UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

Note: This SESP covers all projects activities, under both UNDP and FAO.

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Protecting biodiversity and recovering degraded ecosystems - RECOVER Honduras (CEO Endorsement Request)
2. Project Number	PIMS 6295; GEF ID 10220
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Honduras

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 will strengthen the connectivity and management of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) in Northern Honduras through restoration and reduction of threats to biodiversity from commodity production. The project will adopt a human-rights-based approach in its implementation of field activities necessary for protecting human life and the environment. The project includes measures to increase the inclusion of potentially marginalized individuals and groups (e.g., indigenous peoples and women) in decision-making processes that may impact them (consistent with the non-discrimination and equality human rights principle), including the development of a National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF) regulation to clarify the extent of agroforestry systems and how they contribution to biodiversity conservation, and connectivity between protected areas (PAs) and production landscapes, as well as an enhanced land tenure interinstitutional accreditation system, the gazetting of three subnational biological corridors, the enhanced management and financial sustainability of six PAs, the implementation of landscape management tools (LMTs) to enhance ecosystem connectivity and restore degraded lands, and the promotion of sustainable production of palm oil, beef/dairy, and basic grains (maize and beans) through cooperation partnerships with the private sector and economic and non economic incentives (e.g., access to financing, tax exemptions, training, technical assistance). The project will support meaningful participation and the inclusion of all stakeholders of the prioritized landscape in the Honduran Caribbean Biological Corridor; to this end, the final project design includes a stakeholder analysis that identifies the key stakeholders with an interest in the project and their level of importance and influence, and a Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan with the following objectives: a) identifying the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders and ensuring their participation throughout the entire cycle of the project; b) promoting spaces for dialogue, coordination, and action among the stakeholders, institutions, and sectors to create a shared vision for consolidating PAs and responsible production in the project area; c) using the knowledge, experience, and capacities of the stakeholders to strengthen the design and implementation of the project; d) devising an action plan that clearly identifies the means and frequency of the commitments that the stakeholders will make; and e) allocating funds to strengthen the participation of the stakeholders during the implementation of the project, and in monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The project includes capacity building through technical assistance and training for public institutions, the private sector, and small and medium producers of palm oil and beef/dairy, agroforestry, and basic grains participating in

sustainable agriculture. The project design includes additional tools related to environmental and social safeguards in line UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) that contribute to incorporating a human-rights-based approach and the social inclusion of marginalized groups; these are the Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF) and the Social and Environmental Management Framework (ESMF). These tools include actions to strengthen the capacities of institutions as guarantors of rights and the empowerment of holders of these rights, including indigenous peoples and women. In particular, it is worth highlighting the potential of the IPPF related to the human-rights-based approach in the project: i) producers that implement sustainable food production systems increase their income and improve their food security; ii) public institutions and the private sector strengthen their capacities to ensure the fulfillment of their obligations as guarantors of rights; and iii) indigenous organizations and authorities strengthen their capacity to influence decision-making at the municipal and departmental levels regarding their rights and development. The project also promotes accountability and will address grievances through UNDP's mechanism for addressing complaints, grievances, and suggestions. The project will respect the human rights of all project participants regardless of their race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

The project will promote gender equality and women's empowerment by promoting their equal representation and by making them active participants in decision-making processes and in the implementation of actions to address threats to vulnerable biodiversity, broadleaf forest, wetlands, and freshwater ecosystems in a prioritized landscape in the Honduran Caribbean Biological Corridor, as well as to reduce land degradation, while providing opportunities for women to improve their and the well-being and of their families. The project will make available incentives to promote the adoption of sustainable production and agroforestry systems (e.g., beef/dairy and basic grains) and intensive sylvopastoral systems with production diversification, which will offer opportunities for women to participate in the development of sustainable value chains and contribute to food security. The project will incorporate gender considerations into all phases of its life cycle; a Project Gender Action Plan was developed during the final project design (PPG phase), informed by a gender analysis for the prioritized municipalities in the Northern Honduras Corridor, specifically to ensure that the concerns and experiences of women (as well as men) are an integral part of the development, implementation, and M&E of the project. The Project Gender Action Plan outlines activities and specific indicators to ensure gender participation and gender equality. In addition, the project's Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan, which was also be developed as part of the PPG, allowed to identify women and women's groups in the prioritized landscape that will be directly involved in project implementation. The project results framework also includes indicators gender equality and women's empowerment: a) # of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender and ethnicity; b) financial resources (USD) available to support restoration actions through agroforestry, prioritizing access for women; and c) annual net income of participating small and medium male and females producers of palm oil and beef/dairy. Women at the national and subnational levels were consulted and actively participated in the development of the project; consultations with women and women groups at the local level, including indigenous women, were also conducted. According to the UNDP Gender Marker Rating, the project is categorized as GEN2: gender equality as a significant objective; the results address differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status, and rights, but do not address root causes of inequalities in their lives.

