# Annex D: Social and Environmental Screening Template (C-SAP 2 PIMS 5821)

*The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document at the design stage. Note: this template will be converted into an online tool. The online version will guide users through the process and will embed relevant guidance.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Strengthening coordinated approaches to reduce invasive alien species (IAS) threats to globally significant agrobiodiversity and agroecosystems in China |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | PIMS 5821 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | China |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Implementation |
| 1. Date | 12 December 2022 |

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

Improved protection of the agroecosystem in Hainan and Chongqing will be achieved through the combined effect of project components, which will facilitate a reduction in the IAS threat to agrobiodiversity found in the project targeted agricultural landscapes and beyond. Reducing the negative impact of IAS will have positive ecological and economic consequences, where the latter will have an impact on the local farmer communities’ livelihoods, as well as financial implications. While 35,000 ha of farmland will benefit from direct project intervention, areas benefitting from voluntary replication of similar type of IAS Management, facilitated by the project, is expected to be much larger.

|  |
| --- |
| **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*** |
| The project is guided by UNDPs adherence to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) Statement of Common Understanding of the Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation and Programming or the UN Common Understanding, which further human rights in all development programmes and policies. The project addresses the negative effects of Alien Invasive Species (IAS) on the agroecosystems and the resulting negative impact on the economy and agricultural production at national, provincial and county levels, where parts of the project have specific interventions focusing on farmers at the household level. The project activities are targeted towards preventing, controlling and managing IAS (hereafter termed IAS Management) in the local farming communities, which include farmers of ethnic minorities, as well as farmers living under the official poverty levels. The project’s participatory approach to awareness raising and training, is aimed towards maximizing local engagement and broad dissemination of new knowledge within the communities engaged by the project. The project is regularly communicating and collaborating with farmers within the project’s targeted agricultural landscapes through local extension services trained under the project. The project ensures that youth, single parent households, and people from other disadvantaged groups benefit from the project’s trainings and other initiatives where possible and relevant. The project ensures gender equality and women empowerment are mainstreamed, in adherence to UNDP’s human rights-based approach in all its development programming. The project ensures that human-rights based approach are mainstreamed in the project through the inclusion and participation of local farming communities, including ethnic minorities, in all relevant project activities. The project also ensures compliance with Social and Environmental (SES) Standard 5 through protection of rights of communities that maybe affected by physical or economic displacement, including activities that pose restriction on land use or access to resources. The project also established Grievance Redress Mechanism, the first line of response to stakeholder concerns that have not been prevented by proactive stakeholder engagement, where affected persons who have grievances, complaints or feedback can access to ensure resolution of concerns through dialogue, joint fact-finding, negotiation and problem solving. The project also developed Social Inclusion Plan to ensure that ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups can fully participate in project activities.The implementation of the project’s activities within the project targeted agricultural landscapes (and beyond) reduces, or as a minimum halts the expansion of Alien Invasive Species, as well as improve the measures for preventing, controlling and managing IAS, including making the measures more cost effective and custom-tailored at local level. These combined strategies provide livelihood improvement for the community and individual households. With a reduction in the IAS’ encroachment, more farmlands are available for crop production without farmers having to engage in IAS management, saving both time and money. In addition, with more cost-effective measures for combatting IAS on affected lands, farmers were able to reduce the impact of IAS, thereby maintaining or increasing their yields per unit area, while spending less funds (and time) on the IAS control and management. As another “spin off”, projects activities became a springboard for a smaller subset of local farmers who can engage in local business focused on prevention, control and management of IAS within their local area, thus, providing specialized services to local growers.  Under Output 3.1, the project prepared and currently implements consolidated training packages to strengthen the capacity of farmers, including cooperatives, agricultural enterprises and other relevant stakeholders to prevent, control, and manage IAS within their fields and the surrounding public village areas. The project ensures the inclusion of potentially marginalized individuals and groups in these capacity building packages on IAS prevention, control and management, consistent with the non-discrimination and equality human rights principle. Under Output 3.2, demonstration of IAS management in 60 ha of agricultural landscapes involves farming communities in Hulu and Longfei. The project ensures that potentially marginalized and vulnerable groups are included, to ensure their inclusivity and accessibility of project benefits. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project is following an underlying strategy of gender equality and women’s empowerment, which is based on the project realities where for instance women, comparatively well represented within Government structures, are underrepresented in the mid and top managerial positions. Because of this, the project targets an optimization of this group where project activities provide opportunities for women’s greater representation. This is being done through active promotion and encouragement of women to become the institutional representatives in project relevant activities. In many local rural communities, about 65% or more of residents are women, because of the prevailing household strategy to have the man seek employment outside the county or even the province, while the women stay behind looking after the family’s children, its elderly and equally important, its land. Because of this, the project activities are targeted towards the predominant female target group (the farmers). And while the technical work and IAS measures are gender neutral, the trainings nonetheless are tailored to accommodate women’s need. For instance, half-day training sessions are being done to ensure that they can do household chores and pick up children from school (or be at home when children arrive).  In the project’s Gender Mainstreaming Plan, which has been developed during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, the project promotes / requests / encourages meaningful participatory process for engaging women in all project activities. The Gender Mainstreaming Plan also outlines how the project engages with women in its local level activities including farmers trainings. As part of its indicator system (and its gender disaggregated targets), the project follows its progress towards achieving gender equality and women’s empowerment, which is the base for the project’s GEN 2 gender marker. The project’s gender equality and women’s empowerment monitoring also follows the project’s performance in this regard. The gender-based indicators have been incorporated into the project’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework. The project actively mainstreams gender equality in all its activities, outputs of which are measured through gender-disaggregated indicators. To raise women’s inclusion, several approaches were done by the project – inclusion through women’s representation in its work groups, and dissemination of specific communication messages, planning of training and assistance activities that state their gender targets. The activities were also designed to accommodate women. One such example is the conduct of training for half-day instead of one whole day, during busy season or hours of the day to facilitate the participation of young women with school children. Field activities were adjusted to match the gender equality targets based on gender-disaggregated indicators. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The ongoing implementation of different project components facilitates the reduction of threat of invasive alien species (IAS) to agrobiodiversity not only in the project target areas of Hainan and Chongqing, but in the broader agricultural landscapes in China. This improved protection of the agroecosystem reduces vulnerabilities and strengthens resilience of agricultural communities against the negative impacts of IAS.  The capacity building being implemented by the project under Outcome 3 for farming communities, cooperatives, agricultural enterprises, and farming communities in terms of knowledge and skills contributes to sustainability and resilience against the threat of IAS on agroecosystems.  The project is implementing both a top down and a bottom-up approach to ensure its long-term environmental sustainability effect. At the central level, the project supports the re-establishment of a national IAS Management coordination group consisting of the main ministries and administrations, which are working in the area of IAS Management within China. The national coordination group facilitates the work towards improved collaboration between the relevant ministries and administrations and coordinates the development of the regulatory and strategic framework for long-term IAS Management. The project also facilitates the development of IAS Management strategic action plans at the provincial levels and supports the establishment, and strengthening, of provincial and county level IAS Management coordination groups, to contribute to sustainability beyond project closure.  In addition, the development of the Knowledge Management platform and the project supported data exchange between monitoring and database systems provide stakeholders within and outside Government with information on IAS risk management, early warning, threat analysis and IAS Management, including biological and low to no chemical management measures.  With the increased coordination and strengthened capacity in using new and existing management systems, the benefits of the project will be better institutionalized and embedded within ministries, and provincial and county departments and offices, enabling an increased and long-term engagement in reducing the threats of IAS to the agroecosystem, including traditional varieties and genetic resources for food and agriculture (GRFA), which will ultimately result in positive effects to the economy.  