##### Annex 5: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

Project Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project Title
 | Enhancing jaguar corridors and strongholds through improved management and threat reduction |
| 1. Project Number
 | 6397 |
| 1. 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 as presented ensures the meaningful participation of communities in the effective management of environmental resources directly impacting/ influencing lives and livelihoods. The project design ensures social equity and equality through its targeting of marginalized populations who commonly interface with Belize’s natural systems (includes community groups, indigenous groups, women and youth). The participatory approach considered in project design, development and implementation empowers community resource users as well as resource managers, ensuring the protection of the country’s natural heritage. The project explores in its design the interaction between environment protection and human rights, asserting rights to access and use of resources, building on the principles of “sustainable development,” which considers the needs of present and future generations. The inclusion of the human rights approach in environmental protection is important as it allows for the effective treatment of developmental and environmental conflicts through the management of human/ environment interfaces.The project interfaces with a cross section of Belize’s most vulnerable, its rural dwellers, who depend heavily on the health of the environment and the effective management of natural resources for the meeting of basic needs, including shelter, food security and livelihoods. The targeted areas for intervention coincide with the country’s poorest districts and areas which in some cases support substantial indigenous communities.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project through its design and implementation is expected to treat the differentiated roles of men and women in the management of the country’s biodiversity, as the wellbeing and the livelihoods of both women and men in rural Belize depend on an effectively managed natural resource base. The utilization of Gender assessments during the project design phase has created a clearer understanding of these differentiated roles which allows for more effective and targeted project communications and engagement of women beneficiaries in project implementation. This is particularly important in Component 2 of the initiative which speaks to the “promotion of wildlife-based economy” which targets specifically women as beneficiaries of proposed interventions in an attempt to take women’s needs and the needs of indigenous resource users into greater consideration. Because of the traditional close affiliation between women and indigenous groups and the environment, the project encourages the involvement of these groups in advising and participating in the management of the resources.   |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| The project recognizes the importance of maintaining ecological functionality and connectivity as a critical success factor of Belize’s sustainable development pathway. The project promotes the jaguar as a flagship species which supports the introduction of transformational changes to the national governance architecture supporting sustainable resource management in the country. Belize’s long-term development strategy relies on the performance of key productive sectors such as agriculture and tourism linked to the country's fragile/ vulnerable natural resource base. The expansion of the agriculture frontier and investments supporting the tourism industry have resulted in negative environmental impacts and degradation / depletion of the supporting natural resource base due to increased acceptance among decision makers of trade-offs between economic and environmental goals. The project introduces tools, programmes and institutional and policy changes to address human/ wildlife conflicts and enable a long-term shift to a more sustainable growth path. |

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: Government agencies / institutions may not effectively engage and coordinate the participation of the wider targeted critical population.(Principle 1: q4; Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2) | I = 4P = 2 | Moderate | The success of this project is closely tied to the ability of implementing entities to ensure communities’ buy in and support as well as their ability to broker effective public/ private partnerships, as connectivity of systems and effective wildlife management is dependent on the inclusion of non-state lands within established networks and the engagement of communities and land owners in wildlife conflict resolution measures. | The project has included in its design a stakeholder (community, indigenous and private sector) engagement plan supporting project interventions to minimize this risk, along with an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF). The project has allocated significant budgetary resources (see Budget Notes #5, 8, 10, 11, 18 and 20) to ensure the full participation of key groups in project implementation.  |
| Risk 2: Project implementation reproduces existing discrimination against women(Principle 2: Standard 2) | I= 3P= 2 | Moderate | Within the national setting the role of women in community level conservation efforts is not sufficiently valued or officially recognized.  | The Gender Action Plan (GAP) of this project proposes empowerment and decision-making spaces, livelihood opportunities and environmental education for women beneficiaries and stakeholders in response to this risk. Gender-specific activities and indicators strongly encourage positive impacts by the project. |
| Risk 3: Any eventual limits on wildlife harvests might be interpreted by some as limiting customary rights to wildlife resources (Principle 3; Standard 5: 5.4; Standard 6: 6.1; 6.2) | I = 3P = 2 | Moderate | This risk has been identified because the project, under Activity 3.2.1, will include the development of community resource use management plans to support efforts by indigenous communities to sustainably manage wildlife resources within their area. In the context of increased human population and hunting pressure, the project aims to ensure that communities are empowered to use wildlife sustainably by providing them with instruments to self-check the status of available wildlife for offtake. This requires setting up monitoring systems and help with analysis on potential level of sustainable offtake in relation to wildlife carrying capacity.  | Under Component 3, the project seeks to establish processes and structures within which communities may exercise their customary rights within a broader context of sustainable development. The project design ensures that communities are fully engaged and participating in all processes of wildlife population and hunting assessments and that they have direct responsibility for designing and overseeing implementation of, regulatory systems designed to ensure the sustainability of harvests. In so doing, the project promotes a high level of community-level engagement and management of natural resources. Together, these measures will serve to address any concerns that potential limitations on harvests represent anything other than communities increasing their resource management capacities and exercising responsibilities for same. Per the project’s Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), however, this risk and all other relevant risks will be further assessed and the necessary management measures (including FPIC protocols) will be included in the project’s Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP).  |