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

The project will mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management objectives into a production/conservation landscape in the Honduran Caribbean Biological Corridor, and will deliver multiple global environmental benefits. Through Component 1, the project will enable a territorial governance framework that will allow mainstreaming environmental sustainability in the field through Component 2, including improved management for conservation and sustainable use of 295,398 hectares (ha) of terrestrial PA and the restoration of 30,000 ha of degraded ecologically-sensitive areas (e.g., wetlands and riparian forest) using LMTs and which will allow to enhance ecosystem connectivity between KBAs and PAs and providing habitat for biodiversity in the Honduran Caribbean Biological Corridor. Enhanced ecosystem connectivity will also contribute to the conservation of threatened species such as the jaguar (*Panthera onca*) and the Central American tapir (*Tapirus bairdii*); ecosystem restoration will also contribute to improving water quality and soil productivity. Through Componente 3, the project will reduce threat to biodiversity in the form of loss of habitat due to deforestation, and pollution from non-sustainable production practices of palm oil and cattle ranching; by project end there will be 31,432 ha of production landscapes under improved practices.

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: Vulnerable or marginalized groups, including indigenous people (Garífuna and Tolupán), might not be involved in project implementation supportive of, or benefitting from project activities. FPIC has not yet been applied. (Principle 1: q2, q4, q6; Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6)	I = 4 P =3	**High**	The project will involve small farmers and indigenous peoples engaged in palm oil, beef/milk production, agroforestry, and basic grains (maize and beans) production in the target landscape. Regarding FPIC, representatives of the Garífuna have expressed that they may not participate in the project in the absence of a national FPIC law. Representatives of the Tolupanes have expressed their interest in participation even though there is no national FPIC law. These views should be further explored during project inception.	As the project is High risk with potential downstream impacts and upstream impacts in Components 1, 2, and 3; an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) is required for the field-level activities and an Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) is required for the policy-level activities. The ESIA will inform the development of the required Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), and the SESA will be the means through which that particular Outcome is delivered. During the PPG, this screening (SESP) was revised based on further assessments and on information/details gathered in the course of the development of the project. Based on that updated screening, an ESMF was written, and to ensure the preparation of the ESIA and ESMP during the project's implementation. In addition, during the PPG phase of the project, a preliminary analysis was made of indigenous people's participation in the production of palm oil, beef/milk production, agroforestry, and basic grains (maize and beans) in the prioritized landscape within the Honduran Caribbean Biological Corridor. A comprehensive analysis will be carried out during the initial phase of project implementation , per the ESMF and IPPF.. FPIC was determined to be a requirement, and consultations will be conducted during project implementation to obtain consent from specific rights holders, as appropriate and in accordance with the requirements of Standard 6. FPIC will be obtained, following the steps outlined in the ESMF and the IPPF.. The following were prepared during the PPG to meet SES requirements: • ESMF • Stakeholder analysis and Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan • IPPF • Gender analysis and Gender Action Plan

