## Annex 6. Social and Environmental Screening Template

*The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the* [*Social and Environmental Screening Procedure*](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) *and* [*Toolkit*](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/ses_toolkit/default.aspx) *for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the highly migratory fish stocks of the West and Central Pacific Ocean |
| 1. Project Number | 6445 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Western and Central Pacific Ocean – SIDS |
| 1. Project stage   (Design or Implementation) | Design (endorsement stage) |
| 1. Date | 21 July 2021 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach*** |
| One of the aims of this Project is to strengthen the role that the Pacific SIDS play in the management of offshore oceanic fisheries both within their EEZ and of those same migratory fish stocks in adjacent high sea areas. Historically, the fisheries have been dominated by fleets from distant water fishing nations (DWFNs) and they have reaped the benefits (both financially and in the context of food security) rather than the islands. One major aspect of this Project will be to realign the control over fishing methods and landings/processing to the greater benefit of the Pacific SIDS themselves as ‘right-holders’. This, in turn, will assist with sustainable development, poverty alleviation and ensuring fair distribution of development opportunities and benefits. Climate change has been shown to influence the distribution of migratory fish stocks significantly and this could threaten the food security and livelihoods of some Pacific SIDS while temporarily improving it for others. The Project will seek to understand these implications and to find ways to equitably resolve them on a ‘regional’ basis within the Western and Central Pacific Ocean area.  Throughout the implementation of project activities; the project will uphold the principles of accountability; participation; inclusion; equality and non-discrimination including, but not limited to ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are included in discussions beginning from the stages of project planning, implementation up to the project evaluation stage. The project will ensure that meaningful, effective and informed participation of stakeholders is of paramount importance and considered during the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of project activities. The program will seek to ensure that all vulnerable and marginalized populations have access to claim and exercise all human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis with others in all relevant stages and opportunities of the project cycle. Also, noting that the project will adhere to human rights obligations by seeking to empower women and youth groups as well as marginalized communities and indigenous communities to realize their rights and ensure that they fully participate throughout the programming cycle of this project in compliance with international laws and UNDP’s Social and Environmental Safeguards Policy. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Within the framework of the project, and in promoting gender equality and women empowerment; project activities will aim to a) involve women and youth groups; b) ensure equal income opportunities among all groups when engaged in the same activity; c) provide equal opportunities for access to training and incentives for sustainable production; and d) equal participation in decision making. In its Gender analysis and Mainstreaming Plan, the Project specifies that it will explore the potential to bring economic security and rights to vulnerable women, to reduce the potential for exploitation and abuse, and support women and their communities with practical skills for sustainable livelihoods. More specifically, the Project will foster: (i) Recognition and expansion of the importance and role of women in marine production systems related to fisheries; (ii) Recognise the interest of women to increase family income and develop sustainable production activities; and, (iii) Target and promote women’s interests and knowledge improvement in production processes and sustainable management of fisheries, particularly through capacity building and training.  Furthermore, the Pacific region is one of the most vulnerable regions to climate change impacts in the world. Women are extremely sensitive to these changes given their lack of access to essential resources such as land, finance or information. The nexus between gender and climate change is often underestimated. Climate change and disasters in the Pacific are impacting food security, nutrition, clean water, health and livelihoods. In particular, rural women, children, older persons and other disadvantaged groups bear a heavier burden of climate change, due to social inequalities that limit them. Climate change, in turn, widens socio-economic gaps, trapping communities in a vicious cycle. Overall, the project will aim to ensure that both women and men are able to participate meaningfully and equitably, that they have equitable access to Programme and Project resources, and that they receive comparable social and economic benefits. Notably, the Project Results Framework includes appropriate Indicators and Targets to achieve these objectives. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| This Project has a core focus on environmental sustainability through the strengthening and maintenance of environmental management and biodiversity protection. The Western and Central Pacific Ocean area supports one of the only sustainable migratory stock fisheries in the world, primarily for species of Tuna but also for other commercial target migratory species. This has been achieved to date through the efforts of UNDP and other agencies along with support from GEF. The entire concept of a sustainable fisheries is fundamental to the wellbeing of the island beneficiaries with regards to their entire livelihood and food security; which would collapse if the fishery were to become unsustainable. In order for the fishery to remain sustainable, the environment in which it exists must also be maintained in a healthy state through a strengthened ecosystem-based management approach. Central to such an ecosystem-based management strategy is a precautionary approach that the Project promotes through:   1. The adoption of harvest strategies, targets and triggers. This *“Harvest Strategy Approach”* to management, aims to implement an agreed and scientifically tested rule-based procedure whereby pre-programmed management responses to new scientific data and assessments are agreed in advance and implemented to achieve management objectives. 