Annex E: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Integrated management of production landscapes to deliver multiple global environmental benefits
2. Project Number	PIMS 6015; GEF ID 9796
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Belize

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
The project supports the Government of Belize to facilitate the direct, free, and equal participation of national and local stakeholders (including farmers, producers, and local communities) in the planning and implementation of measures for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable land/water management in production landscapes in Belize. The project retains a focused objective of ensuring that women and other vulnerable populations, dependent on the resources within the Belize River Watershed (BRW), are given equal opportunity to participate in the project at all levels of implementation and to formalize national mechanisms and platforms which enables their meaningful participation in the governance architecture associated with the extended watershed. Planned state and community-led measures are expected to contribute to delivery multiple global environmental benefits and are reflective of framework principles on human rights and the environment; as the project is deigned to be inclusive and features prominently local peoples in ensuring a safe, clean healthy and sustainable environment which offers communities protection from environmental harm and supports that they fairly and equitably share the benefits realized from the resources. In line with UNDP's human-rights based approach, the project directly empowers right holders in the persons of farmers, owners of production lands, and communities so that they are the principal facilitators and decision makers for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management (SLM) objectives in the production landscapes which they inhabit in the BRW. In addition, the project provides for the equal allocation and disbursement of monetary and non-monetary benefits to all stakeholders. These benefits will result from: a) financial incentives for the implementation of biodiversity-friendly production practices and sustainable water management and use strategies; b) increased agro-ecosystem productivity that sustain food production; c) extension services that improve production capacities and enhance value chains for key products (sugar cane, cohune oil, and livestock0; d) improved access to markets for sustainable products; and e) trained small- and large-scale producers, including women and other small-holder groups, so that they implement sustainable production practices and improve their business management capabilities. Through a landscape and integrated watershed management approach to biodiversity conservation and SLM, ecosystem services, this project a significant and positive impact on the well-being of the communities in the BRW and in keeping with the state's obligation to establish and maintain substantive environmental standards that are non-discriminatory and non-retrogressive. The project has created and strengthens multiple spaces and opportunities - governance mechanisms, gender integration and technical assistance, and project monitoring - that increase stakeholder participation and decision-making throughout its implementation.
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment
The project incorporates gender considerations in the project design to ensure that there is equal opportunity for female participation and realization of benefits under the initiative as presented. Formalized structures, policies and strategies developed within the project framework will explicitly reflect the role of women in all tiers of biodiversity/ resource management addressing specifically existing disparities faced by women and girls in terms of (amongst other things) access to economic participation and participation in decision making. The project integrated gender-based analysis into its designed and targeted the involvement of women, male and female youth within consultation processes meant to inform final project design. The project stakeholder engagement plan assures their continue participation within the implementation phase of the project.

Within the national context, women generally share the responsibility for resources management and this is particularly visible at the household level. Owing to their active resource management roles, the project targets women participation in processes associated the conservation, sustainable use of water and forest resources and the delivery of ecosystem services. In this regard, water and soil resource management, the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, as well as sustainable production technologies and practices are expected to be achieved with their equal participation.

In further consideration to the roles and priorities of both men and women, the project has granted women greater opportunities to actively participate in governance bodies including those led by various government institutions, the private sector, and social organizations. The project promotes activities that close gaps resulting from gender equity issues since women in Belize generally, but more acutely in the rural communities, are more constrained by traditional gender roles and by the lack of access to financial resources and capacity-building to improve their livelihood. The expected project provision of gender-disaggregated data, specifically, the distribution of project benefits based on sex, will assist in the monitoring of the effectiveness of addressing equality gaps through project programming.

The safeguards to be applied to ensure that gender considerations continue to be a part of the project delivery approach include the contribution of a gender and participation specialists, continued targeting and engagement of women stakeholder groups through the project participation plan, and the mandatory utilization of gender assessments to guide all significant project deliverables. It is the aim of the project is to achieve the categorization of "Gender Responsive" according to UNDP's gender results effectiveness scale (i.e., the results addressed differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights but do not address root causes of inequalities in their lives).

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

The project will mainstream biodiversity conservation and SLM/watershed management objectives into production landscapes in Belize, contributing to the delivery of global environmental benefits and to the well-being of local communities. This will be achieved through the implementation of specific actions to address threats to biodiversity, forests, and land and water resources degradation that results primarily from conventional production practices, including deforestation, unsustainable exploitation of forest resources (hunting, logging, and non-timber forest products), land conversion from forested land to agriculture, and farming on marginal lands. The project's use of "Integrated Landscape and water Management Approaches" allows for the balancing competing demands and integrating of policies governing resource management within the watershed. These approaches allow functionaries to more effectively manage the resources of the watershed by addressing inter‐connected social, environmental, economic and political challenges.