Risk 2: Field activities related to palm oil and beef/milk production, agroforestry, and basic grains (maize and beans) production could inadvertently support child labor and other violations of international labor standards. (Principle 1: q1; Standard 3: 3.8)	I = 5 P = 2	**High**	Although Honduras made an important advancement in efforts to eliminate child labor, children in Honduras are still engaged in child labor, including in agriculture.	Per the ESMF, this risk, along with all others, will be fully assessed during the ESIA (and as part of the SESA if determined necessary). The required measures to avoid supporting child labour, directly or indirectly, will be identified and implemented via that implementation-stage work.
Risk 3: The project could restrict the access of small palm oil, cattle, and basic grains farmers to natural resources (land and water) within PAs/KBAs due to increased enforcement of landscape protections and new approaches to land management, potentially causing economic displacement. (Principle 1, q3; Standard 1, q1.3, Standard 5, q5.2, q5.4, and Standard 6, q6.3)	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**	Some small palm oil cattle, and basic grains farmers may be conducting production activities within PAs/KBAs and access to these areas, or other ecologically sensitive areas may be limited; however, no physical displacement is anticipated.	During the development of the project, consultations were held with small palm oil, cattle, and basic grains farmers and preliminary restrictive measures were identified jointly with farmers and PA/environmental authorities. During the initial phase of project implementation, management measures will be developed through a more complete and meaningful consultation process, including consultation to achieve FPIC. The risk is covered within the ESMF and further assess during the ESIA. A Livelihood Action Plan will be included in the ESMP as needed. In addition to the mandatory Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP).
Risk 4: Existing conflicts related to land use and/or ownership could be exacerbated or reignited by project activities (Principle 1, q8; Standard 5, q5.4, and Standard 6, q6.3)	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**	Land tenure in Honduras is often insecure due to unreliable cadastral and legal information, weak inter-institutional coordination, and inadequate conflict resolution mechanisms. Rural areas faced the most significant challenges.	During design of the project activities were defined through a participatory process to enhance the existing land tenure interinstitutional accreditation system (e.g., collective and private land titles [including indigenous and afro-Honduran peoples], long-term government or private lease-holds) to reduce this risk. This will facilitate territorial planning, the regularization of land tenure, access to financing to support sustainable production and restoration of degraded lands, conflict resolution related to land tenure, the development of protocols on corridors and PAs with indigenous peoples participation; and the improvement of land tenure definition processes for six prioritized PAs. This risk has been covered in the ESMF and the IPPF. Accordingly, it will be evaluated in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP and IPP as determined necessary. The upstream aspect of this risk will be covered by the SESA.

Risk 5: Local governments (municipalities) and cooperatives or producers' associations (e.g., Associations of Ranchers and Farmers of Atlántida [AGAA]) might not have the capacity to implement project activities successfully. (Principle 1: q5)	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**	Currently there is weak implementation of national policies at the municipal and community levels due to capacity limitations. This results in inadequate land and other natural resources governance, and weak enforcement of agricultural and environmental regulations.	The project design through Component 1 includes several outputs related to strengthening capacity of the public sector, the private sector, and civil society to manage PAs and biological corridors. During the PPG, a capacity analysis was carried out using the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard with several of the partner institutions including five municipalities within the project landscape as well as producer associations (AGAA). This analysis identified weaknesses and proposed actions to strengthen the capacity of these stakeholders for the successful implementation of project activities. This risk will be further examined in the course of the ESIA and measures will be included in the ESMP as determined necessary.
Risk 6: The proposed project may have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls, including women farmers (Principle 2 Gender, q2 and q4)	I = 3 P = 2	**Moderate**	Due high levels of poverty in Honduras (60.9 percent of he population), particularly in rural areas, women and girls may suffer the most marginalization and deterioration of their living conditions.	This risk was assessed as part of the gender analysis for the target landscape, and which includes sex desegregated data. This risk will be managed through the Gender Action Plan that was developed during the final project formulation, and which includes specific activities (and budget) to ensure gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, and gender-based indicators. This risk will be further examined in the course of the ESIA and measures will be included in the ESMP as determined necessary (or in an updated GAP). The upstream aspect of this risk will be covered by the SESA
Risk 7: Poorly designed or executed project activities could damage critical or sensitive habitats, including within and adjacent to protected areas and KBAs and through the introduction of invasive alien species (IAS) during restoration activities. (Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)	I = 5 P = 3	**High**	The project targets to restore 30,000 ha of degraded ecosystem between selected protected areas and KBAs to build ecosystem connectivity. There are risks of introducing IAS if the restoration plans for selected areas are not properly formulated.	The project design includes activities to minimize this risk, particularly through Component 2, including reference to the fact that the restoration actions will mostly use native species after analyzing the capacity of the existing nurseries in the project landscape to provide the necessary native vegetative material for to implement the restoration actions. Besides native species, timber and fruit species that are not considered invasive will also be produced as part of agroforestry systems. This risk will be further examined in the course of the ESIA and included in the ESMP and SESA as determined necessary.