The project’s on-the-ground engagement through training of local departments and offices, including the extension services, provides for an increased long-term capacity for engaging effectively with the local communities and individual farmers. In turn, the training of local farmers ensures the sustainability of their agricultural farms from the threat of IAS, builds the village capacity, knowledge and expertise, which is needed for peer-to-peer learning and information exchange. Peer-to-peer learning is not only happening within villages, but as part of the project replication and up-scaling efforts. Local farmers are engaged in explaining, promoting and demonstrating the advancements they have made within their areas to farmers from outside. This bottom-up engagement will be important for the successful dissemination of project activities and results aimed at large scale uptake of the project promoted solutions and interventions. In addition, farmers trained in the use of vegetation replacement techniques using cash crops such as hybrid elephant grass *Pennisetum sinese* and nectar producing plant *Sophora davidii*, which are suited to local conditions, and being used as countermeasures against IAS, provides sustainability of their livelihoods, in addition to their regular crops.  The initial, on the ground implementation will demonstrate an IAS threat reduction to traditional varieties and GRFA in form of wild rice, litchi and herbs used in Chinese traditional medicines, by targeting a subset of IAS (i.e., Alligator weed, Golden apple snail and Mile-a-minute) on 30 ha in Wenchang (Hainan) and Bishan (Chongqing). Through the project, the developed and demonstrated practices is being replicated on additional 35,000 ha providing for added direct global environmental benefits. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The project ensures active local community engagement and participation in different project activities, specifically targeting those at risk of being left behind through the project’s developed Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP). The establishment of the IAS knowledge management platform and use of IAS app contributed to accelerated and effective response to IAS through information exchange among stakeholders, thus contributing to the full participation of technicians, farmers, and professional service providers to the implementation of national and provincial IAS action plans. The project also ensures the participation of farmers, private sector, and citizens to its activities. The project has established a grievance mechanism at the project level where direct beneficiaries of the project such as farmers can air their concerns and demands. The MARA website also has a special interactive section, such as ministerial mailbox, online petition, agricultural hotline, and interactive comments and messages, which can be accessed by affected stakeholders, to help address their questions and concerns, and to promote the work of MARA. The stakeholders can also avail of the project’s Accountability Mechanism, composed of Compliance Review and Stakeholder Response Mechanism. The former is an avenue for affected persons or groups to respond to claims that UNDP is not in compliance with its Social and Environmental Standards, while the latter helps affected stakeholders to jointly resolve their concerns.  The project also ensures the timely disclosure of information on supported activities, including the project’s potential environmental and social risks and impacts and management measures through public disclosure of SES documents and providing regular feedback to stakeholders through coordination meetings at different geographical levels, the established Grievance Mechanism, and through information posted in MARA website. The Project Steering Committee also ensures that the project implementation is in accordance with UNDP SES policy and standards that ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness and transparency.  Although the PMO Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, with support of the Technical C-SAP program advisor, monitors the indicators of the Project Results Framework, the project will benefit from the hiring of dedicated Gender and Safeguards Officer to monitor the SESP checklist and the developed management instruments, for the remaining project activities. This is to ensure the project’s compliance to SES’ programming principles and applicable standards. |

**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 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | | | | **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:** Some members of the farming communities who may suffer violations of their human rights, including the ability to be heard, or may not have benefited from the project, may not have opportunity to air their grievances related to the project resulting in their exclusion from enjoying project benefits  **Human Rights:** P.3 P.4, P.6  **Accountability:** P.13, P.14 | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Any changes brought about the project have the potential to go against one or more persons, community group and/or stakeholder group. Grievances from groups and/or individuals must have a forum to be voiced and heard. | | **Assessment**  Under Output 3.4 (Operational IAS management plans are developed for two target agricultural landscapes and implemented on 35,000 ha demonstrably reducing IAS threats on agrobiodiversity and traditional varieties), the developed IAS management plans have been implemented starting 2022 for two target agricultural landscapes in Wenchang and Bishan, with midterm target reaching 21,191 ha of landscape under improved IAS prevention, control and management practices, out of target of 35,000 ha.  As the implementation of the developed IAS management plans will rely on active participation of local farming communities, including consultations with various institutions and stakeholder groups, there is potential risk that some individuals or stakeholder groups will raise their concerns or grievances related to IAS management plans implementation.  