# UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Template (April 2024) - FOR DISCLOSURE 16-12-2024

*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 | Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources in Compliance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the draft National Biodiversity Economy Strategy |
| 2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | PIMS 5686 |
| 3. Location (Global/Region/Country) | South Africa |
| 4. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Implementation |
| 5. Date | 16 December 2024 – FOR DISCLOSURE |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach*** |
| This project will positively impact South African society within the country's legal framework, as outlined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, particularly the Bill of Rights, with a focus on supporting vulnerable, rural communities. The positive changes that the project will bring are in alignment with the content of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, especially the articles related to the right to equality, work, dignity, ending gender discrimination, and securing cultural, economic, and social rights of people (Article 23, Article 7, Article 22 respectively). One of the rights enshrined in the Bill of Rights is the “right to life”. The project will ensure that bioprospecting products have positive outcomes for the health of the South Africans. (Principle 1: Leave no one behind; Principle 2: Human rights; Principle 3: Gender equality and women’s empowerment).  More specifically, the project will create jobs in the bioprospecting sector and will target vulnerable social groups as potential employees. In this manner, the project will contribute to improving the economic status and livelihoods of the rural communities in South Africa. It will also provide appropriate training to improve the professional skills of the targeted groups, which will help secure economic and social well-being of vulnerable and marginalised groups in society and indirectly contribute to ensuring fair and equal pay for work (Principle 1: Leave no one behind; Principle 3: Gender equality and women’s empowerment; Principle 4: Sustainability and resilience).  One of the goals of this project is to ensure that the intellectual property rights and expectations of traditional knowledge (TK) holders are recognised and respected in the use of genetic resources and the development of value chains. This will be done through, among others, negotiating appropriate agreements and arrangements for equitable benefit sharing and by providing required training, capacity development opportunities and, in some cases, investments.  The project will also help ensure equitable benefit sharing through inclusion of marginalised groups within rural society into decision-making bodies, as well as ensuring that their participation in activities is placed higher-up in the value chains (Principle 1: Leave no one behind; Principle 4: Sustainability and resilience; Principle 5: Accountability).  Lastly, by respecting and preserving traditional knowledge related to indigenous plants, the project supports the cultural rights of local communities. The project can reinforce cultural identity and heritage by valuing indigenous knowledge systems, practices, and beliefs tied to the use of local plants for medicinal and cultural purposes. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| This project aims to contribute to discouraging gender discrimination by promoting increased recognition of the role of women in the bioprospecting sector in South Africa. Specifically, the Project will empower women by positioning them and promoting their increased involvement in decision making, and taking measures to ensure their adequate representation in community-level management institutions and decision-making structures. The Project will contribute through training and skills building that targets women and men, and will strive for a 50/50 gender parity in participation. The training will also ensure the improvement of sustainable project skills. All community engagement and -outreach activities will be designed and implemented considering gender dimensions, including household power relationships. Consultations with women will be conducted at all stages of Project’s implementation, through appropriate structures and in local languages, to ensure the participation of women. Additionally, the Project supports collecting gender disaggregated data and ensures that this is used to continually improve the focus on gender equality and women’s empowerment during implementation and beyond.  The Project’s strategy includes a strong gender action plan (GAP) to ensure that implementation of project interventions incorporates aspects of gender equality and empowerment throughout. The gender action plan was developed as part of the project implementation but has not been fully implemented. Taking into account the remaining timeline of the project, the relevant and targeted measures of the GAP will be included in the ESMP for targeted outputs, mainly Outputs 1 and 2. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| This Project has a strong biodiversity conservation aspect, aiming to ensure environmental sustainability mainstreaming into the bioprospecting sector of South African economy. The project has incorporated planting of biodiversity material that is of interest as a sustainability alternative rather than solely harvesting from the wild. The envisaged long-term solution for the Project highlights the environmental benefits that the project will generate, and ensures that environmental and economic sustainability are mainstreamed into the bioprospecting sector.  