# ANNEX 2:

# Social and Environmental Screening Template

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Supporting Public Administration Reform in Georgia - Phase 2 |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 00127668/output 00121579 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Georgia |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date | 12 July 2021 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach*** |
| The project will be guided by the Human Rights based approach. All project activities will be based and will apply Human Rights principles such as: Equality and non-discrimination, participation and inclusion, accountability and rule of law. The PAR reform will be approached as a means for safeguarding the basic rights of rights-holders (local citizens, women, vulnerable and other groups) and enabling proper satisfaction of their fundamental rights, needs and interests. Whilst, at the same time, it will provide the duty-bearers at central level stronger capacities and opportunities to effectively fulfil their obligations and increase accountability. Project also responds to address some of the EU directives including on Human Rights. The PAR Roadmap 2015-2020 was the guiding policy document for the PAR project and its counterparts. The international context demands PAR implementation, as within the framework of the Association Agreement (AA) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the government has committed itself to addressing a wide range of policy issues, all of which require effective, transparent and accountable administration, ensuring the participatory, inclusive, and gender-sensitive policy process, which guarantees the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The project addresses the Human Rights issues as a cross-cutting theme along with gender equity, inclusiveness, etc. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Since achieving gender equality and reducing inequalities are fundamental to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), these notions will become integral parts of every stage of the upcoming project. From PAR project perspective, gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) can be achieved through boosting equal access to various aspects of public administration and governance for women and men as well as for vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities and ethnic minorities.  GESI activities will be mainstreamed under each of the project pillars through an indicative objective and integrated within the project’s results and risks frameworks. They will also be integrated in all interventions. The project will be guided by this general, three-pronged approach to addressing the GESI objectives:  **Project management with gender and social inclusion perspective:**  The project team will engage with national counterparts to ensure that gender mainstreaming is observed in the design and implementation of interventions, i.e., that impacts on gender equality are analysed in the design phase, gender equality is maintained in implementation, and gender-disaggregated data is collected, where possible, for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Capacity building measures having a long-term effect on representation and power relations in institutions, will be planned and implemented with the focus on proactive involvement of women. Fair representation will be sought in different consultative processes and female experts will be recruited whenever possible.  **Specific initiatives (studies, research) particularly focusing on gender and social inclusion will be carried out:**  PAR project team has previously analysed the career path of women in civil service and explored specific needs for service provision by the police to the women victims of domestic violence. These findings along with study results of other upcoming initiatives will become the basis for GESI sensitive interventions of the project in addressing the systemic and cultural constrains that result in the “glass ceiling” existing in the public sector, limited accessibility of the services, etc.  **GESI indicators will be mainstreamed in strategic documents and action plans:**  The project aims at integrating the application of GESI sensitivity and mainstreaming it as a part of institutional culture in Georgia’s civil service. The year 2020 provides an opportunity for gaining momentum in mainstreaming GESI into the PAR new strategy. UNDP-supported PAR Strategy development is a participatory process where UN Women bears an important role for ensuring PAR Strategy gender-sensitivity and high focus on social inclusion. PAR project’s collaboration with the UN Women and the AoG sets the solid ground for future institutional partnership and engagement of GESI focused CSO’s in PAR implementation, as well as enables meaningful integration of the GESI elements in monitoring and evaluation measures supported by the project.  In order to ensure gender and social inclusion sensitivity of the project, the Results Framework of the PAR 2 was developed in close collaboration with the national GESI consultant. The project will closely collaborate with the Human Rights, Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Unit at UNDP Georgia Democratic Governance Portfolio throughout the project lifecycle. The project will work through a set of recommendations with project counterparts to identify the areas where the most considerable and tangible impact can be made. Apart from mainstreaming gender and social inclusion into the project activities, capacity building activities will be planned for the project team and national counterparts throughout the project duration. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| Development of professional and modern civil service and public administration are decisive for ensuring the resilience of Georgia to internal and external shocks, and for achieving the country’s human development objectives by ensuring citizens’ access to their rights and services, as well as facilitating development of better public policies.  PAR project Phase 1 has been continuously supporting key GoG institutions in strengthening their policy development and administration capacities. Each initiative has been implemented in a way that aims to maximize the sustainability of results.  The experience and lessons learned from previous interventions as well as UNDP good practices in general will feed into the sustainability strategy of the project’s second phase. The approach effectively practiced by PAR project from the very beginning is to implement and maintain effective initiatives and systems that are continually responsive to stakeholders’ needs. This is accomplished by examining factors that, if addressed diligently through strategic planning, can increase the sustainability of interventions and their results.  These factors include:   * **Capacity building and institutional strengthening:** PAR 2 emphasizes national ownership through growth in capacity accrued both through professional development initiatives and consultancy support. Thus, institutional strengthening is present strongly across the works-streams of the PAR project, serving as an additional safeguard for delivering sustainable results. * **Alignment of the program with stakeholder needs:** The project objective is linked to the fulfilment of national and/or agency’s strategic priorities. Reforms must meet the needs of intended users and other stakeholders if they are to be sustained. The intervention logic therefore is to support initiatives that are both responding to the major policy and legislative frameworks and are demand driven. To reap the benefits of long-term reform sustainability, focus is placed on activities that are owned by decision-makers, contribute to replicability, institutional strengthening and continuity. Particular emphasis is placed on avoiding creating the aid dependency – through establishment of practices that are sustainable (in terms of human resources, funding, etc.) at the current levels of resource allocation, or provided for in future budgets. * **Partnership among stakeholders:** Establishing and maintaining already existing highly positive relationships with the stakeholders through donor coordination group is a key part of national ownership and coordinated aid response. * **Quality of program implementation:** Commitment to the quality of project implementation via participatory and consultative process, fidelity, and project evaluation helps sustain and ensure commitment by key government partners. * **Measurement, monitoring and evaluation:** Agreement on measurement and evaluation processes, including key project benchmarks and targets, lends transparency to the program and thus has been settled very early in the project initiation phase. Early assessment of needs provides a baseline against which improvements can be measured.   Sustainability has also been strengthened by making the PAR process more inclusive and by intensively engaging civil society initiatives in the reform implementation. According to the evaluation report ‘It is important to recognize that PAR is a long-term process that requires patience and perseverance. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| Efforts will be made to develop a viable ‘exit plan’ for the phase 2 of the PAR project, which could be accomplished through gradual, phased approach along with staggered graduation from specific project areas via intensive cooperation with the key GoG stakeholders and the PAR donors active in the relevant PAR pillars. Given that the timeline of the proposed initiative closely follows the implementation timeframe of the new PAR Strategy (currently spanning from the year 2021 through 2025) the project will apply the ‘phasing over’ strategy by transferring the program activities to the key Government partners leading the PAR implementation (AoG, CSB, PSDA and DGA). This will be mostly achieved through the capacity building component of the project, which is strongly presented in the design of the proposed interventions, to ensure that the technical assistance and consultancy services provided can continue through local structures. Since the project implementation will influence the ultimate exit plan, it is important that the exit plan remains flexible with the expectation that some of the exit criteria and benchmarks may need to be modified during the project cycle. |