2. The Project also aims to capture climate-resilient strategies for the Pacific SIDS in relation to the migratory fishery. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The Project Design has been fully inclusive with a range of stakeholders involved as listed in the Project Document and with a number of progress reviews and meetings during the Project Development process. A detailed stakeholder engagement plan has been developed (with inputs from the stakeholders themselves) and is annexed to the Project Document. The main objective of the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) is to ensure that the interests and priorities of the different stakeholder groups and sectors are taken into account during relevant phases of project development and implementation. Specific objectives of the plan include:   * + Informing stakeholders to ensure a common understanding of the intended project goals and approaches.   + Generating project buy-in and appropriation by targeted partners and beneficiaries, including Indigenous Peoples, youth, women and marginalized communities.   + Identification of priority interventions and adequate strategies to successfully achieve the intended outcomes of the project.   + Identification of opportunities for synergies and partnerships, including co-financing and institutional cooperation.   + Validation of the intervention strategy and targets by its key stakeholders.   + Facilitation of participatory M&E and feedback mechanisms.   + Establishment of grievance mechanisms   The stakeholder engagement plan will be implemented according to five basic principles that will ensure its effectiveness and inclusiveness: I). **Participation**: Open representation and participation of stakeholders will be facilitated at all levels, from Government to local community members. II). **Gender equity**: Project design and implementation will be responsive to gender-sensitive considerations including the specific capacities and needs of women, the youth and marginalized/vulnerable groups. III). **Respect for cultural diversity**: Project design and implementation will respect existing customs, traditions, and forms of organization and decision-making. IV). **Communication and transparency**: Care will be taken to design and implement a communication strategy that guides messages coherently to specific stakeholder groups and audiences targeted by the project. Adequate communication will help avoid unrealistic/false expectations or erroneous interpretations between actors. Information will be provided transparently, without marginalizing any stakeholder groups. V). **Partnerships and synergies**: Continuous efforts will be made to ensure mapping of other interventions with similar objectives as the project, or initiatives that are related to the same thematic scope as the project. Opportunities will be explored to establish synergies that can help to maximize project impact and avoid duplication of efforts.  Methodologies for the engagement of stakeholders and beneficiaries will depend on the actor, and the stage of project implementation and will include:   * **Project Steering Committee**: Meetings of the PSC will be organized on a regular basis to ensure relevant partners remain actively engaged in monitoring progress and steering the implementation of project activities towards its intended outcomes. * **Workshops**: Workshops will be used to inform and actively engage larger groups of stakeholders in consultation processes, generating buy-in and sharing knowledge. * **Strategic / informal meetings**: Meetings will be held bilaterally or with groups with the purpose to inform stakeholders and/or obtain agreement on issues of importance for successful project implementation. Group meetings will also form an important means of communication at the community level. * **Liaisons**: representatives of regional governments and district councils, community leaders, elders, religious leaders, etc. may be used as liaisons, for instance between beneficiaries and other project partners. * **Expert consultations**: Recognized experts in thematic areas will consult and inform stakeholders on strategic aspects of the project. * **Exchange visits**: Project partners and beneficiaries at the national level may be selected to participate in visits to other countries in order to exchange knowledge and learn from good practices and successful approaches implemented elsewhere that could be replicated in the project sites.   The project will develop a communication strategy that will take into consideration the stakeholder engagement plan and can be adapted depending on the stage of the project, and in response to feedback from stakeholders, as well as the grievance mechanism which will be shared with all stakeholders. |

**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 5 below before proceeding to Question 6* | | | | **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: If technical assistance and policy advice does not sufficiently fill capacity gaps, then there is a possibility that in some cases some government bodies may have insufficient capacity to meet all of their obligations.  Human Rights P.2 | I = 3  L = 3 | **Moderate** | This risk is based on the context of limitations in member-state capacity in some areas. The fisheries administrations of FFA members are are characterised by stronger than average capacity against public sector benchmarks, nonetheless some jurisdictions within the region have corruption and public sector capacity indicators in the bottom quartile globally (WGS, World Bank, 2019). In these contexts there may at times be constraints on member-states abilities to meet all obligations as defined within project activities. This would naturally be true of any GEF project requiring capacity building. However, although the impact could be significant in the event of no improvements in capacity, the probability is very low as the implementing partners have a solid track record of delivery within this context. | | * FFA has extensive experience in oceanic (primarily Tuna) fisheries management and will integrate capacity-building experience and skills to its implementing partners. Capacity building and associated training initiatives will ensure continuous upgrading and expansion of skill-sets to ensure that duty bearers meet their obligations. * The associated training and capacity building, has been integrated in all the four (4) components of the project during project implementation and will be monitored through the Results Framework and Monitoring Plan. * The project will develop/establish a Social and Environmental Strategic Assessment (SESA) to ensure that all upstream impacts are carefully managed during project implementation. |
| Risk 2: Project activities managed by FFA on behalf of member states have the potential to inadvertently cause harm to Protected Areas since the project will be implemented 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.  