

Annex 4. Social and Environmental Screening Template

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) and [Toolkit](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.

Project Information

| Project Information | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Project Title | Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia |
| 2. Project Number | PIMS 6303 (Proposal ID: 00126450 Output ID: 00120509) |
| 3. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Namibia |

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

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

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

One of the core outcomes of this project is to reduce the incidence of human wildlife conflict (HWC) and generate economic benefits for communities from wildlife-related enterprises. HWC causes economic displacement, loss of property, and sometimes injury and loss of life for rural communities living adjacent to protected areas and in community conservancies, while economic benefits for communities both increase wellbeing and sustainability of conservation and environmental protections.

The human rights approach will also be mainstreamed through efforts to build a diversified and vibrant wildlife-based economy, through which communities will be empowered to engage in innovative business partnerships that deliver adequate benefits to offset the costs of living with wildlife. The project will catalyze the development of wildlife-based tourism and ancillary businesses and other job opportunities created through landscape restoration activities, and engagement as natural resource monitors. In the medium-term, the project will build resilience in community livelihoods and community-based natural resource management while the global economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic reduce tourism.

The Project follows approaches set out in the National Policy Human Wildlife Conflict Management and the National Policy on Community Based Natural Resource Management, and therefore assists the Namibian State in promoting the rights of the Namibian people to live 'free from fear', and 'free from want,' which are among the core principles of the UN Charter on Human Rights. The project seeks to do this by promoting integrated, proactive and socially-inclusive approaches to addressing the interlinked issues of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime, in which stakeholders from across the socio-economic spectrum to participate in planning, decision-making and knowledge exchange

Engagement processes will build on existing institutional frameworks that have legitimacy and credibility and that take local customary norms into due consideration. The project will establish a multi-stakeholder HWC-WC knowledge platform through which stakeholders can engage in local-level monitoring and evaluation, awareness raising and lesson sharing at local, regional and global levels – this will ensure that communities living in conservancies and in lands neighbouring protected areas (who are among some of the most marginalized in Namibia) are given a voice.

Following risks identified in the pre-SESP, the PPG has included the development of an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan and an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), to ensure that there is meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders. Within the first 6 months of the project an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Environmental and Social Management Plan and Indigenous Peoples Plan will be developed, and a Project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism will be put in place. These plans will form a framework for implementation and monitoring through the project with quarterly reports and annual project implementation reports (PIRs), including evaluations for the mid-term review (MTR) and terminal evaluation (TE). There will be an ongoing process of feedback from monitoring and evaluation into the project implementation methodology within the Project Management Unit (PMU).

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

The project places great emphasis on ensuring adequate and equitable representation of women, who are critical agents of change in efforts to address HWC and wildlife crime, given the customary roles they play in natural resource management, agricultural production and other engendered roles that place them at high risk of coming into conflict with wild animals. Women often also bear the brunt of social ramifications and economic displacement that comes from community involvement in wildlife crime. To ensure that the project design and activities fully incorporate and reflect the views and needs of women, and provide opportunities for women and girls to benefit from their involvement, a gender analysis was undertaken by a gender specialist during the PPG phase. A Gender Action Plan has been developed as a result of the analysis, and gender-disaggregated targets and indicators have been included within the project results framework under the wildlife-economy and knowledge-sharing components, with dedicated budget allocated to ensure that they are monitored throughout the project lifespan.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

The overriding objective of the project is to ensure that Namibia's critical wildlife populations – especially threatened and competitive-edge species (such as desert-adapted black rhinoceros) - and their habitats are adequately protected and managed both now and in the future, and are able to generate benefits for the people of the country through well-informed, environmentally sustainable use. The project will contribute to reducing the threats to these natural resources by enabling the development and implementation of science-based, species-specific management plans that will enable strategic, adaptive management of these populations. A key component of implementing these plans will be ensuring that their effectiveness is monitored. Environmental sustainability will also be mainstreamed through the development of biodiversity-compatible alternative land -uses and livelihood opportunities linked to biodiversity-based value chains, and the development of best-practices for predator-friendly farming. To ensure that all possible risks to environmental sustainability are identified and addressed, the project has produced an ESMF during the PPG phase, and will undertake an ESIA and produced an ESMP during the