Although the project has established a grievance mechanism at project sites, where member of the communities, including farmers can voice their grievances, information on the nature of grievances, the process of resolution, and whether the resolution of grievances did not lead to further marginalization (e.g., violation of human rights and economic displacement) of affected persons, were not available.  Aside from the established grievance mechanism, the MARA website provides interactive platform where members of farming communities can send their concerns. Record of these grievances however is not available to further assess the improvements needed to make this platform address concerns of affected stakeholders.  **Management Measures**  The **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** and the **Grievance Redress Mechanism** developed for the project ensure that any grievances raised by project stakeholders, or direct or indirect beneficiaries will be addressed. The PMO acts as a “doorway” to address any potential grievance from affected stakeholders or beneficiaries.  For the two demonstration areas in Longfei Village in Chongqing and Hulu Village in Hainan (Output 3.2), the project has established village-level grievance management mechanisms. A complaint / suggestion box was set up in each office of village committee and committee members collect information periodically (quarterly) and submit to Chongqing / Hainan UNDP project teams (PMOs), if any.  For the two target agricultural landscapes in Wenchang and Bishan, the project, through the PMO implements a similar village-level grievance redress management mechanisms as that of the demonstration areas in Longfei Village in Chongqing and Hulu Village in Hainan, being implemented throughout China and in accordance with the developed Grievance Redress Mechanism for the project.  Under the grievance system being implemented within China, village issues or grievances are brought up at the village committee meetings or are brought up at country meetings.  The project also has an Accountability Mechanism, composed of Compliance Review and Stakeholder Response Mechanism. The Compliance Review is an avenue for affected persons or groups to respond to claims that UNDP is not in compliance with its Social and Environmental Standards. The Stakeholder Response Mechanism, on the other hand, helps project affected stakeholders to jointly resolve their concerns and disputes. | | | |
| **Risk 2:** Efforts to halt/minimize the threats of IAS to agrobiodiversity, including use of traditional varieties and GRFA, do not materialize or are insufficient, leading to reduced productivity of land with adverse impacts on local farmers’ livelihoods.  **Human Rights:** P.3, P.4, P.6  **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment**: P.9  **Standard 5**: 5.2  **Standard 6:** 6.1 | I = 4  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Even with the project and the overall Government of China’s interventions towards addressing the barriers for an effective and efficient IAS Management in China, the likelihood exists that the planned interventions are not sufficient (due to issues of scale) to negate the impacts of IAS on agrobiodiversity and land productivity, or there might be a lag period before the intended benefits of the project interventions are realized. There are potential risks that in the course of implementation of IAS management plans, efforts to halt or minimize the threats of IAS to agrobiodiversity of the two landscapes will not be realized or insufficient, which may lead to further reduction of land productivity causing economic displacement on local farmers. | | **Assessment**  Under Output 3.4, it targeted about 35,000 ha of farmlands covered by IAS such as mile-a-minute, alligator weed, and golden apple snail. Although the midterm target of 15,000 ha of landscape under improved IAS prevention, control and management practices has been achieved, with total area reaching 21,191 ha, complacency or lack of follow-up in activities to prevent, control and manage IAS may lead to recolonization of these invasive species on agricultural lands. This consequently may further impact local farmers’ livelihood.  It was initially assessed during the PPG stage that Longfei Village, which is the main village in the project targeted agricultural landscape in Chongqing under Output 3.2, is predominantly an ethnic minority village. After cross-checking of the original Chinese baseline documents and raw data, and interview with personnel participating in baseline survey, in addition to updated confirmed information by the village head, it was established that there were only 8 ethnic minority people in the village, composed of Miao, Yi and Dai people out of a total population of 3,399 people, 7 of these ethnic minorities are female.  As for demographic features of the village, of the 3,399 registered residents of 1,196 households in the village, 70% are between 15-64 years of age while 12% and 18% are between 0-14 and above 65 years old respectively.  Approximately 40% of the village labor force are long-term migrant workers, while another 25% have employment outside the village and commute every day. 35% are professional farmers.  **Management Measures**  The National Strategic Action Plan (NSAP) for the Prevention and Control of Invasive Alien Species (IAS), and Measures for the Management of IAS have been jointly developed by different ministries in January 2021, and June 2022, respectively to ensure the delineation of relevant ministries in IAS management. The IAS NSAP will be revised and improved based on the findings of the MTR. At the provincial level, Provincial Strategic Action Plans (PSAPs) for the prevention and control of IAS for Hainan and Chongqing have been completed.  