Standard 1: 1.1; 1.2; P.13; P.14 | I = 2  L = 2 | **Low** | * There are protected areas within the project system area (e.g., Palau National Marine Sanctuary; Niue, Phoenix Islands) and commercial fishing is strictly controlled or banned (no-take zones) within such areas. There are also a significant number of special management areas in the WCPO. * The project will not be undertaking activities within these areas unless it related to approved scientific research by SPC. The project will be providing key support to national MCS strategies specifically designed to eliminate any inappropriate incursions or activities in these areas. The project will be providing key support to national MCS strategies specifically designed to eliminate any inappropriate incursions or activities in these areas. * This project ensures sustainable management of Fisheries by not only safeguarding biodiversity and life-supporting capacity of water, but also ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are properly consulted including women, men and that Free Participatory Informed Consent (FPIC) is implemented among Indigenous Peoples. This will ensure that all relevant stakeholders equally participate in development and that associated benefits are shared equitably. * At the national level, nearshore and coastal fisheries resources in FFA member countries are strongly supported by community level management processes in which local community management areas are promoted and supported. This ensures full community engagement in resource management. | |  |
| Risk 3: During project implementation/management there is a potential risk of overexploitation of the marine resources particularly non-target species harmed by tuna-fishing.  Standard 1: 1.3; 1.13;1.10 | I = 2 L = 2 | **Low** | * Mitigating this risk is a core objective of the project. If the consequences of Tuna fishing, whether through purse-seine or long-line methods causes significant damage to other aquatic lie such as sea birds, sharks and turtles are not managed adequately, they can directly contribute to loss of biodiversity. * If the fishery of the main Tuna target stocks were to become ‘unsustainable’ this would threaten the long-term effective management of these migratory species; have significant negative impacts on the socioeconomic well-being of the PICS (as well as the other fishing nations) and; potentially create irreversible harm to the overall ecosystem though knock-on effects. However, the probability of this happening is low. Additionally, the FFA and member states will be operating within the context of the WCPF convention rendering risks triggered under Standard 1 to be categorised as low. Moreover, the project supports SPC work on fisheries stock assessments and monitoring and WCPFC management processes. * The project will also support key FFA fisheries management consultative processes via the annual Management Options Consultation process and the whole project is about sustainable fisheries and ensuring sound management in support of these. | |  |
| Risk 4: Fishing activities and livelihood activities managed by FFA and implemented near/on shores could potentially cause/lead to economic changes within the local community and indigenous peoples whose livelihoods rely on fishing/fisheries.  Standard 5: 5.2 | L=2  I=2 | **Low** | The likelihood of this happening is greatly reduced when considering the specific Outputs and associated activities that are being addressed through the Project to ensure as much benefit as possible goes to the Pacific SIDS whose waters are being fished. Food security is a wider issue that goes beyond migratory tuna as is related to over-fishing of coastal fisheries. | |  |
| Risk 5: There is the possibility that the project will experience ineffective or incomplete stakeholder engagement with relevant stakeholders including the local communities including Indigenous communities and women.  P.13; P.14 | I = 3  L=3 | **Moderate** |  | | * To ensure compliance to the SES, the Project has a proactive, comprehensive and functional Stakeholder Engagement Plan that includes all relevant stakeholders including women, youth, marginalized communities and Indigenous Communities. * The project has also established an ESMF (which includes/covers procedures for ensuring effective stakeholder engagement during implementation); strong communication and awareness structures with decisions being seen to be ‘supported’ across the board. * Additionally, the project will carry out a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment to towards ensuring stronger awareness and support at the national policy level to help create a consensus within FFA which can carry into WCPFC also. * The project has a well-founded Grievance Redress Mechanism to complement its stakeholder engagements and participation. |