first 6 months of implementation. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will also take into consideration impacts and vulnerabilities (both social and environmental) that might arise from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in relation to linkages between the illegal trade in wildlife and vulnerability to zoonotic disease transmission, the implications of the expected economic downturn on the capacity of government to address HWC and wildlife crime, and the need to re-build the ecotourism sector and strengthen its longer-term resilience to future shocks and disturbances.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

| <p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p> | <p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p> | | | <p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p> |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Risk Description</p> | <p>Impact and Probability (1-5)</p> | <p>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</p> | <p>Comments</p> | <p>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</p> |
| <p>Risk 1: Indigenous peoples including vulnerable groups might not engage in, support, or benefit from project activities. (Principle 1: q4, q6; Principle 3: Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.9)</p> | <p>I = 4 P = 3</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Indigenous peoples are present in the three implementation landscapes (refer to page 3 of the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework, or page 14 of the Environmental and Social Management Framework) though only in larger numbers in the north east (Bwabwata National Park)</p> | <p>As the project is overall High risk, an ESMF has been prepared (Annex 8), covering all risks. Per the ESMF, this risk and all others will be further assessed through an ESIA at the start of implementation, leading to the preparation of an ESMP.</p> <p>In order to safeguard indigenous peoples specifically, an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) will be formulated for the project, as part of the ESIA/ESMP process, guided by the Indigenous People’s Planning Framework (IPPF) that has been developed during the PPG. The comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan will take account of factors noted above, including the use of appropriate language, engagement of youth and use of consultation. Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) consultations must be carried out for certain project activities. (Also refer to the Project Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) for more details).</p> |

| <p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p> | <p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p> | | <p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p> | |
|---|---|------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Risk 2: Local governments and community associations might not have the capacity to implement and/or coordinate project activities successfully.</p> <p>(Principle 1: q5)</p> | <p>I = 3 P = 3</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>Note that a number of project outcomes and outputs address capacity within government and community institutions regarding HWC, prevention of wildlife crime and benefits to communities from conservation.</p> | <p>This risk has been addressed through project design, though will be further assessed during the ESIA/ESMP (along with all other risks). Under Outputs 1 and 3, the project will assess potential partner capacity before activities commence and mitigate any shortfalls in capacity through capacity building, technical support or redesign of activities. Partner capacity levels will be assessed before activities commence (baseline) and will be re-assessed during implementation in the Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation.</p> |
| <p>Risk 3: Poorly-informed or executed project activities could damage critical habitats and change landscape suitability for threatened species.</p> <p>(Standard 1)</p> | <p>I = 4 P = 2</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>In particular, grazing and agricultural practices, and to a lesser extent tourism, may pose a risk to certain habitats.</p> | <p>Per the ESMF, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will examine this issue further, and the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will describe the required measures for SES compliance to be undertaken by the Project Management Unit (PMU) and partners, as appropriate, during the project implementation. Additionally the Project will observe the established regulatory framework for monitoring and assessing such risks, for example the Environmental Management Act (2007).</p> |
| <p>Risk 4: Project activities and approaches might not fully incorporate or reflect views of women and girls, and ensure equitable opportunities for their involvement and benefit.</p> <p>(Principle 2: q2, q4)</p> | <p>I = 3 P = 2</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>While Namibia has taken multiple steps to reduce gender inequality at national and local levels, ensuring equitable opportunities for women remains a challenge.</p> | <p>The project will follow the ESMF, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan - in line with all national policies on gender - to ensure the inclusion of women and girls in the Project’s activities. The Project’s Social and Environmental Safeguards Officer’s duties will include monitoring of gender issues. The Gender Action Plan will be reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted during the annual project implementation reports (PIRs).</p> |
| <p>Risk 5: Anti-poaching patrols could pose safety risks to local communities if</p> | <p>I = 4 P = 3</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Due to a high rate of poaching of key species in previous years, which has</p> | <p>The ESMF (including IPPF) and subsequent ESIA and ESMP will address safety risks to local communities.</p> |