Under Output 3.1 (Farming communities, including cooperatives, agricultural enterprises and other relevant stakeholders are capacitated through training building the knowledge and skills base of all groups to work together to address IAS threats to agroecosystems), the training for different stakeholder groups in Chongqing and Hainan is currently being implemented, the objective of which is to strengthen the capacity of farmers, including cooperatives, agricultural enterprises and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the prevention, control and management of IAS within their farms and immediate surroundings. The training includes vegetation replacement techniques, biological control, and low volume chemical management, all aimed at reducing the immediate impact on farmers’ fields and crops. The training will include videos of practical on the ground training and will be made available online (Output 4.2 - A national web‐based IAS information and communication platform is established providing a forum for information sharing and communication on prevention, control, and management of IAS in agroecosystems.  To further lessen the impacts of IAS on land productivity and consequently, on the livelihoods of farming communities, including that of women, the project actively mainstreams gender equality, where gender disaggregated indicators are measured in all project activities. Several approaches that were done to raise women’s inclusion include increase in their representation in training demonstration, assistance activities, and work with farmers’ cooperatives, thus ensuring their engagement in IAS prevention, control, and management.  To ensure the participation of ethnic minorities in the project, 4 had participated in the project core demonstration area and 7 had received IAS training in the project area. The project also ensures the participation of vulnerable groups in project activities, including women and youth.  As to the anticipated potential economic loss due to the IAS impact on lands arising from decrease in available area crops or grazing livestock, the project will develop a **Livelihood Action Framework**, in compliance with UNDP SES Standard 5 requirements. | | | |
| **Risk 3:** Existing gender biases and discrimination related to access to opportunities and benefits remains unaltered or may worsen  **Human Rights:** P.3, P.4, P.6  **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment:** P.9 | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Although one of the most gender balanced countries in Asia, gender mainstreaming still needs to be actively promoted within projects to ensure women’s empowerment. If not actively pursued, less engagement of women could potentially occur.  While China is on the path towards gender equality and women’s empowerment, China is still struggling with gender imbalance. Although women are comparatively well represented within Government structures, they are underrepresented in the mid and top managerial positions. In many local rural communities, about 65% or more of local residents are women because of prevailing household practice of letting men seek employment outside the county or the province, while women stay behind to take care of the children, the elderly and the family’s land. | | **Assessment**  In Longfei village for example (Output 3.2 – Participatory approaches for preventing, controlling and managing IAS are demonstrated in 60 ha within two target agricultural landscapes, providing viable and cost-effective techniques to reduce IAS threats and impacts), although 51% of the registered residents are women, men seek employment outside the village (and the county), and hence, do not take part in the daily life and work in the village. This resulted in more women comprising the village workforce.  In Hulu village, another demonstration site, about 48% of registered residents are women. But like Longfei village, men also seek employment outside the village and county, resulting to women making up for larger village workforce.  **Management Measures**  The project has undertaken a **gender analysis** and prepared a **Gender Mainstreaming Plan**, which serves as the guiding document during project implementation. The Gender Mainstreaming Plan, which aims to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment, will ensure that project related application processes are without gender bias, and engage with women in its local level activities including farmers trainings with the aim of having 50% or more of the project beneficiaries being women. The project’s gender equality and women’s empowerment monitoring will follow the project’s performance in this regard. In addition, the Gender Mainstreaming Plan describes specific actions to mainstream gender into project output implementation including gender indicators. Key strategies include mobilizing support from gender specialists, ensuring women’s genuine and equal representation, and project specific actions to empower women, including providing capacity support for women’s group in IAS management.  Under Output 3.1 (Farming communities, including cooperatives, agricultural enterprises and other relevant stakeholders are capacitated through training building the knowledge and skills base of all groups to work together to address IAS threats to agroecosystems.), a gender specialist has been recruited under Activity 3.1.3 to develop the training plan for women. The project will ensure the implementation of developed Gender Mainstreaming Plan in all project relevant activities.  Under Activity 3.1.2 (Organize adapted trainings for different stakeholder groups including farmers, cooperatives, enterprises and other stakeholders) for example, organizers ensure that gender and mainstreaming of women play a central role in trainings, including having all women trainings and observing gender equality. The monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the C-SAP 2 IAS project’s gender mainstreaming action plan (MARA-lead) is also being done under Output 4.4.7. | | | |