| Risk 6 The project has the potential to impact on the rights of indigenous peoples because project activities will engage with Indigenous communities and impact on their resources and livelihoods.  Standard 6 Indigenous Peoples; 6.1, 6.3)  Standard 5 Economic Displacement: 5.2 | I =2 2  L = 2= 2 | **Low** | The project will engage with Member States who are predominantly Indigenous Peoples across the 14 Pacific SIDS. However, the project envisions more positive impacts by ensuring that the substantial rights, livelihood and benefits to Indigenous Peoples will be realised by the Pacific SIDS through its engagement with the Member States.  The project (under Outcome 2) will explore and support/promote options for improving access to pelagic food resources for local communities and strengthening food security in relation to climate change impacts, such as nearshore FAD deployment, offloading of small tuna and non-target by-catch food-fish, cheaper access to canned tuna, etc.  Furthermore, this Outcome will focus on the development and promotion of/support for alternative income generating activities both within fisheries management and other sectors that can provide adaptive responses to climate change and its expected/predicted impacts on the fisheries sector.  The Project will also include appropriate training staff involved in the management of fisheries focusing on new skills and technologies with an emphasis on gender empowerment and youth job creation. The Project will have a positive impact on these indigenous peoples by securing their well-being and livelihoods. | |  |
| Risk 7: *The project is operating in areas in which there are existing Gender imbalances that the project continues to address, these could be reproduced or exacerbated if not properly managed during project implementation.*  Gender Principle: P.10; | I = 3  L= 2 | **Moderate** | Women and girls comprise about half of the population in Pacific Island countries. However, generally speaking, representation in leadership and decision making is low. For example, statistics suggest that less than 8% of women are in parliamentary positions[[1]](#footnote-2). Gender inequities in the Pacific Islands region are distinct. Women are vulnerable and at higher risk to violence, lack of economic opportunities and limited access to health care and education[[2]](#footnote-3). One of the reasons for inequality comes from the traditional culture and social structure of each country. The capacity to achieve gender equality is not merely about changing laws, it is about social attitudes in which women are not regarded as equal and there is a struggle for women to face the challenges of both social and cultural complexities in each national setting. In the work-place, men outnumber women by two to one. In the context of economic empowerment, if women had the same access to markets, credit and technology as men then the share of wealth for women would dramatically increase[[3]](#footnote-4). | | * The project’s ESMF includes a Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Action Plan which provides an analysis of gender inequalities and gender-based violence in the Pacific countries involved in this project as well as procedures to ensure that these gaps are not exacerbated during project implementation. * FFA will promote gender equality and women empowerment through Moana Voices. Moana Voices is currently led by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency with support from the GEF Oceanic Fisheries Management Project, OFMP2. This project aims to increase the participation of women in fisheries by raising the profile of fisheries as a potential career, as well as the profile of women already working in the sector. * The project has also developed a comprehensive and functional Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Plan embedded in both the *ProDoc & ESMF)* to ensure that requirements under Principle 3 Gender are met during project implementation. * The project will carry out further assessments under the site specific ESIAs on impacts to Gender and develop management measures in the subsequent ESMPs to ensure that gender roles are carefully identified, constraints to women’s participation are managed, and that measures to reduce negative impacts of the fisheries and opportunities for participation are integrated into project activities to achieve Sustainable tuna industry development. |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?**  *Note: Project categorization is determined by the highest level of significance of identified risks across all potential risk areas (as rated in Question 3).* | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **X** |  |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | **☐** |  |
| ***High Risk*** | | | **☐** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)** | | | | |
| Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High-Risk projects. | | | | |
| ***Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)*** | **X** |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* |  | **X** | Targeted assessment(s) | Completed: stakeholder analysis, gender analysis |
|  | **X** | SESAs (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Site-specific assessments planned for implementation |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | **X** |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* |  | **X** | Targeted management plans | Completed: Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Action Plan both to be updated during project implementation. |
|  | **X** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) | Completed |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** |  | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | --- |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***Accountability*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** |  |  | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** |  |  | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** |  |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***7. Labor and Working Conditions*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** |  | | |

**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** | | |
| 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 for further guidance on addressing screening questions. | | |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** | **Notes (optional)** |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |
| 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 do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | YES | *Note: is a normal risk of working in developing context, and not an assessment of FFA member states fisheries management bodies.* |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g., project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | NO |  |
| *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? | NO |  |
| P.6 restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? | NO | Note: There are no restrictions in access or vulnerability of resources or basic services. |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | NO |  |