Nevertheless, the Project directly contributes to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources, through the Outputs under Component 2 and through targeting biodiversity conservation safeguards to ensure that bioprospecting/biotrade economic activities will not deplete the stocks of indigenous biological resources or their gene pool – thereby enabling the effective contribution of value chains to conservation. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The Project will place a strong emphasis on robust community engagement throughout its design and implementation phases. This entails fostering active involvement and participation from local communities in decision-making processes. To achieve this goal, the Project has developed a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). This plan ensures that stakeholders receive timely, accessible, and relevant information about supported activities, including potential environmental and social risks and the corresponding management/mitigation measures. However, the implementation of the Project has fallen short in involving all relevant stakeholders, in particular for Output 1.1 and Output 2.2. The SEP will be updated to strengthen stakeholder engagement for the remaining time of implementation. Additionally, the Project will implement a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) to provide stakeholders with a formal channel to voice any concerns or complaints they may have. |

**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-** Inequitable impacts on marginalized groups, including women  **Event:** Insufficient consideration of social dynamics and gender roles in the design and implementation of project activities, leading to limitations on women’s ability to participate, access opportunities and benefits, or manage natural resources effectively. This may include activities that degrade or deplete natural resources relied upon by vulnerable communities for their livelihoods and well-being.  **Cause:**  For all outputs, project activities may result in inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly marginalized or excluded groups, including persons with disabilities and women.  **Impact:** Marginalized groups, including women, may face increased inequality, reduced access to opportunities, and worsened livelihoods due to diminished availability of critical natural resources. This could undermine the project’s social equity and sustainability objectives.  **Principle Leave No One Behind** P.5, P.7,P.8,P.10 and P.11 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate |  | Further stakeholder analysis was conducted during project implementation and the **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)**. The updating and implementation of the SEP and the inclusion **of gender specific measures in the ESMP** will ensure that marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, are meaningfully involved in project activities and decision-making processes throughout project implementation. | | | | | |
| **Risk 2- Risk of inadequate stakeholder engagement and community mistrust**  **Event:** Inadequate stakeholder engagement, including exclusion of marginalized peoples in project decisions that affect them.  **Cause:** For African Ginger ABS negotiations and licensing (Output 1.1), supporting Aloe Ferox value chain development (Output 2.2), supporting community-based organizations in honeybush value chain development (Output 2.3), Roiboos ABS negotiations (Output 2.4) and recording of traditional knowledge (Output 3.1), consultations with the communities are conducted insufficiently and potentially inappropriately.  **Impacts:**   * Erosion of trust among stakeholders. * Reduced community buy-in and support. * Potential project delays or obstacles, threatening overall project success.   **Principle Leave No One Behind** P.2 and P.13 | I = 4  L = 5 | **High** |  | Further stakeholder analysis was conducted during project implementation and the **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)** and **Gender Action Plan (GAP)** were updated, accordingly. The updating and implementation of the SEP will ensure that communities, including vulnerable groups are meaningfully involved in project activities and decision-making processes throughout project implementation. | | | | | |
| **Risk 3- Concerns or grievances raised by stakeholders not being properly addressed**  **Event:** Stakeholders face challenges in effectively claiming rights, raising concerns, or filing grievances.  **Cause:** Under all outputs of the project, stakeholders face barriers and limiting factors including:   * Lack of awareness of processes to raise a grievance * Logistical challenges. * Language, cultural, and literacy differences. * Limited access to or familiarity with necessary technology.   **Impacts:**   * Erosion of trust and collaboration. * Generation/exacerbation of conflict   Accountability Principle: P.14, P.15 | I = 5  L = 5 | **High** |  | To address potential grievances from stakeholders, particularly vulnerable groups, the project will operationalize a culturally sensitive and gender responsive **Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)** and provide opportune information regarding UNDP's **Accountability Mechanism** (Stakeholder Response Mechanism [SRM] and Social and Environmental Compliance Unit [SECU]).  The PMU and Responsible Parties (RPs) will be trained on the implementation of the GRM, with support from UNDP as needed to address project-related grievances as part of its oversight and assurance roles. | | | | | |