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | | | | **QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High** | | | |
| ***Risk Description***  ***(broken down by event, cause, impact)*** | ***Impact and Likelihood (1-5)*** | ***Significance***  ***(Low, Moderate Substantial, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High*** | | | |
| Risk 1: No Risk Identified | I =  L = |  |  | |  | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **X** | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***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”)*** | | | **☐** | |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* | | |  | | **☐** | Targeted assessment(s) |  |
|  | | **☐** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | | **☐** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) |  |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | **☐** | |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | |  | | **☐** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) |  |
|  | | **☐** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) |  |
|  | | **☐** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) |  |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** | | |  | | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | | |  | |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |

**Final Sign Off**

*Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor: Gigi Bregadze, DG Team Leader |  | 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:  Anna Chernyshova, DRR |  | 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: Anna Chernyshova, RR a.i. |  | 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](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/Pages/Homepage.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| P.1 Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? | *No* |
| P.2 Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project? | *No* |
| 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? [[1]](#footnote-1) | *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* |
| 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? | *No* |
| 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 risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.13 exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | *No* |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 1.2 activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | *No* |
| 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) | *No* |
| 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?[[2]](#footnote-2) | *No* |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3) | *No* |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | *No* |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | *No* |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | *No* |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | *No* |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | *No* |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 3.1 construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams) | *No* |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | *No* |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | *No* |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | *No* |
| 3.5 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | *No* |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | *No* |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | *No* |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | *No* |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | *No* |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | *No* |
| 4.3 adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | *No* |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | *No* |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | *No* |
| **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)? | *No* |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[4]](#footnote-4) | *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)? | *No* |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | *No* |
| 6.3 impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?  *If the answer to screening question 6.3 is “yes”, then the potential risk impacts are considered significant and the project would be categorized as either Substantial Risk or High Risk* | *No* |
| 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 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | *No* |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | *No* |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | *No* |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)* |  |
| 7.1 working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments? | *No* |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | *No* |
| 7.3 use of child labour? | *No* |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | *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 materials and/or chemicals? | *No* |
| 8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal 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. Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender and transsexual people. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)