# Annex D: Social and Environmental Screening Template (C-SAP 2 PIMS 5822)

*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 | Conservation and sustainable use of indigenous agricultural genetic diversity in Hubei |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | PIMS 5822 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | China |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Implementation |
| 1. Date | 23 February 2023 |

**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*** |
| The project is currently implementing a participatory and partnership-based approach to in-situ conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity that engages local farming communities. The project aims to generate social and environmental benefits in parallel with identifying and demonstrating incentive mechanisms for encouraging participation into conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources for food and agriculture (GRFA) that result in mutually supportive outcomes of (1) increased well-being and strengthened resilience of local communities and (2) protection of globally important GRFA varieties through sustainable management of natural resources, emphasizing traditional farming practices.  Farming communities lie at the heart of the project, as well as the C-SAP program (PRC-GEF Partnership Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development). At this stage of implementation, the project has established effective incentive mechanisms for the in-situ conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity through active participation of local farmers. Extensive consultations with local farmers were completed during the project preparation phase to ensure that the approaches developed, and the activities, outputs and envisaged results reflect the livelihood aspirations of both women and men and capture the sustainable development priorities of the local communities. During project implementation, the project ensures participatory approaches to conservation of GRFA, instilling ownership at the community level and, proactive stakeholder engagement, establishing an enabling environment that encourages broader participation among local farmers in the province, including the ethnic minority Tujia and Miao people that live in western Hubei, particularly in the mountainous areas.  The project will ensure that for the remaining period of project implementation, human rights-based approach will be mainstreamed in the project. These include, among others, providing focus on marginalized, disadvantaged and excluded groups and developing and sustaining the partnerships between the C-SAP program and local communities. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Women in rural communities throughout China play an important role as custodians of genetic animal and plant resources, including in seed collection and storage, cultivating home gardens, gathering of ‘wild crops’ alongside a range of other aspects of agrobiodiversity conservation and sustainable use. In fact, women farmers outnumber male farmers in many communities as men have the tendency to migrate to urban areas for factory jobs. Women farmers and members of farming communities have been engaged in project design and their participation is an integral part of project implementation. The project has recruited a Gender Expert, who offers trainings to women, including indigenous peoples, for them to understand their rights and interests and motivates them to participate in the project and play important roles. The Gender Expert, together with the project team continue to support women’s participation through the following:   * Dedicated consultation with women during the identification and design of incentive mechanisms to ensure women’s perspectives help shape the mechanisms developed and ensure that they reflect women’s livelihood priorities. * As part of the participatory landscape assessments and GRFA conservation and sustainable use plans, identification and recognition of areas where women play a key role in the cultivation, processing and marketing of traditional crops and livestock, and identification of areas where roles could be further developed. * Equal representation of women in local landscape coordination committees to guide the implementation of community-based activities. * Targeted training and technical assistance to women farmers, ensuring that 50% of those are women and that training supports them to achieve livelihood objectives. * Targeted training of women professionals among provincial and local governmental units, ensuring that 30% of the total number of trained staff members are women. * Establishment of business ventures that are run by women or have a majority participation by women, and facilitating opportunities for women and women groups to participate in project activities aimed at introducing improved farming practices, developing niche markets, broadening partnerships with agricultural associations and enterprises, etc. * Equal consideration of women in the baseline knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) survey, and targeted awareness-raising actions incorporated into the project knowledge management strategy and action plan. * Ensure and encourage equal opportunity recruitment of women for positions within the project management office, consultancies and other service providers.   As the project has been assigned a gender marker of GEN-2 indicating that gender equality is incorporated as a ‘significant objective’ in the project design, the project has incorporated the results of gender analysis to ensure that gender-specific differences are built into project activities, and gender-disaggregated performance metrics are measured to achieve gender mainstreaming targets. The project is currently implementing the Gender Action Plan and is guided to meet Indicator 3.1, under Outcome 3.1, of actively engaging at least 40% of households led by women and 20% of teenagers actively engaged in the conservation and sustainable use of GRFA in target agricultural landscapes, and at least 50% of households led by women actively engaged in climate-smart grassland management in target pastoral landscapes. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The project will significantly contribute to the conservation of Hubei’s unique agricultural genetic diversity, including crop genetic diversity located within the Chinese center of origin. The project directly improves in-situ conservation and sustainable management of agrobiodiversity across approximately 15,500 hectares of agricultural landscapes. The target GRFA varieties in the three demonstration landscapes include rouge rice, Tao tea and black goat. Each represent globally and nationally important crop and livestock genetic diversity endemic to or largely known from Hubei. They are also culturally important local varieties that have suffered a marked decrease in genetic resources due to reduction in on-farm use. Replication of techniques across a further 5,000 hectares of agricultural landscape is anticipated, covering additional traditional varieties for which strong market prospects are identified. The policy mainstreaming, engagement and awareness components of the project will help facilitate the requisite enabling environment for broader upscaling of in-situ conservation and sustainable use of GRFA across Hubei province.  The project develops and demonstrate incentive mechanisms to support the in-situ conservation of local agrobiodiversity. On-farm conservation of this important agricultural genetic diversity is considered essential to allow these genes to be preserved and form part of the broad genetic resource base for future agricultural production. The project mainstreams the new techniques and incentives and the conservation of agrobiodiversity across government through inclusion into sectoral work plans and agrobiodiversity strategy frameworks. These activities and approaches help raise awareness of agrobiodiversity conservation across a range of levels including government decision makers, farming communities, the public and the next generation, building broad support for it and helping mainstream it into farming production systems across Hubei and government support programs and extension services for farmers.  To further mainstream sustainability and resilience to the project, Component 3 includes strengthening institutional capacity, which is an important aspect of an enabling environment for mainstreaming and upscaling GRFA approaches in province. A total of 180 institutional staff members are targeted for capacity development, representing several provincial agencies, county and township offices and research/academic institutions. The project strategy includes a multifaceted approach to capacity building, including formal course-based training, learning-by-doing interventions and domestic and international knowledge transfer exchanges (Output 3.1). Integrating incentivized GRFA approaches into provincial and county level work programs will help facilitate upscaling (Output 3.2), and GEF resources will help initiate replication in at least two landscapes beyond the areas focused on in Component 2 (Output 3.3).  The project improves access to information and awareness raising among stakeholders under **Component 4**. The added value of a programmatic approach includes sharing best practices and lessons learned through collaborative monitoring & evaluation activities (Output 4.1). A knowledge management strategy and action plan has been developed for the project based on the results of a baseline knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) survey carried out at project inception. Awareness-raising and advocacy campaigns were being carried out, with a particular emphasis on women and youth stakeholders (Output 4.2). GEF funds are also allocated for upgrading a provincial GRFA database, expanding the functions of the system and broadening participation (Output 4.3).  Although there is no legislation on animal welfare in mainland China, the China Association for Standardization (CAS) has developed several group standards for “farm animal welfare requirements”, which the project can adopt (<https://www.ialasia.org/projects/farmed-animal-welfare-group-standards-in-mainland-china>). The project will ensure that black goats will be given appropriate protection and care methods to mitigate the issue of animal cruelty and abuse, within the applicable welfare requirements in China. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| Affected stakeholders may raise their concerns or grievance at any time to the landscape partnership working groups, Project Management Office, the Executing Agency (Hubei DARA) or the Implementing Agency (UNDP). Due diligent efforts will be made by the local project representatives to first resolve grievances locally, in a manner sensitive to local social and cultural norms. If the local process does not result in resolution of a grievance, the case will be upgraded to the PMO (Executing Agency), with the process managed by the Project Manager and National Project Director providing guidance and signing off on written responses to grievances.  Under the guidance of the local county-level agricultural bureaus or municipal agricultural science academies, each project demonstration area has set up a local GEF project office, which is responsible for the implementation of local projects respectively. A project display board was installed in each project demonstration site, indicating a brief description of the project demonstration content, the project's funding source, international implementing agency, domestic implementing agency, project supervisor, project guide, specific organization and implementation party, as well as the main partner undertaking the project. The office phone number and the project’s WeChat official account are left down below, so that it’s convenient for local residents to reach the project members and project management offices to file a complaint or offer more useful suggestions. In this way, their rights of being informed, participation, and supervision can be effectively guaranteed.  The UNDP Country Office, as the Implementing Agency, will be the next avenue for resolving grievances if the case is not resolved at the local level or by the Executing Agency. The Resident Representative will identify a member of the Country Office management team to oversee and manage the grievance through the UNDP Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM). The SRM ensures individuals, peoples, and communities affected by projects have access to appropriate grievance resolution procedures for hearing and addressing project-related complaints and disputes. Further information, including how to submit a grievance to the SRM is found on the UNDP website at: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/secu-srm/> .  