| **Risk 4 – Commercial cultivation of species leading to negative impacts on natural ecosystems**  **Event:** Negative impacts on habitats, including encroachment and ecosystem degradation  **Cause:** Cultivation of species under Outputs 2.2 (Aloe ferox), and 2.3 (Honeybush) within communal or private land zones near natural habitats, including national parks.  **Impacts:**   * Disruption of ecosystems and biodiversity. * Reduced resilience and health of surrounding natural habitats.   **Standard 1. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable NRM**, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.8 | I =4  L = 3 | Substantial |  | The **ESIA** will be updated for Outputs 2.2 and 2.3. Based on the outcomes of the ESIA, the **ESMP and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)** will be updated. The BAP will ensure among others:   * Sustainable harvesting training with communities in Aloe ferox and Honeybush. * A resource assessment, monitoring plan, Sustainable Harvesting Guidelines, Biodiversity Management Plan for Honeybush. * A honeybush Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to monitor the sustainable-use actions plant through the implementation of the fund. | | | | | |
| **Risk 5 – Commercialization and wild harvesting leading to reduction of the populations of endangered species and increased illegal trade**  **Event:** Threats to endangered or declining species and increased illegal trade  **Cause:**  Wild harvesting and commercialization of Devil’s Claw (Output 1.2), Aloe ferox (Output 2.2.), and Honeybush (Output 2.3)  **Impacts:**   * Further endangerment of these species. * Escalation of illegal trade activities. * Undermining conservation efforts and biodiversity protection   **Standard 1. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable NRM**, 1.4, 1.5, 1.8, 1.13 | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial |  | The **ESMP and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)** will be updated. The BAP will ensure among others, to mitigate risks, through sustainable harvesting practices. | | | | | |
| **Risk 6 – Non-compliance with environmental regulations and potential international conflict over unverified species origins (genetic resources)**  **Event:** Non-compliance with environmental regulations and potential international conflict over unverified species origins (genetic resources)  **Cause:** Under Outputs 1.1 and 1.2, utilization of species such as African ginger (Output 1.1) and Devil’s Claw (Output 1.2) for R&D  **Impacts:**   * Legal risks, including fines and project delays. * Reputational damage and loss of trust among stakeholders. * Potential international trade disputes and challenges related to species conservation.   **Standard 1. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable NRM S**1.13 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate |  | The **ESMP** will be updated. The BAP will ensure among others, to mitigate risks, a thorough legal and regulatory review will be conducted to identify all necessary permits and compliance requirements for the cultivation, transport, and use of these species. | | | | | |
| **Risk 7 – Risk of operational disruption and infrastructure damage due to flood line vulnerability**  **Event:** Operational disruption and infrastructure damage to provincial government facilities in the Northern Cape Hub.  **Cause:** The cultivation and processing hub facilities for devils’ claws established under Output 1.2 are located on a 100-year flood line, making it vulnerable to future flooding, with risks exacerbated by increasing climate variability and the potential for more frequent and severe flood events.  **Impacts:**   * Disruption of government operations and essential services. * Financial burdens from costly repairs and relocation expenses. * Long-term challenges to the sustainability and resilience of government functions.   **Standard 2. Climate change and disaster risk** 2.2 | I =2  L = 3 | Low |  | To mitigate flood risks, the project will develop a flood resilience and management plan focused on infrastructure adaptation and emergency preparedness as part of the **updated ESMP**. | | | | | |
| **Risk 8 - Mishandling of cultural heritage due to commercial cultivation**  **Event:** Undermining traditional knowledge of plants, including Indigenous Peoples’ traditional knowledge  **Cause: Lack of protocol for recording and using traditional knowledge for revising ABS on African Ginger (Output 1.1.), on research and commercial development of Devil’s Claw (Output 1.2), implementation of Pelargonium management plan (**Output 2.1), honeybush use and processing (Output 2.3), negotiation of Roibos ABS (Output 2.4) and operationalization og the TK registration system (Output 3.1).  **Impacts:**   * Conflicts over use and resource rights, reducing traditional and/or indigenous access to essential resources like traditional medicine. * Ecological harm, including biodiversity loss, depletion of valuable plant species, and ecosystem disruption. * Threats to species survival, indigenous livelihoods, and the preservation of resources for future generations.   **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage,** 4.5 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate |  | The **ESIA** will be updated to fully map risks to traditional knowledge in all project areas where interventions may impact Indigenous Peoples and potential impacts assessed. Based on the outcomes of the ESIA, the **ESMP will be updated** to guide the implementation of activities under all outputs except 3.2 for effective implementation of Protection, Promotion, Development and Management of Indigenous Knowledge Act, 2019 and NEMBA (Chapter 6 and associated Regulations) and to ensure full protection of traditional knowledge holders. In addition, the IPP will include an FPIC Protocol that follows UNESCO’s Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. | | | | | |