| Risk 4: Project support for conservation of wildlife as an economic resource for indigenous populations may lead communities to impose limitations on their hunting, via catch quotas or other measures, with short-term reductions in harvests (but probable long-term gains)(Principle 3: Standard 5: 5.4; Standard 6: 6.3, 6.5, 6.9) | I = 3 P= 4 | Moderate | Communities in the project region rely to some extent on game species for household food security and, to a significantly lesser extent, livelihoods. The growing population in the area means that offtake levels and long-term sustainable use are at risk. The project ensures long-term livelihood opportunities through the institution of systems to maintain wildlife populations. The implementation of instruments of feedback loops on the sustainability of the activities under their own control means that this can be regarded as an empowering instrument, assuring long-term management of wildlife presence in the area.  | As with any intervention aimed at encouraging sustainable use, short-term limitations on consumption are designed to enable long-term maintenance of same, in this case via maintenance of viable wildlife populations. The project is designed to collect, share and disseminate data in collaboration with the communities. This data and information will be used jointly with the community to set quotas and/or seasonal access. Per the IPPF, procedures for doing so will be developed as part of the IPP, at which time this risk will be further assessed. |
| Risk 5 Capture of jaguars poses risk of bodily harm to personnel both trainees and trainer, and jaguars (Principle 3: Standard 3.7) | I = 4P = 1 | Moderate | The risk is real and almost completely related to the expertise of the trainer and capture expert. The trapping requires high expertise in terms of the physical capture mechanisms and control of timing of capture, knowledge of jaguar behavior when captured, high veterinary knowledge about jaguars, and ability to take charge and control the situation in terms of people trained around him. | Belize has a strong record of safe jaguar captures with several highly experienced trappers, having worked within Belize. The trapper tentatively identified for the project likely has the highest number of safe live release captures of jaguars in the world, has worked previously with CSFI in the North, and understands the landscape and culture of personnel. He has extremely rigid safety protocols that will be implemented with care, and with this we feel the project can place the risk of accidents as extremely low with confidence. These will be carefully chosen and will have a proven record of no harm to jaguars, themselves, and involved personnel.  |
| Risk 6: Project activities and outcomes could be vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change.(Principle 3; Standard 2: 2.2) | I=3P=3 | Moderate | Corridors (and increased landscape connectivity more generally) are the most frequently recommended conservation strategy to protect biodiversity as climate changes. Climate change, however, can influence natural corridors and connectivity of systems. Those managing corridors must consider range shifts, as well as alternative corridors which provide paths for individuals to recolonize habitats where populations have been lost.  | This risk is managed within the project design by further bolstering corridor systems delineated formally through government decree and by supporting actions within productive landscapes to further benefit connectivity.  |
| Risk 7: Trail cutting for camera trapping will increase the possibility of access by hunters to sensitive habitats and wildlife, including within and adjacent to protected areas (Principle 3; Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2)  | I=3P=2 | Moderate | The project target landscapes are located within ecologically important areas and within, or adjacent to, formally protected areas. While the project design aims to improve the effectiveness and value of this habitat for its constituent biodiversity, including jaguar and prey species, some activities, such as ecotourism and creation or expansion of trails to support camera trapping, may include *slight* risks of increased impacts associated with human presence.  | Trail design will ensure minimal disturbance to the ecosystem, in line with conservation biology criteria. Project staff, who understand risks created by enhanced access, will take action to safeguard against this, e.g. minimize trail cutting to minimal requirements, assuring trails easily overgrow within short period. This has been captured in the design of output 1.2.2. |
| Risk 8: Project’s approach to promoting cultural heritage, in the context of ecotourism, could result in unintended social and cultural consequences.(Principle 3: Standard 4: 4.2) | I= 2P= 2 | Low | Belize promotes cultural tourism. In an effort to introduce opportunities for non-traditional livelihoods within the project area, and to further engage local, mainly Creole communities in conservation efforts, the project proposes to further develop and scale up the model being piloted under Output 2.2 which presents a hybrid cultural and ecosystem-based tourism.This risk is assessed as low, first because tourism activities will not take place in sites having indigenous communities. In addition, the project is not introducing a new avenue of activity, but helping communities participate better and benefit from existing tourism packages. Finally, Belize has significant existing safeguards, including a tourism board and industry association. Nevertheless, the project has been designed to monitor and maintain ongoing and close engagement with participating communities, ensuring that project-supported interventions serve their needs and that cultural practices are fully respected. |  |
| Risk 9: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there may be risks to individuals participating in project activities, including consultations, until the crisis is under control(Principle 3: Standard 3: 3.6  | I = 3P = 3 | Moderate | The spread of the novel Coronavirus has created new risks to project implementation.  | At the time of writing, reported cases in Belize are few. However, this will of course change and it is extremely difficult to predict the degree of future spread. Should future circumstances warrant, and in order to mitigate risk, travel by central office personnel in Belmopan to the project sites may be cancelled and meetings with local and strategic partners will be held using virtual platforms. The fact that the country has good internet connectivity makes it possible to implement these alternative forms of work with relative ease. Activities in the field that require the presence of project personnel or staff from partner organizations (especially activities involving travel for multiple staff) will be postponed if necessary. Instead, virtual communication will be promoted using mobile phone networks to exchange messages and images, and virtual forums will be held. Virtual meetings will be held with local beneficiaries’ associations, using the proper prevention measures and only when necessary, at locations that have the required connectivity. This will ensure a reduced number of participants to those who are considered essential. On a quarterly basis, project progress will be assessed and activities will be rescheduled as needed. |