Landscape partnership working groups have been established in each of the three demonstration landscapes in Yunyang, Danjiangkou and Xishui counties, with inclusive participation of local farmers, agricultural associations and cooperatives, enterprise sector, NGOs and local government units, and having equitable representation of women and youth. Local level project management support is currently being delivered by county and township agriculture sector offices where the three demonstration landscapes are located. County level GRFA coordination committees have been established at the three target counties to guide the project activities and to provide advisory support on regulatory reform and community interventions. Coordination amongst provincial government agencies is being facilitated by the NPD, and the GRFA Intersectoral Coordination Committee has been established to provide a platform for coordination, information exchange and engagement with a wide range of provincial stakeholders, including NGOs and academic institutions. At the national level, the Project Management Office (PMO) is based the Hubei Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (DARA) in Wuhan. Coordination with other C-SAP child projects is led by the Project Coordinator in liaison with the C-SAP Coordination/M&E Officer working under the C-SAP2 National Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Project.  To further ensure active local community engagement and participation in different project activities, the project has developed and currently implementing Stakeholder Engagement (SEP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP).  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. 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. |

**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: Women are still underrepresented in their participation in project activities, especially in the leadership positions in agricultural associations, cooperatives and local government units, limiting their involvement and accessing benefits from the project.  Accountability: P.13, P.14  Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: P.11 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | While women farmers are actively engaged in farming activities in the demonstration areas, and, in fact, outnumber men in some cases, due to the tendency of men to migrate to urban areas for work, women in leadership positions among agricultural associations, cooperatives and local government units are typically held by men, reducing equitable representation in decision-making processes. This limits them from accessing benefits from the project. | | Assessment  The GEF gender policy shifts from a gender-aware, “do no harm” approach, to a gender-responsive, “do good” approach to better address the gender gaps critical to the achievement of global environmental benefits.  The gender analysis and action plan have been developed during the project preparation phase and is currently being implemented. A gender expert has been recruited to offer trainings to motivate women and disabled people to participate in the project and play important role.  At this stage of implementation, challenges encountered during GAP implementation include the negative impact of the pandemic on the implementation of the GAP and more generally on gender equality.  **Management Measures**  For the remainder of the project implementation, the project will strengthen existing activities to strengthen project activities and reach the end of program target for women beneficiaries.  Under Output 2.2 (Gender-mainstreamed market and non-market based incentive mechanisms for in-situ agrobiodiversity conservation are demonstrated at 3 target agricultural landscapes, resulting in enhanced germplasm protection and securing sustained livelihoods benefits for farmers and improved conservation of target varieties), the project will continue to mainstream the participation of women.  The project will also continue to closely monitor the following outputs relevant to participation of women:2.1.4 Establish or strengthen women marketing groups; and 3.1.5 Deliver targeted training to women professionals. | | | |
| **Risk 2:** Communities in the project areas could face short or longer term economic displacement and/or restricted access to resources because of changes in farming approaches and practices, focusing on improved in-situ conservation and sustainable use of GRFA varieties .  Human Rights: P.3, P.4, P.6  Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: P.11  Standard 5: 5.4 | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | The project design is built upon the premise that introducing and strengthening incentive mechanisms will encourage local farmers to further engage in GRFA varieties. Shifting farming approaches and practices will require time, facilitated through demonstrations, training, partnership development and awareness-raising.  Market development of GRFA varieties through implementation of market and non-market- based incentives include marketing products that are based on traditional farming practices or on traditional products. | | **Assessment**  At this stage of project implementation, there were neither relocation of residents nor economic displacement in the three demonstration landscapes. Instead, the local communities benefit from reduced pesticide chemical inputs arising from the use of GRFA varieties. The communities also benefitted from participating in marketing activities organized by the project that translated to more sources of income.  **Management Measures**  The project has established the grievance mechanism at the start of project implementation to address any complaints or concerns from local communities at the 3 demonstration areas, including potential concerns on economic displacement or restriction of access to resources. Under the guidance of the local county-level agricultural bureaus or municipal agricultural science academies, each project demonstration area has set up a local GEF project office, which is responsible for the implementation of local projects respectively. A project display board was installed in each project demonstration site, indicating a brief description of the project demonstration content, the project's funding source, international implementing agency, domestic implementing agency, project supervisor, project guide, specific organization and implementation party, as well as the main partner undertaking the project. The office phone number and the project’s WeChat official account were also indicated, so that it’s convenient for local residents to reach the project members and project management offices to file a complaint or offer more useful suggestions, including concerns on potential economic displacement. In this way, their rights of being informed, participation, and supervision can be effectively guaranteed.  The project is currently implementing Output 2 activities to ensure long-term livelihood benefits for local farmers. Under Output 2.2, the project is currently implementing both market and nonmarket-based incentive mechanism for in-situ agrobiodiversity conservation, which aims to enhance  germplasm protection and secures sustained livelihood benefits for farmers.  Farming communities are integral to project design and implementation. The project aims to ensure farming communities are central to business partnerships and value chains to ensure that they are able to reap benefits from development of traditional GRFA varieties. Project activities provide training in market skills and development to farming communities so that they have the skills required to initiate and negotiate partnerships with enterprises for product development, and to form farmers cooperatives to take products to market. This mitigates the risk of farming communities not benefitting from these market opportunities.  There is the chance that market opportunities for traditional GRFA varieties might fail or take time to bring to fruition. To mitigate this risk, market assessments and supply/value chain analyses will be conducted and explored only where there are clearly identified opportunities. Incentive mechanisms will also include non-market-based opportunities for situations where there are no or weak market opportunities, and to avoid the risk of product development when there is not a clear demand.  In each of the three demonstration landscapes, local coordination committees have been established, ensuring that farmers have equitable representation in decision making processes regarding market development, changes in farming approaches and dissemination of traditional knowledge. | | | |
| **Risk 4:** Climate change has potential to negatively impact the diversity and viability of sustaining GRFA varieties in the project area.  Standard 2: 2.2 | I = 2  L = 2 | **Low** | Climate change projections are uncertain and more likely to impact the project in the longer-term, with lower probability and scale of impact during the project implementation timeframe.  Some GRFA varieties are inherently more resilient to climate change impacts, e.g., more drought resistant, than modern varieties. Increased awareness and positive incentives to farmers for engaging in GRFA varieties are expected to strengthen the resilience of local ecosystems and increase food security and economic potential for the local communities. | | Participatory landscape assessments for each of the three demonstration landscapes at project inception will include evaluation of potential climate change impacts. The GRFA conservation and sustainable use plans that have been developed based on the results of the participatory landscape assessments include climate change adaptation management measures. Under Outcome 1.2, the project has established a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism to manage and sustain use of grassland ecosystems as a mechanism to increase resilience to climate change. | | | |
| **Risk 5:** Increased farming of GRFA varieties could entail an increase in the quantity of agrochemicals applied, potentially impacting the environment or human health.  Standard 3: 3.2, 3.6  Standard 7: 7.6  Standard 8: 8.5 | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | In general, GRFA crop and livestock varieties require lower levels of inputs such as pesticides, chemical fertilizers, antibiotics, etc., compared to modern varieties. The project aims to facilitate adoption of incentives that would encourage farmers to increase engagement in traditional GRFA varieties.  In some areas, it might be necessary to rehabilitate fallow land, entailing application of agrochemicals. | | The project will prepare **Pesticide Management Procedures** that will include occupational health and safety measures, in accordance with Targeted Guidance: UNDP SES Standard 8 (Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency) in general and WHO / FAO International code of Conduct on Pesticide Management, in particular.  The project is obliged to fulfill governmental regulations and UNDP standards regarding the use of agrochemicals. For instance, farmers participating in project activities will be required to handle, store, apply and dispose of agrochemicals in accordance with international good practice, such as the FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides.  Management measures will be integrated into project procurement processes and targeted training will be delivered to farmers, agricultural associations, enterprises and local government units. | | | |
|  | **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) | Gender Mainstreaming Plan (completed)  Stakeholder Engagement Plan (completed)  Livelihood Action Plan (planned)  Pesticide Management Procedures (planned) |
|  | |  | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan) |  |
|  | |  | 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*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 2 | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | **✔** | | Risks 1 and 2` | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 1 | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 3 | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 4 | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 5 | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 2 | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | | | **✔** | | Risk 5 | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | **✔** | | 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? | No |
| 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* | Yes |
| 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* | No |
| 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? | No |
| 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) | No |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | No |
| 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** |  |
| *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* | Yes |
| 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** |  |
| *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? | Yes |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | No |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | 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)? | Yes |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | No |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | 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? | Yes |
| **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)? | No |
| 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? | Yes |
| **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)? | No |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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)