| **Risk 4:** Use of low volume pesticides as one of IAS prevention, control and management techniques will adversely affect plants, animals and their habitats  **Standard 1:** 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6  **Standard 8:** 8.1, 8.2 | I = 4  L = 1 | **Moderate** | The project will conduct targeted IAS eradication, control and management activities at IAS degraded agricultural landscapes and the removal or reduction of these IAS (and the methods used) could result in that ecological function/structure/ processes change locally in the project targeted agricultural landscapes, affect endangered species within these areas or facilitate an unintentional spread of IAS. | | **Assessment**  As of the project midterm, the reduction of IAS threats in the project’s 35,000 ha large targeted agricultural landscapes have only been partly achieved. The current project interventions as of midterm are the training of around 6,000 farmers in IAS management, which includes vegetation replacement techniques, biological control and low volume pesticides management. The use of pesticides, even if low volume can adversely affect both animals and plants and their habitats.  **Management Measures**  The project has institutionalized IAS management through establishment of regulatory framework and coordination mechanism at the national and provincial levels, thereby expanding protected landscapes that contribute to sustainability of GRFA production.  Under Output 3.1 (Farming communities, including cooperatives, agricultural enterprises and other relevant stakeholders are capacitated through training building the knowledge and skills base of all groups to work together to address IAS threats to agroecosystems), training for different stakeholder groups in Chongqing and Hainan is currently being undertaken. These expert-led trainings will serve as the foundation for long-term implementation of IAS Management techniques and interventions to be undertaken by local stakeholders in project’s targeted agricultural landscapes (Output 3.2 and 3.4), to minimize the threat from Alligator weed, Golden apple snail and Mile-a-minute in the project targeted landscapes.  Output 3.3 (Improved understanding of IAS distribution and impacts on agrobiodiversity, at two agricultural landscapes through targeted and management-oriented surveys and assessments) involves local stakeholders in the collection of data on the distribution of key IAS from the “First Priority” IAS species list, to ensure that IAS threats on critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas are minimized.  The development of local and county level management plans, currently being undertaken is through a participatory process, and relies on latest research and expert inputs.  Some of the management techniques being implemented include vegetation replacement using cash crops (e.g., hybrid elephant grass *Pennisetum sinese* and nectar producing plant *Sophora davidii);* use of IAS specific biological agents; use of local plants to control IAS in areas bordering the fields; combined vegetative replacement with biological agents and/or chemical agents (i.e., project will only use “low-chemical” techniques).  For the remaining timeline of the project, both expert-led and targeted and management-oriented assessments will continue to be implemented to ensure that farmers trained on IAS prevention will observe due diligence in application of IAS prevention techniques, including the application of low-volume pesticides. | | | |
| **Risk 5:** Local communities may face physical hazards, or risks related to use and transportation of pesticides and agrochemicals used to eradicate IAS invasions, with adverse impacts on their health and safety or on ecosystems or ecosystem services on which they depend.  **Standard 3:** 3.2, 3.5, 3.6  **Standard 7:** 7.6  **Standard 8:** 8.1, 8.2 | I = 4  L = 2 | **Moderate** | The project will conduct targeted eradication, control and management activities for selected IAS of national significance.  Eradication, control and management will involve the use of chemicals solely where it is the only effective method. | | **Assessment**  The project has institutionalized IAS management through establishment of regulatory framework and coordination mechanism at the national and provincial levels, thereby expanding protected landscapes that contribute to sustainability of GRFA production.  As of the project midterm, the reduction of IAS threats in the project’s 35,000 ha large targeted agricultural landscapes have only been partly achieved, which if not sustained, may have negative impact on agrobiodiversity through proliferation of IAS. The use of low volume pesticides, as one of the IAS management techniques, may pose occupational health and safety hazard for the users, the adjacent communities.  **Management Measures**  The project’s ESMP will include **Pesticide Management Procedures** that are in accordance with Targeted Guidance: UNDP SES Standard 8 (Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency) in general; and best national and international practices such as WHO / FAO International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management, which prohibits the use of chemical products that fall in Classes Ia (extremely hazardous) and Ib (highly hazardous). Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard WHO Class II (moderately hazardous) chemicals will not be used. Chemicals will also be handled, stored, applied and disposed of in line with FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides.  Management measures built into project design:  Part of the project’s demonstration is the introduction to local farmers of new practices in IAS Management. These include: (i) use of biological agents; (ii) use of specific and optimized dosages of chemicals; (iii) use of other types of pests and weed control; (iv) vegetation replacement; and (v) safe handling of pesticides based on FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides.  A key project component in this regard is the establishment of the IAS knowledge platform (Output 4.1 and 4.2), which among other things identify and collect best international practices for the prevention, control and management of IAS, hereby broadening the potential non-pesticide options available to China, as well as options for effective low-level usage of chemicals where other options are not available and or feasible. | | | |