The sustainability of environmental actions is realized through the localization of conservation goals, that is, the vesting to resource users, particularly those at the community level, the knowledge and capabilities to actively participate in conservation and management features introduced into the watershed by the project. Capacity development of resource managing institutions and the formalization, through legislation and regulations, of processes also serve to make more permanent project introduced interventions.

More specifically, the project will mainstream environmental sustainability by means of the following:

1) Promoting inter-agency cooperation and programming, which will lead to increased public and private investment to support sustainable production practices.
2) The rehabilitation of degraded riparian forests and wetlands contributing to enhance ecosystem connectivity and improve water quality.
3) The adoption of landscape management tools including the introduction of financial incentive systems for improved biodiversity management and corridor connectivity
4) The promotion of public/ private sector partnership in support of integrated watershed management
5) Establishing 15,000 ha under sustainable production (agriculture and forestry).

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? *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.*	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6*			QUESTION 6: 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)?
Risk Description	*Impact and Probability (1-5)*	*Significance (Low, Moderate, High)*	*Comments*	*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.*
Risk 1. Poorly designed or executed project activities could damage critical or sensitive habitats environmentally sensitive areas, including KBAs, including through restoration activities (Standard 1: 1.2, 1.6)	I = 3 P = 2	**Moderate**	The project mainstreams biodiversity conservation and sustainable land/water management in the production landscapes of the BRW where critical habitats are located. These habitats include the Maya/Chiquibul Forest, which is rich in biodiversity, riparian forest, and key water recharge areas that provide water and other ecosystem services. Activities will also be implemented to build connectivity in the Central Belize Corridor that connects Belize's two largest forest blocks: the privately managed northern forest block (Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area, Yalbac, Laguna Seca and Gallon Jug) and the Maya Mountain Massif in the south. In	This risk has been managed through the design of the project through the selection of sites for the implementation of activities through a rigorous technical process in consultation with national environmental experts. In addition, the project has been designed to include activities with minimal or no risks of adverse impacts to damage critical or sensitive habitats environmentally sensitive areas, including KBAs; however, limited or focused environmental impact assessments may be developed during project implementation as determined necessary.

			addition, the project will restore 750 ha of riparian forest and 350 ha of groundwater recharge areas.	
Risk 2: The project could restrict the access of small farmers to natural resources (land and water) due to increased enforcement of landscape protections and new approaches to land management, potentially causing economic displacement (Standard 1, q1.3, and Standard 5, q5.2)	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**	Some small farmers may be conducting production activities within ecologically sensitive areas and access to these areas may be limited; however, no physical displacement is anticipated.	During the development of the project, small livestock farmers and cohune oil producers were closely involved and engaged, and an assessment of their livelihoods was undertaken. This risk will be managed through the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and management measures will be developed with full, meaningful engagement, and consultation, as required.
Risk 3. Vulnerable or marginalized groups, including indigenous people (e.g., Belizean Creole and Mopan Maya), might not be involved in project implementation and therefore not engaged in, supportive of, or benefitting from project activities. (Principle 1: q6 and Standard 6: 6.1)	I = 3 P =3	**Moderate**	Specific to the BRW, which is the area of influence, the project includes the Belizean Creole population who are indigenous to the Belize River Valley and some parts of the Cayo District. This population are Afro-descendants and can also include people of African descent who speak Creole as their mother tongue. There are also Mopan Maya and Mestizo communities present along the Belize River and in the western portion of the watershed.	This risk was partially addressed during the project design though a feasibility analysis conducted that included consultations with indigenous people which determined the project activities including the proposed financial incentives that are in line with traditional livelihood, social, and cultural practices that promote improved and sustainable production practices. During project implementation this risk will be managed through the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as part of the Plan a grievance mechanism will be established and published so that all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, are aware of its existence. The Project Manager will be responsible for documenting all grievances and ensuring they are addressed in a timely manner. This project aims to strengthen the longevity of the relationship that indigenous people have with the land and their culture. The project does not displace or require the resettlement of the indigenous populations in the BRW. It does not impinge on any of the cultural, religious or spiritual practices of this population. The actions in the project do not result in any changed status of indigenous peoples to their land or to their means of livelihood. Contrastingly, the project promotes actions that improve livelihood opportunities and strengthen sustainable use of the land on which many indigenous households depend. Collectively, these diversified financial incentives, training and technical assistance available to indigenous populations stand to improve their socio-economic status, knowledge and sustainable production practices.