| <p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p> | <p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p> | | <p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p> | |
|---|---|------------------------|--|---|
| <p>enforcement officers are not properly trained, managed or overseen. (Principle 1, q8; Standard 3: 3.1, 3.9)</p> | | | <p>now been reduced, a significant anti-poaching unit presence remains in many areas. Anti-poaching enforcement is carried out by a combination of staff of the MEFT, Namibian Defence Force (NDF) and Namibian Police Force (NAMPOL).</p> | <p>Consultations with communities on the risks of anti-poaching patrols and engagement with anti-poaching activities will included in the ESIA process. Additionally, the Grievance Redress Mechanism design will take into account accessibility, protection and participation for community members. The ESMP will describe measures to increase cooperation and communication, and ensure human rights training to SES standards.</p> |
| <p>Risk 6: Anti-poaching patrols could face safety risks during encounters with poachers. (Principle 1, q8; Standard 3, 3.1)</p> | <p>I = 4 P = 4</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>While Namibia has largely avoided violent encounters seen with anti-poaching activities in some other African countries, it remains a risk.</p> | <p>The project will consult with MEFT and key APU staff to ensure the Project mitigates safety risks to APUs through projects activities including the provision of equipment. These consultations will be primarily carried out during the ESIA and ESMP preparation phases, and actions to address this risk will be described in the ESMP.</p> |
| <p>Risk 7: Increased enforcement and new approaches to HWC/WC could change current access to PAs, buffer zones and resources, potentially leading to economic displacement and/or changes to property rights. (Principle 1: q3; Standard 1: 1.3; Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4)</p> | <p>I = 3 P = 3</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>As in most African countries, competition for land and differing approaches to land management is increasingly an issue in Namibia, which affects both protected areas and communal land.</p> | <p>Per the ESMF, the ESIA and ESMP will define the management measures for this risk. Project staff, with the support of MEFT and other stakeholders, will monitor and consult on any changes to land use and enforcement resulting from project activities, before they are implemented, incorporating suitable mitigation measures wherever possible. It should be noted that Namibia has extensive experience with participatory community-based natural resource management approaches, and displacement or substantive rights changes are very unlikely within Project activities.</p> |
| <p>Risk 8: Project outcomes will be vulnerable to potential impacts of extreme climatic stresses (low rainfall, high temperatures) (Standard 2: 2.2)</p> | <p>I = 3 P = 3</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>Namibia, while receiving recent good rainfalls, has experienced years of drought. As an arid country, unpredictable rainfall patterns can be expected.</p> | <p>The ESIA will assess activities for impact and sustainability within Namibia’s national context, including its arid climate. The ESIA will describe requirements and recommendations which will be formulated by the ESMP into project activities.</p> |

| <p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p> | <p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p> | | | <p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p> |
|---|---|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>Furthermore, the Project Steering Committee and project team will utilise the expertise of MEFT and local partners to ensure the Project’s activities are sustainable.</p> |
| <p>Unidentifiable risks from the not-yet-defined pilot activities and changing economic, health and travel circumstances related to COVID-19.</p> | <p>I = 2 P = 2</p> | <p>Low</p> | <p>Due to pilot activities (for example Output 3.3) that will be defined during project implementation, and with COVID-19 global pandemic related economic, health and travel impacts, Project risks may emerge during implementation (after the ESIA and ESMP are completed)</p> | <p>Quarterly reports, annual project implementation reports (PIRs), and the mid-term review (MTR) will screen for additional risks that develop during project implementation. Any additional risks identified will be added to monitoring, and mitigation measures designed by the Project Management Unit (PMU) and consultants as required, in discussion with the Project Steering Committee and UNDP Country Office.</p> |
| <p>Summary of risk avoidance and mitigation actions: As the project is High risk with potential downstream (Outcomes 2 and 3) impacts, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be formulated for the field-level activities. The ESIA will inform the development of the required Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), guided by the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) which has been developed during the PPG. Both will be produced within the first 6 months of project implementation.</p> <p>During the PPG, this screening (SESP) has been revised based on further assessments and on information, consultations and research gathered in the course of the development of the project. This information has informed the development of an ESMF, IPPF, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan.</p> <p>The Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) will guide the development of an IPP in line with Standard 6 requirements within the first 6 months of the project. The IPP will form a sub-component of the ESMP and overall actions, may require input from a different specialist to the ESMP, though may also be a stand-alone document linked to the ESMP if exceptional circumstances demand it. As only preliminary free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) was completed (given the constraints of time, and travel restrictions towards the end of the PPG period), further FPIC consultations will be needed to ensure IPP development. FPIC would then be continued during project implementation, following the measures summarized in the ESMF and in the IPP that is prepared alongside the subsequent ESMP.</p> <p>In summary the following plans have been prepared during the PPG phase to meet SES requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Social Management Framework • Stakeholder analysis and comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan • Gender analysis and Gender Action Plan • Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework | | | | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i> | QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i> | QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)? |
|--|--|---|