| **Risk 6:** Local communities and minority communities, who traditionally used IAS as animal fodder are negatively impacted by strengthened IAS prevention, control and management efforts, with strengthened quarantine process and reduced access to land with IAS.  **Standard 6:** 6.1, 6.2, 6.4 | I = 2  L = 2 | **Low** | Alien Invasive Species will spread to any area as long as there are no or few restrictions, which affect Chinese farmers regardless of their ethnicity.  IAS are used traditionally as animal fodder, but there is no evidence yet that IAS are used for specific income generating or livelihood purposes, unless there are entrepreneurs importing exotic species for the purpose of selling, using non-regulated channels. There is no evidence that IAS control and restriction being done under the project will affect whole communities or parts thereof.  Although IAS have been in China for up to 150 years, there is also no evidence that these are being used for livelihood by any minority group. However, with the opening-up of the trade and transportation network, local species might, if introduced elsewhere, become an invasive species in the “new areas” and in such cases, restrictions might come into play.  That said, this would not affect people in the local area (as the species are not invasive there) but could affect businesses that seek to export the species, or growers or exporters of goods through which a given specie might unintentionally be spread.  However, farmers and growers, regardless of the communities/ethnic groups they live/belong, will most likely be faced with an increased need for ensuring that their products do not unintentionally contain any IAS. This in turn requires more time on quality and shipment control not only by the producers, but also on behalf of the buyers/sellers who ultimately are responsible for the shipments across, for instance, provincial boundaries. The cost of this increased product scrutiny will initially fall upon the local farmer who will have an additional time/financial cost. However, over time this cost will be absorbed in the product cost and is not expected to have any marked effects in the long-term. | | **Assessment**  The project will strengthen IAS prevention, quarantine, disposal and management systems and standards. Although unlikely, this could put additional restrictions on the use of IAS by local communities and/or those involved in the agricultural sector who face strengthened quarantine processes.  During the PPG stage, it was initially assessed that Longfei Village, which is the main village in the project targeted agricultural landscape in Chongqing under Output 3.2, is predominantly an ethnic minority village, but it was confirmed during the baseline survey and interview that there were only 8 ethnic minority people in the village, composed of Miao, Yi and Dai people out of a total population of 3399 people (see Assessment in Risk 2). As IAS are used traditionally as animal fodder, the increased strengthening of quarantine processes and reduced availability of IAS will affect the communities’, including ethnic minorities’ access to this resource.  **Management Measures**  A **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)** and the **Grievance Redress Mechanism** prepared for the project will ensure that local communities and minority communities will have an avenue to address their concerns arising from the potential negative impacts of IAS prevention, control and management efforts.  The **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** developed for the project will be expanded to include a **Social Inclusion Plan** to ensure that the project will not adversely affect the rights, interest, needs, concerns of ethnic minorities, in compliance with Standard 6 requirements. In addition, an **FPIC Implementation Framework**, which will be included in the SIP, will be developed to ensure that any activities will not commence unless FPIC process has been conducted with affected ethnic minorities.  The project will work with local farmers, including those from minority communities on safe product handling. Also, the project’s activities to be implemented with or by local communities will be developed in a participatory manner, taking local concerns (and conditions) into account in the design and implementation of identified IAS Management actions. The engagement of local farmers, including ethnic minorities representatives, will provide for an important feedback loop to ensure that the on the ground intervention within the project targeted agricultural landscapes is as optimal as possible, in design and execution. | | | |