| **Risk 9 - Heightened conflict and reduced trust in ABS agreements**  **Event:** Increased conflict between stakeholders  **Cause:**   * Lack of meaningful participation and inclusion of traditional knowledge (TK) holders and affected communities in the revision process of the ABS for Pelargonium (Output 2.1) * Lack of mapping of South African Honeybush Tea Association (SAHTA) and the Honeybush Community of Practice (HCoP) interests and positions on ABS for Roiboos under Output 2.4.   **Impacts:**   * Destabilization of ABS relationships. * Escalation of disputes and diminished trust among stakeholders. * Compromised effectiveness of sustainable development goals in the Rooibos farming industries.   Accountability Principle: P.7 | I = 3  L = 2 | Low |  |  | | | | | |
| **Risk 10 – Limited access to resources under ABS**  **Event:** Implementation of ABS agreements imposing restrictions on the use of biological resources traditionally accessed by local communities.  **Cause:** Limited access to resources due to restrictions under negotiated Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) agreements for Outputs 1.1 and 2.4.  **Impacts:**   * Reduced access to resources critical for community livelihoods, such as traditional medicines and agricultural inputs, leading to economic hardship * Disruption of customary practices and cultural traditions tied to resource use.   **Standard 5: Displacement and resettlement,** P. 5.2, P.5.4 | I = 2  L = 2 | Low |  |  | | | | | |
| **Risk 11 – Indigenous Peoples (including Khoi and San) may be negatively impacted by the implementation of activities, including Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) not properly obtained**  **Event:** Use of traditional knowledge and implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) agreements and record of traditional knowledge do not take into account negative impacts on Indigenous Peoples (including Khoi and San)  **Cause:** Failure to conduct consultations in alignment with Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols on activities affecting the rights, lands, resources, and cultural practices, including those of of Khoi and San, in the cultivation in the Northern Cape Hub (Output 1.2), by fund-supported organizations using honeybush traditional knowledge (Output 2.3), in ABS for Rooibos farming (Output 2.4) and in the recording of traditional knowledge (Output 3.1).  **Impacts:**   * Disruption to Khoi and San’s lands, access to resources, and cultural practices. * Erosion of traditional livelihoods and territorial rights. * Potential conflicts and reduced trust in project activities.   **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.7 | I = 4  L = 4 | **Substantial** |  | Given that the project is under implementation, the **ESIA** and **ESMP** for the Project will be updated to refine risk identification, mitigation, and management strategies, thus establishing a system for ongoing risk monitoring. Additionally, the **Indigenous Peoples Plan** (**IPP**) will be updated to include the FPIC Protocol and to detail potential impacts on indigenous communities of Outputs 1.2, 2.3 and 2.4 and required mitigation measures.  As part of the **SEP,** cultural-sensitive appropriate consultations will be conducted with the goal of achieving agreement, and FPIC will be ensured for any matters that may affect Indigenous Peoples' rights, interests, lands, territories, resources, traditional livelihoods, and tangible and intangible cultural heritage. | | | | | |
| **Risk 12 – Potential non respect of labour and working conditions**  **Event:** Non-compliance with fair working conditions and occupational health and safety standards for staff involved in cultivation, wild harvesting, processing, marketing and other support to value-chain development activities.  **Cause:** Organizations involved in the cultivation activities at the Northern Cape hub (Output 1.2), processing, packaging, and marketing of Aloe ferox (Output 2.2), and implementing cultivation and processing for honeybush value-chain (Output 2.3) do not have the systems in place to ensure compliance with labor law.  **Impacts:**   * Breaches of labor laws and regulations. * Increased risk of workplace accidents, harassment, and unsafe working conditions. * Inequitable or unlawful pay practices, leading to staff dissatisfaction and potential legal challenges.   **Standard 7: Labour and working conditions** P.7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 | I = 4  L = 3 | **Substantial** |  | Given that the project is under implementation, the **ESIA** and **ESMP** for the Project will be updated to refine risk identification, mitigation, and management strategies, thus establishing a system for ongoing risk monitoring. Additionally, the **Labour Law and Safety Action Plan (LLSA)** will be updated to include required mitigation measures for Outputs 1.2, 2.2 and 2.3. | | | | | |