| **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |  |
| P.8 Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? | NO |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to?* |  |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | NO |  |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | YES | *Note: Has been marked yes to reflect the context in which gender-based inequalities exist, the amelioration of which continue to be a focus of the project. It is not indicating that the project would in any way promote such inequalities.* |
| 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* | NO |  |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc. | NO |  |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related 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 | *Note: Reflects the context of indirect consultation processes conducted by sovereign member states – does not imply that the projects could lead to said exclusion.* |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | YES | *Note: Reflects the zero-sum nature of resource management decisions.* |
| P.15 risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project? | NO |  |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |  |
| Would the project potentially involve or lead to: |  |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g., modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | YES | Note: Project aims to have positive impacts on natural environment and biodiversity, while working with an extractive industry. |
| 1.2 activities 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 | Note: Project aims to enhance protection of critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas. |
| 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 | As above. |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species? (e.g., reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | NO |  |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | NO |  |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species? | NO |  |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | NO |  |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | NO |  |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | NO |  |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | NO |  |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction | NO |  |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[4]](#footnote-5) | NO |  |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g., collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) | NO |  |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | NO |  |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 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?  For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events | NO |  |
| 2.3 direct or indirect increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disasters 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 |  |
| 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 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)? | YES |  |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | NO |  |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property, or to support project activities? | NO |  |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |  |
| Would the project potentially involve or lead to: |  |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | NO |  |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | NO |  |
| 4.3 Adverse 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 |  |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | NO |  |
| 4.5 Does the Project propose utilizing 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?[[5]](#footnote-6) | 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 | *Note: The project scope does not interact with the economic or cultural claims of any IPs beyond those reflected in self-determined priorities of member-states.* |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | NO |  |
| 6.3 Impact (positive or negative) to 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 Substantial or High Risk.* | NO | *Note: FFA will be engaging with Member States and Oceanic Fishery Management staff and does not propose specific engagements or activities that will be targeted or impact on the Indigenous Peoples human rights, lands, resources, and territories.* |
| 6.4 The absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | NO |  |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | NO |  |
| 6.6 forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above.* | NO |  |
| 6.7 adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | NO |  |
| 6.8 risk to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | NO |  |
| 6.9 impact on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | NO | *Note: Traditional fishing rights will/are not in any way curtailed by the project activities. The project will not lead to a commercialization of cultural heritage*. |
| **Standard 7 : Labor and Working Conditions** |  |  |
| 7.1 working conditions that do not meet national labor laws and international commitments? | NO |  |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | NO |  |
| 7.3 use of child labor? | NO |  |
| 7.4 use of forced labor? | NO |  |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | NO |  |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? | NO |  |
| **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |  |
| 8.1 the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or [transboundary impacts](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | NO |  |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | NO |  |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? | NO |  |
| 8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) | NO |  |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | NO |  |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | NO |  |

1. <http://publications.dlprog.org/Womens_Leadership_Pacific.pdf> accessed 17th September 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. <http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/leadership-and-political-participation> accessed 17th September 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. <https://pacificwomen.org/our-work/focus-areas/economic-empowerment/> accessed 17th September 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 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-6)