Risk 8: Policy changes could have unintended negative social and/or environmental impacts if poorly designed or executed (upstream impacts). (Standard 1: 1.11)	I = 3 P =3	**Moderate**	The project will develop a regulation to clarity activities related to agroforestry systems and their contribution to biodiversity conservation and to enhance connectivity between PAs and production landscapes. It will also allow drafting emergency decrees /PCMs to regulate commercial agreements between producers and agreements related to payment for environmental services (PES)	The development of a National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF) regulation regarding agroforestry systems will be done through a participatory process that includes inter-institutional working groups to reduce this risk. The need to develop PCMs will be determined based a feasibility assessment of the PES schemes as an incentive mechanism to be user by the project and that will be conducted during project implementation. In addition, this risk will be managed in the course of the SESA, per the ESMF.
Risk 9: Project activities and outcomes will be vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change. (Standard 2: 2.2; Standard 3: 3.5)	I = 3 P =3	**Moderate**	The project area is susceptible to hurricanes, tropical storms, landslides, and drought	The project will rely on the National Risk Management System (SINAGER) to provide timely information to reduce risks associated to natural disasters. In addition, this risk will be managed through the project's system to monitor of project's environmental benefits, which includes the use of tools such as the Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model (GLEAM) and the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) that will allow determining changes in carbon stocks. Also, the project will coordinate actions with the ICF National Forest Monitoring Unit to ensure the flow of information and establish measurement mechanisms, including those relate to climate change. In addition, management plans for PAs to be developed by the project, will include mechanisms to manage climate change. This risk will be further examined in the course of the ESIA and included in the ESMP as determined necessary, and considering climate projections for the project landscape developed by institutions such as IHCIT and UNAH.
Risk 10: Workers in palm oil and beef/dairy production who are supported by the project might be exposed to hazards common to these activities, including exposure to chemical inputs (pesticides, fertilizers) that might be subject to international bans. (Standard 3: 3.7; Standard 7: 7.3, 7.4)	I = 3 P = 2	**Moderate**	The use of chemical inputs (pesticides, fertilizers) is common practice in agricultural production in the prioritized landscape of the Northern Honduras Corridor.	The final design of the project includes training activities for agricultural producers and cattle ranchers on the application of Best Agricultural Practices (BAPs) on farms. As part of BAPs, farmers will be trained to appropriately equip themselves against exposure of hazardous materials. Additionally, BAPs will prescribe appropriate types and doses of agrochemicals that are not internationally banned or pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health. This risk will be

Risk 11: The release of non-hazardous and potentially hazardous pollutants and the significant consumption of water could result from project support to agriculture ad and cattle ranching production practices. (Standard 7: 7.1, 7.2, 7.5)	I = 2 P = 3	**Moderate**	Palm oil and beef/dairy production may generate wastes and may use large volumes of water is not properly managed and under drought conditions.	further assessed in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP as determined necessary. Issues related to overuse of water and the potential release of non-hazardous and hazardous pollutants into the environment from food production systems will be assessed in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP as determined necessary.
Risk 12: The proposed project may result in actions that would potentially adversely impact ceremonial sites or traditional cultural practices. (Standard 4: 4.1; Standard 6: 6.9)	I = 3 P = 2	**Moderate**	There may be ceremonial sites in the project area.	This risk was updated during the project design phase as a result of preliminary consultations with indigenous peoples, which were cut short due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As part of the mitigation measures during the project implementation phase, this risk will be considered as part of the FPIC to minimize, if not avoid, activities in these places or in their vicinity; this risk will be evaluated in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP and IPP as determined necessary.
Risk 13: Sub-projects supported by the project (e.g. low-value grants under output 2.1.2) cannot be screened for environmental/social risks at this stage (CEO ER) because they will be designed during project implementation. (Principles and Standards TBD; possibly including Standard 6: 6.5)	I = 4 P = 2	**Moderate**		Procedures for screening and managing the potential risks associated with these activities have been included in the ESMF.
Risk 14. Representatives of the Garífuna indigenous people have expressed that they may not participate in the project in the absence of a national FPIC law Standard 6: 6.4	I = 2 P = 4	**Moderate**	A national FPIC law has been under discussion; however, there is no guarantee the law will be approved during the life of the project, and the project does not include activities to promote such law.	To mitigate this risk, the project team and MiAmbiente+ will continue explaining to the Garífuna during the initial phase of the project, that FPIC is required for the implementation of activities that are agreed to with their participation and according to UNDP SES requirements, in particular with Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples. In case FPIC is not granted, the project will be implemented without the participation of the Garífuna and outside their lands. The ESMF/IPPF includes activities to conduct consultation and achieve FPIC. This risk will be evaluated in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP and IPP as determined necessary
Risk 15. Project activities may result in exposure to of staff and stakeholders to COVID-19. (Standard 3: 3.6)	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**	The COVID-19 pandemic may still not be under control by the time the project is implemented	To mitigate this risk and taking into account the government regulations, meetings with partners (e.g., Project Board) at the central level will be held through virtual platforms. If it is not possible to work in the field, activities will be rescheduled and carried out remotely, as feasible (telephone communications, forums, online/Website, network exchanges, etc.). The planned activities will be evaluated quarterly with