| **Risk 7:** Climate change will lessen impact of project’s IAS prevention, control and management intervention.  **Standard 2:** 2.2 | I = 3  L = 3 | **Moderate** | Variations in temperature could increase the range of the individual Invasive Alien Species. | | Scientific research and data from China show a correlation between the range boundaries of IAS and temperature, and with the general and localized changes in climate (including temperature). There is therefore an apparent likelihood that areas optimal for the invading IAS will increase in size in the coming years as climate change induced temperature increases.  However, this is a comparatively slow change and while the effects of climate change, in all likelihood, will not show any marked changes during the project duration, it will have impact long-term on project sustainability and resilience.  This fact is well recognized, and the project is to address this issue through an optimization in the information exchange between monitoring and data management systems, which among other will be used for risk assessments and model analysis. These will assist the national, provincial and local governments in their IAS Management planning, as well as their targeting of IAS Management interventions aimed at halting IAS advances into new areas opening up due to the changes in climate. | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | |  | |  | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***High 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”)*** | | | **✔** | |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* | | |  | | **✔** | Targeted assessment(s) | Gender analysis (completed)  Stakeholder analysis (completed at PPG stage) |
|  | |  | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | |  | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) |  |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | **✔** | |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | |  | | **✔** | Targeted management plans (e.g., Indigenous Peoples Plan, Resettlement Action Plan, others) | **Completed**  Gender Mainstreaming Plan  Stakeholder Engagement Plan  **Planned**  Expanded Stakeholder Engagement Plan (to include a Social Inclusion Plan)  FPIC Implementation Framework  Livelihood Action Framework  Pesticide Management Procedures |
|  | | **✔** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan) | To include all planned targeted management plans |
|  | |  | 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*** | | | **✔** | | Risks 1, Risk 2 and Risk 3 | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 2 and Risk 3 | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 1 | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 4 | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 7 | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 5 | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | |  | |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 2 | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | **✔** | | Risks 2 and Risk 6 | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 5 | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | **✔** | | Risks 4 and Risk 5 | | |

**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](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/Pages/Homepage.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| 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? | No |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | Yes |
| *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? | Yes |
| 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? [[1]](#footnote-1) | No |
| 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 |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | No |
| 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* | No |
| 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*. | No |
| **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? | 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? | No |
| **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* | 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? | No |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | No |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | No |
| 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?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-2) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** | Yes |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | No |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | No |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping 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* | No |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** | No |
| *Would the project 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) | No |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | No |
| 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? | No |
| 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)? | No |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | No |
| 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? | No |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | No |
| 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) | No |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | No |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | No |
| **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)? | 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?[[4]](#footnote-4) | 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? | No |
| **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)? | Yes |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 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* | No |
| 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? | No |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 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* | No |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | No |
| 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?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | No |
| **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? | No |
| 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? | No |
| **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)? | 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?  *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/) | No |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |

1. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)
4. 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-4)