| **Risk 13 – Potential pollution of ecosystems and energy consumption for cultivation and processing activities**  **Event:** Potential environmental harm associated with cultivation and processing activities  **Cause: Potential** application of pesticides, generation of waste, and excessive resource consumption in during cultivation of Devil’s Claw in the Northern Cape hub (Output 1.2), processing of Aloe ferox at the newly established facility (Output 2.2), cultivation and processing of Honeybush by grant recipient organizations (Output 2.3).  **Impacts:**   * Pollution of soil, water, and air, leading to environmental degradation. * Potential harm to local biodiversity and ecosystems. * Increased resource depletion and reduced environmental sustainability due to waste generation and overuse of water and energy.   **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** P8.1, 8.2, 8.5 and 8.6 | I = 3  L = 4 | **Moderate** |  | The **ESIA** and the **ESMP** will be updated to include specific mitigation for each of these outputs and to support sustainable cultivation and processing. | | | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | | **☐** | |  | | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | | **☐** | |  | | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | | **☐** | |  | | | |
| ***High Risk*** | | | | **☑** | | **Two high risk and multiple Substantial and Moderate Risks** | | | |
|  | **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) | Completed: stakeholder analysis | |
|  | | **☑** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) | To be updated | |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | | **☑** | |  |  | | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | | |  | | **☑** | Targeted management plans | To be updated: Stakeholder Engagement Plan | |
|  | | **☑** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans)  (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Indigenous People Plan, Grievance Redress Mechanism, Livelihood Action Plan, Security Plan, etc.) | EMSP, incl. IPP, BAC, LLSA and SEP to be updated | |
|  | |  | 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*** | | | |  | |  | | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | |  | |  | | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | | **☑** | |  | | | |

**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, the 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? | Yes |
| P.3 | Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | Yes |
| *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? | No |
| P.5 | inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? 16 | Yes |
| P.6 | restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? | No |
| P.7 | exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | Yes |
| **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)? | Yes |
| *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? | | Yes |
| P.11 limitations on women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different  roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?  *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 |

16 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screening questions 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? | Yes |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural 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? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | No |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilisation of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?17 | No |
| 1.13 utilisation of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)18 | Yes |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |

17 See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol)

18 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 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? | 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? | Yes |
| **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?19 | 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? | Yes |
| 6.3 impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?  *If the answer to screening question 6.3 is “yes”, then Standard 6 requirements apply, and the potential significance of risks related to impacts on indigenous peoples must be Moderate or above. [[1]](#footnote-2)\** | Yes |
| 6.4 the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | Yes |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | Yes |
| 6.6 forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?  *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? | Yes |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | Yes |
| **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? | Yes |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | Yes |
| 7.3 use of child labour? | Yes |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | No |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | Yes |
| 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 |

19 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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? | 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*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)[*Protocol,*](https://ozone.unep.org/treaties/montreal-protocol?q=treaties&q=treaties/montreal-protocol) [*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? | Yes |

1. \* Note: revised July 2022 modifying presumption of risk significance from Substantial or higher to Moderate or higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)