The subsequent measures to be put into place during the first 6 months of the Project implementation include:

- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
- Environmental and Social Management Plan
- Indigenous Peoples Plan (annexed to or within the ESMP)
- Grievance Redress Mechanism (see ToR in the Environmental and Social Management Framework)
-

QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?

| Select one (see SESP for guidance) | | Comments |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Low Risk</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| <i>Moderate Risk</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| <i>High Risk</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The Project includes activities with potential significant adverse social impacts among potentially affected communities. Avoidance and mitigation of these risks will be undertaken through management plans, monitoring and evaluation. |

QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?

| Check all that apply | | Comments |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The ESMF/ESMP, IPPF/IPP, Gender Action Plan and Stakeholder Engagement Plan all contribute to realizing human rights and mitigating associated challenges. Add the GRM |

| QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i> | QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i> | QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)? |
|--|--|---|
| Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The project has drafted a Gender Action Plan, and gender issues are cross cutting through other management plans. |
| 1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | An ESMF has been produced during the PPG Phase, which will lead to an ESIA and ESMP to avoid or mitigation biodiversity and NRM risks. |
| 2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The ESIA and ESMP will mitigate for climate associated risks. |
| 3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The ESMP, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and IPP will mitigate or avoid risks for Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions. The GRM also provides a way for community members to express concerns regarding project activities. |
| 4. Cultural Heritage | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 5. Displacement and Resettlement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The ESIA and ESMP will define the management measures for this risk. |
| 6. Indigenous Peoples | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | An IPPF has been developed during the PPG Phase, which will lead to an IPP complimenting the ESMP, alongside the GRM. |
| 7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Final Sign Off

| Signature | Date | Description |
|-------------|------|--|
| QA Assessor | | UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted. |

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| QA Approver | | UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC. |
| PAC Chair | | UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC. |

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

| Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Principles 1: Human Rights | | Answer (Yes/No) |
| 1. | Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | No |
| 2. | Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ¹ | No |
| 3. | Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | YES |
| 4. | Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | YES |
| 5. | Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | YES |
| 6. | Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | YES |
| 7. | Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process? | No |
| 8. | Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | YES |
| Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | | |
| 1. | Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | No |
| 2. | Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | YES |
| 3. | Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment? | No |
| 4. | Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i> | YES |
| Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below | | |
| Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management | | |
| 1.1 | Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? | YES |

¹ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, 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 people and transsexuals.

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i> | |
| 1.2 | Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including 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 | Does the Project involve 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 | Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species? | No |
| 1.5 | Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species? | No |
| 1.6 | Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | No |
| 1.7 | Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.8 | Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i> | No |
| 1.9 | Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) | No |
| 1.10 | Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| 1.11 | Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i> | Yes |
| Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation | | |
| 2.1 | Will the proposed Project result in significant ² greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change? | No |
| 2.2 | Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? | YES |
| 2.3 | Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i> | No |
| Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions | | |
| 3.1 | Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | YES |
| 3.2 | Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | No |

² In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| 3.3 | Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)? | No |
| 3.4 | Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure) | No |
| 3.5 | Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions? | No |
| 3.6 | Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)? | No |
| 3.7 | Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning? | No |
| 3.8 | Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)? | No |
| 3.9 | Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)? | YES |
| Standard 4: Cultural Heritage | | |
| 4.1 | Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | YES |
| 4.2 | Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes? | YES |
| Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement | | |
| 5.1 | Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | No |
| 5.2 | Would the Project possibly result in 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)? | No |
| 5.3 | Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ³ | No |
| 5.4 | Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | YES |
| Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples | | |
| 6.1 | Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | YES |
| 6.2 | Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | YES |
| 6.3 | Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i> | YES |

³ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 6.4 | Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | YES |
| 6.5 | Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | YES |
| 6.6 | Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? | No |
| 6.7 | Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | No |
| 6.8 | Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.9 | Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? | YES |
| Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency | | |
| 7.1 | Would the Project potentially result in 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? | No |
| 7.2 | Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 7.3 | Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i> | No |
| 7.4 | Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 7.5 | Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |