on the global coffee market.  (Standards 4.1 and 4.2) | I=2  P=2 | **Low** | The project will support coffee growing communities, including coffee cooperatives and unions to benefit from this rich history, tradition and culture around coffee and its many uses, and its socio-cultural and environmental characteristics. This will be done under Output 2.4 - *Intensive pre- and post-harvest support to at least 10 extension pilot communities shifting to specialty coffee, working with emerging marketing centres, and existing cooperatives, unions, washing stations and direct exporters;* and Output 2.5 - *Local and international coffee buyers, traders and roasters engaged to establish innovative partnerships and support new specialty brands – through Ethiopia Coffee Platform, and FOLUR programme networks.*  This intensive support will entail the branding and marketing of these coffee varietals to access niche markets that are more profitable, and the socio-cultural and environmental characteristics that make these coffees unique will form a major basis for building a ‘brand’. This work comprises a commercialization of coffee as a product but also the production and processing knowledge and traditions behind it. Many coffee cooperatives and unions in Ethiopia already pursue this goal but lack the resources and capacity to do it. | While the support under Outputs 2.4 and 2.5 will focus on branding and marketing of coffee as a commercial product, the nature of the work is in fact to promote the uniqueness and characteristics of sustainably-produced coffee (social, economic and environmental), and so will by default be in compliance with the UNDP SES.  As outlined in the ESMF, assessments at activity and site levels will be screened to determine the extent to which they trigger particular risks, and appropriate mitigation and management measures will be put in place in response. The framework referred to under Risk 1 and 2, related specifically to ethnic minorities and associated FPIC, will provide key guidance on how issues related to Standard 4 (Cultural Heritage) should be handled, prior to activities being implemented. The ESMF screening tools include an Exclusion List and activities that fall in this list will be avoided or become ineligible from project support and funding. |
| Risk 11: Loss or reduction of access to natural resources important to family livelihood due to changes in land use or restrictions in access  (Standard 5.2, 5.4 and 6.6) | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | As indicated in the previous row, the Project does not include the construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure or new structures and, therefore, no physical displacement of people and associated relocation will take place as a result of Project implementation.  Under Component 3, 20,000 ha of degraded buffer zones of Kafa and Yayu UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and 60,000 ha of communal forest will be placed under a PFM regime for protection and restoration, which may restrict access to those forest areas by some families that currently derive part of their livelihoods from the utilization of natural resources present in those areas. | The Project design includes a strong participatory approach to the development of PFM practices, including consultation with vulnerable and marginalized groups.  Site-level interventions will be conducted only after an ESMP (or management plan, as determined appropriate per the ESMF process) has been prepared for all activities that have been screened for risks and meets the eligibility criteria for proceeding to implementation stage, in that they are not categorized as ‘high risk’ and having potentially adverse impacts on the lives of communities dependent on the forest resources and with little possibility of mitigating such adverse impacts or the benefits outweigh the impacts.  The attached Livelihood Restoration Framework is the initial management plan that provides guidance on, among other aspects, the timeline and procedures for the preparation of the Livelihood Action Plan (LAP) for the Project, participation of individuals and communities in decisions potentially impacting them and their livelihoods, compensation and rehabilitation assistance, applicable legal framework, and monitoring and evaluation. In addition, it includes the Terms of Reference for the development of the detailed LAP to be prepared during Project implementation. |
| Risk 12: - Potential contamination of soil and/or water resources due to the anticipated increased use of natural and chemical fertilizers, and higher runoff and waste pulp generation at coffee washing stations because of expected heightened coffee production.  - Generation of non-hazardous solid and liquid domestic wastes during the conduct of activities dealing with commercialization, training and extension, conferences and regional dialogues, as well as due to the provision of new equipment and supplies to land use planning agencies and teams.  (Standard 8.1) | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | Component 2 includes the adoption of sustainable intensification practices, the provision of a pilot enhanced extension package to farm households to improve yields, the support to Agricultural Commercialization Clusters (ACC) in the greening of value chains, and the increase in public and private investments in sustainable coffee value chains and new entrants to specialty markets. These interventions potentially involve: i) a higher use of natural fertilizers traditionally employed in agriculture in the two regions, in particular manure; ii) the introduction of chemical fertilizers or the intensification of their use in smallholder farmers receiving the extension package or participating in an ACC; and iii) an increase in the processing of coffee at washing stations because of improved production levels. The uncontrolled release of these substances (natural and chemical fertilizers) and wastes (runoff and processed pulp at coffee washing stations) may lead to contamination of soil and/or water resources.  The generation of liquid and solid domestic wastes during the holding of commercialization, training and extension, conferences and regional dialogue activities, and the production of solid wastes associated with the packaging of equipment and supplies for planning entities are anticipated to be negligible to minor. | The attached ESMF elaborates on the identified contamination risks and provides prevention, mitigation, management, monitoring and capacity building measures to address those risks. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?**  *Note: Project categorization is determined by the highest level of significance of identified risks across all potential risk areas (as rated in Question 3).* | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***High Risk*** | **X** | While the identified risks and their potential impacts are individual assessed to be moderate, their cumulative impacts, and the associated challenges of managing them, which is largely dependent on the capacities of the partners and the implementation arrangements during project implementation, have necessitated a High risk rating. The Environment and Social Management Framework and associated tools provide clear and detailed guidance on how these risks should be managed during implementation and the required procedures for each type of risk. | | |
|  | **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. | | | | |
| ***Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)*** | **X** |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* |  | **X** | Targeted assessment(s) | Completed during PPG: Stakeholder analysis, Gender analysis, Climate Risk Assessment (part of ProDoc) |
|  | **X** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) | Planned (as noted in the ESMF) |
|  | **X** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Planned for implementation |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | **X** |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* |  | **X** | Targeted management plans | Completed during PPG: Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan  Planned for implementation:  1)Livelihood Action Plan (guided by the Livelihood Restoration Framework completed during the PPG), 2) Integrated Pest Management Plan  3) Ethnic Minority Group Plan (and associated FPIC)  4) Labour Management Plan |
|  | **X** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan) | Planned for implementation for site-level activities |
|  | **X** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) | Completed during PPG  A Livelihood Restoration Framework was also completed to complement the ESMF |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** |  | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | --- |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | **x** | As explained under Risks, 1, 2 and 3, the Integrated Land Use Plans (ILUPs) may impose limitations and prohibitions on currently allowed uses in certain areas, including land cultivation or the harvesting of forest resources, which would result in negative economic impacts on the individuals, groups and households whose livelihoods are dependent partially or largely on those natural resources. In addition, placing large forest areas under a Participatory Forest Management (PFM) regime may restrict access to those areas by some families that currently derive part of their livelihoods from the utilization of natural resources present in the managed areas. These impacts (i.e. restrictions on access, participation and beneficiation) may be heighted for those that are already vulnerable and marginalized on the basis of their ethnicity, religion, sex, gender and other social and demographic attributes. The capacities of rights-holders to claim their rights to claim their rights and duty-bearers to meet their obligations are limited in Ethiopia, and particularly so for smallholder farmers in the coffee sector and forest resource users/groups and also in the environment and forest sector in general. Institutional capacities are limited by inadequate budgets, human resources and expertise.  The Project design therefore includes a strong participatory approach to the development of both the ILUPs and PFM practices, including consultation with vulnerable and marginalized groups, seeking to incorporate their views, traditional knowledge and experience into the ILUPs and the PFM framework, including how to incorporate affected communities in the proposed Project interventions and enhance Project benefits to them. In addition, a Livelihood Restoration Framework has been prepared as the initial management plan to provide guidance on, among other aspects, the timeline and procedures for the preparation of the Livelihood Action Plan (LAP) for the Project, participation of individuals and communities in decisions potentially impacting them and their livelihoods, compensation and rehabilitation assistance, applicable legal framework, and monitoring and evaluation. The Livelihood Restoration Framework includes the Terms of Reference for the development of the detailed LAP to be prepared during Project implementation.  To ensure appropriate, evidence- and results-based implementation of project activities, there is a strong emphasis on capacity building and training, and budgetary provisions have been made to ensure this for all relevant project interventions and activities. | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **x** | During the stakeholder consultation process undertaken for the preparation of the Project Document, a key concern raised was that the Project may pay limited attention to and not fully include vulnerable groups such as women, and particularly women from vulnerable and marginalized groups. Furthermore, As explained in the response to Question 1, Part A of this Report, a detailed Gender Analysis and Action Plan was prepared for the Project and their main findings were incorporated into the Project design, including in the Project Results Framework and specific activities have been planned to target women and improve their participation and also benefits from the project. | | |
| ***Accountability*** | **x** | As explained under Risk 2: The capacity of duty bearers and rights-holders to claim their rights and meet their obligations are limited due to inadequate resources and technical capacity. The local land use planning process under Component 1 is expected to lead to local level dialogues and deeper level engagement with the issues of land tenure, land use and management and raise an awareness at the local level, about national policy views on land use and governance. Currently, capacities for engaging on these issues, at both regional, zonal, woreda and kebele levels, is limited, and so how the land use planning process will turn out is highly dependent on these capacities, including within formal institutions and within local communities.  To ensure accountability to stakeholders a robust Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) has been designed for the project. | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | **x** | As explained under Risk 5: The Project includes activities in two UNESCO Biosphere Reserves: Kafa and Yayu Forests, which trigger pre-mitigation risks related to possible adverse impacts to habitats and /or ecosystems and ecosystem services, as well as activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas. The Project design however emphasizes sustainable production practices, which diminishes the likelihood of occurrence of the noted risks, and the ESMF includes appropriate management measures, such as guidelines for fertilizer management, guidelines for integrated pest management, mitigation of impacts at coffee washing stations, among others, which further reduce risks to environmentally sensitive areas. Furthermore the intervention under Component 2 of the project, as designed to provide a higher level of income for farmers, reducing pressure on the forest for timber extraction and crop expansion – as a result of improved agronomic practices, diversification of cash crops, and improved agroforestry with indigenous shade-tree species. | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | **x** | As explained under Risk 2, two of the outcomes of Component 2 (Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains across coffee zone of Oromia and SNNP) are sensitive to potential impacts of climate change. The Project design includes a series of measures aimed at building resilience and promoting adaptation to climate change in the agricultural and agroforestry sectors. The ESMF elaborates on the potential risks posed by climate change and provides prevention, mitigation, management, monitoring and capacity building measures to address those risks. | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | **x** | As outlined under Risks 7, 8 and 9, some of the activities under Component 2 (related to increased production and productivity in the coffee sector) as well as under Component 3, related to deployment of forest rangers under PFM, may introduce community health, safety and working conditions risks that will require active management and mitigation measures. | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **x** | As outlined under Risks 10, some of the activities under Component 2 (related to branding and specialty coffee marketing) will support a commercialization of Ethiopia’s coffee knowledge, culture and tradition, and so this may introduce negative impacts related to cultural appropriation that could contravene Standard 4 of the UNDP SES. This will require active management and mitigation through FPIC and associated plans that will be developed to manage risks under Standard 6. | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **x** | Please refer to comments on Principle 1 above. | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **x** | As outlined under Risk 1, vulnerable and marginalized groups (in line with Standard 6), including minority ethnic groups who may be/are excluded based on their cultural identity are expected to be present in the project sites, considering Ethiopia’s diverse ethnicities. | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | **x** | As outlined under Risk 8, Component 2 of the project which supports the intensification of production in Ethiopia’s coffee zones through work with small-scale farmers and Component 3 the project which will recruit forest rangers, these activities carry the risk of violation of ILO standards, including child labour and underpayment. Hence in order to supplement the site-level ESMPs prepared as part of the ESMF implementation for the project, a Labour Management Plan will be prepared to mitigate risks around wages and working conditions, with particular monitoring of the use of Child Labour, and accompanying sensitization and mitigation measures. | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **x** | The Project may lead to the potential contamination of soil and/or water resources due to the anticipated increased use of natural and chemical fertilizers, and higher runoff and waste pulp generation at coffee washing stations because of expected heightened coffee production.  The Project emphasizes sustainable production practices, which diminishes the likelihood of occurrence of the noted risks, and the ESMF includes appropriate management measures, such as guidelines for fertilizer management, guidelines for integrated pest management, mitigation of impacts at coffee washing stations, among others. | | |

**Final Sign Off**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/ses_toolkit/default.aspx) 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)? | *N* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | *Y* |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| 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]](#footnote-4) | *Y* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | *Y* |
| **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)? | *Y* |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | *N* |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | *Y* |
| 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?  *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* | *Y* |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  *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*. | *Y* |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | *Y* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | *Y* |
| 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? | *Y* |
| 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) | *Y* |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | *N* |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | *N* |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species? | *N* |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | *Y* |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | *Y* |
| 1. 9 significant agricultural production? | *Y* |
| 1. 10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | *N* |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | *N* |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[5]](#footnote-5) | *N* |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[6]](#footnote-6) | *N* |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | *N* |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | *N* |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events* | *Y* |
| 2.3 direct or indirect increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disasters now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | *N* |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | *N* |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 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) | *N* |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | *N* |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | *N* |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | *N* |
| 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)? | *N* |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | *N* |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | *N* |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property, or to support project activities? | *N* |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | *Y* |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | *N* |
| 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) | *N* |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | *N* |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | *Y* |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 5.1 temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)? | *N* |
| 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)? | *Y* |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[7]](#footnote-7) | *N* |
| 5.4 impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | *Y* |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 6.1 areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)? | *Y* |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | *Y* |
| 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)?  *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* | *N* |
| 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? | *N* |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | *Y* |
| 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?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above.* | *Y* |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | *N* |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | *N* |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | *Y* |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)* | *---* |
| 7.1 working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments? | *Y* |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | *N* |
| 7.3 use of child labour? | *Y* |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | *N* |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | *Y* |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? | *Y* |
| **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *---* |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | *Y* |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | *Y* |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals? | *N* |
| 8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) | *N* |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | *N* |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | *N* |

1. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew and ECFF. 2017. *Coffee Farming and Climate Change in Ethiopia. Impacts, Forecasts, Resilience and Opportunities. Summary Report 2017*, p. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ibid, p. 20. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ibid, p. 24 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Ibid, p. 24

   rounds 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)