| Risk 10: The risks associated with the seed funding (output 2.2) are currently unknown because the specific alternative livelihoods will be selected and designed during the project’s implementation. (Principles/Standards TBD) | I = 4P = 2 | Moderate |  | During the first year of implementation, the project will conduct livelihood analysis/ assessments to establish sustainable livelihood alternatives through a thorough stakeholder consultation process within the buffer communities of the northern “Jaguar Corridor”. Once defined, such alternative livelihood activities will undergo the environmental and social risk screening process following the UNDP SES procedure. If risks are identified, the project will develop the appropriate management measures and plans, such as a Livelihood Action Plan to avoid, reduce or mitigate the impact of such risks. |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?**  |
| **Select one (see** [**SESP**](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | **Comments** |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **X** | The project is assessed as “moderate” risk, as it involves the participation of indigenous peoples and other vulnerable or marginalized groups and has several additional moderately rated risks. It should be noted, however, that the concept builds on the lessons and the processes of recent similar actions undertaken by natural resource managers, including community consultation and participation in REDD+ programming, the development of a management strategy and plan for the central Belize Corridor System and the expansion of the North Eastern corridor system. Project development has been informed through consultations with a broad cross section of national stakeholders and thorough analysis of national and local circumstances. Project developers have also elaborated three action plans to manage and mitigate the cumulative nature of the risks and/or the complexity of assessing and managing the moderate risks identified in the SESP. These action plans are: (1) Stakeholder Engagement Plan, (2) Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) and (3) Gender Action Plan. The IPPF for example, outlines key activities designed to obtain the FPIC of local communities during the project’s inception phase. A full Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) will be prepared during project implementation. |
| ***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 | The project recognizes people as key actors in their own development; however, communities have traditionally been marginalized by a centralized system of environmental governance limiting their abilities to fully participate in decisions pertaining to the management of the natural resource base. The project design ensures that communities are fully informed as to processes pertaining to wildlife management and monitoring and allows them access to systems of decision making and power facilitating their possible influence on these processes. |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | x | A gender analysis, action plan and gender-differentiated indicators have been prepared |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | x | Despite the project’s inclusion of critical habitats within its scope, the project is designed to enhance these features and is expected to have an overall benefit on biodiversity and natural resource management. |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | x | As noted above, climate change can influence natural corridors and connectivity of systems. Those managing corridors must consider range shifts, as well as alternative corridors which provide paths for individuals to recolonize habitats where populations have been lost. |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | x | Issues related to COVID-19 and other risks.  |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | x | Minimal impacts possible due to promotion of traditional cultural heritage of Creole people |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | x | Communities in the Component 3 landscape rely to some extent on game species for household food security and, to a significantly lesser extent, livelihoods. The growing population in the area means that offtake levels and long-term sustainable use are at risk. As with any intervention aimed at encouraging sustainable use, short-term limitations on consumption are designed to enable long-term maintenance of same, in this case via maintenance of viable wildlife populations. |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | x | Communities in the component 3 landscape rely to some extent on game species for household food security and, to a significantly lesser extent, livelihoods. The growing population in the area means that offtake levels and long-term sustainable use are at risk. As with any intervention aimed at encouraging sustainable use, short-term limitations on consumption are designed to enable long-term maintenance of same, in this case via maintenance of viable wildlife populations. |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** |  |

Final Sign Off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor |  | Diane Wade-Moore |
| QA Approver |  | Ian King |
| 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]](#footnote-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? | Yes  |
| 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? | No |
| 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?  | 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? *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:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **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* | Yes |
| 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) | No |
| 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? *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.* | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |
| 2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[[2]](#footnote-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](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) 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 |
| 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)? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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? | 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]](#footnote-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)? *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.* | Yes |
| 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 |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)?  | 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?*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? | No |
| 7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?  | 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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.] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)