Risk 4: The proposed project may have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls, including women farmers. (Principle 2: q1 and q3)	I= 3 P= 2	**Moderate**	Males predominate within the production landscape, as they are primarily the landowners, which facilitate their access to financial and material resources. These male producers are also well represented in the BRW decision-making and leadership spaces unlike women who have less representation.	This risk will be managed through the Gender Action Plan developed during the PPG following a gender analysis for the target landscape. In addition, the Project Results Framework includes gender-based indicators. Project mechanisms are such that delivery of benefits targets specifically women and youth beneficiaries. Formal mechanisms provide the opportunity for greater women involvement in decision making, creating spaces for female leaders from the communities and the expression of the voices of male and female producers. Production incentives are focused at the household and smallholder producer' levels improving the opportunity for women access.
Risk 5: There could be disruption of project processes and sustainability of project investments linked to climate triggers. (Standard 2: 2.2; Standard 3: 3.5)	I=3 P=3	**Moderate**	The project area has recorded progressive increases to various climate hazards. This increase in exposure can potentially disrupt project processes as well as undermine the sustainability of planned interventions. Belize is considered to be highly vulnerable and is expected to be negatively impacted as the country sees increases in the frequency and intensity of natural disasters such as cyclonic systems, droughts, floods and in the variability and unpredictability of rainfall patterns, increase in temperature and sea level rise impacting Belize's natural heritage as well as the country's productive sectors.	Projects proponents have introduced climate risk management as a key element of risk management and in execution. The project in its response to corridors and species habitat protection allows for the consideration of changes in species ranges and habitats as a result of climate change on the natural environment. This technical consideration will be included in the analysis informing all management mechanisms introduced by the project. The Project addresses production systems within the BRW. The lower and central reaches of this watershed have in the recent past showed extreme vulnerabilities to climate change, with triggers ranging from sea level rise/ water intrusion to reoccurring extreme hydrometeorological events. In its design, the project has introduced climate smart actions as a means of climate proofing of production systems. Project functionaries are expected to include examination of climate risks on all project interventions and to set in place systems to address and adaptively manage risks during activity design and implementation. In addition, the project includes upgrading the network of meteorological/hydrological stations in the BRW improving the capacity for forecasting.
Risk 6: Policy changes could have unintended negative social and/or environmental impacts if poorly designed or executed (Standard 1: 1.11)	I=3 P=1	**Low**	With the application of diverse strategies and policies within the BRW, lack of true synchronization and coordination can negate desired conservation benefits. A crucial delivery of this project is a mechanism for coordination	

			among regulatory agencies as well as a mechanism for the monitoring of the efficiency of legislation and policies supporting the realization of the primary objective of realizing GEBs. These structures allow for better analysis of local circumstances and the application of an integrated policy management mechanism ensuring harmonization of actions in advancing singular goals.	
Risk 7: Field activities related to sugar cane production in large farms could inadvertently result in the release of pollutants to the environment or the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health. (Standard 7: 7.1, 7.4)	I=3 P=1	**Low**	The project will only promote and support sustainable production practices that include the reduced use of pesticides and fertilizer in the participating farms. Farmers will be trained to make use of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) on farm as part of the project strategy to promote sustainable production.	

	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?		
	Select one (see SESP for guidance)		Comments
	Low Risk	☐	
	Moderate Risk	X	**The project activities are designed ensuring minimal or no risks of adverse social or environmental impacts. The risk assessment and risk mitigation measures considered during the final project design, includes the adoption of project approaches which allows for greater localization of programmed actions i.e. greater involvement of communities in introduced sustainable production and conservation features and watershed management arrangements. Risks are fully incorporated into UNDP's Risk Log and risk monitoring mechanisms and dedicated project personnel will be assigned to monitor and manage associated safeguards.**

	High Risk	☐	
	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
	Check all that apply		Comments
	Principle 1: Human Rights	X	See comment on risk 3.
	Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	X	See comment on risk 4.
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management	X	See comment on risk 1 and 6.
	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	X	See comment on risk 5.
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	☐	
	4. Cultural Heritage	☐	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	X	See comment on risk 2.
	6. Indigenous Peoples	X	See comment on risk 3.
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	X	See comment on risk 7.

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?	No
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?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
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?	No
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?	Yes
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?	No
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?	Yes
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? *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being*	No
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? *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes*	No

[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.

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?	Yes
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? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction*	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? *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.*	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)? *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
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?	No
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
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

[2] In regards to CO_2, '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.]

3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	Yes
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)?	No
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)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
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)?	Yes
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?	No
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?	No
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)? *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.*	No
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?	No

[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.

6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
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?	No
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?	Yes
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? *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol*	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	Yes
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No