				the project partners; adaptive management will be used, as needed. In addition UNDP corporate tools for COVID-19 risk management, including UNDP's response offer on green recovery will be applied. Also, GEF Guidelines regarding Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics have been considered. This risk will be evaluated in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP and IPP as determined necessary
Risk 16. PA co-managers may request support from local police and the army to control illegal activities such as timber extraction and the safety of communities and/or individuals	I = 4 P = 1	**Moderate**	All six PAs participating in the project are under co-managers with NGOs or CSOs, which must rely on local police or the army to control illicit activities within the PAs.	To mitigate this risk, monitoring and control will be achieved with the participation of co-managers, members of local community, and local police and the army when needed. PA co-managers on SES/social and environmental safeguards, and l in the preparation, implementation, monitoring of specific social and environmental management plans/measures, and legal framework of indigenous peoples' rights. This risk will be evaluated in the course of the ESIA, and included in the ESMP and IPP as determined necessary

	Select one (see SESP for guidance)		**Comments**
	Low Risk	☐	
	Moderate Risk	☐	
	High Risk	**X**	**The project is considered of high risk at this stage (CEO Endorsement Request). FPIC has not yet been applied and stakeholder engagement process at the local level has not be completed in great part due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, project field activities related to palm oil and beef/milk production, agroforestry, and basic grains production could inadvertently support child labor and other violations of international labor standards. Finally, poorly designed or executed project activities could damage critical or sensitive habitats, including within and adjacent to protected areas and KBAs and through the introduction of invasive alien species (IAS) during restoration activities**

	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
	Check all that apply		**Comments**
	Principle 1: Human Rights	**X**	See comment on risk 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
	Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	**X**	See comment on risk 6.

	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management	**X**	See comment on risks 7 and 8.
	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		See comment on risk 9.
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	**X**	See comment on risks 10.
	4. Cultural Heritage	**X**	See comment on risk 12.
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	**X**	See comment on risk 3.
	6. Indigenous Peoples	**X**	See comment on risk 1.
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	**X**	See comment on risk 11.

Final Sign Off

Signature	*Date*	*Description*
QA Assessor Astrid Mejia, Program Specialist	TBD 02-Sep-2021	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 Rose Diegues, Deputy Resident Representative	TBD 02-Sep-2021	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 Rose Diegues, Deputy Resident Representative	TBD 02-Sep-2021	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?	Yes
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]	Yes
3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	Yes
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?	Yes
6. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	Yes
7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	Yes
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?	Yes

[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.

	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	
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes*	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)	Yes
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	Yes
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	Yes
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction*	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities, which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? *For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.*	Yes
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		

2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant[2] greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	Yes
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding*	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	Yes
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	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)?	Yes
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)?	Yes

[2] In regards to CO_2, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources).

	(Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	Yes
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[3]	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	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?	Yes
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?	Yes
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

[3] Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

6.9	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?	Yes
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	Yes
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*	Yes
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	Yes
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	Yes

DocuSign

Certificate Of Completion

Envelope Id: 7AF4385077E24935B5A602B4C5D83876
Status: Completed
Subject: Please DocuSign: PIMS 6295 SESP RECOVER(1).docx
Source Envelope:
Document Pages: 16
Signatures: 3
Certificate Pages: 2
Initials: 0
AutoNav: Enabled
EnvelopeId Stamping: Enabled
Time Zone: (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Envelope Originator:
Ricardo Enrique Elvir Lainez
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
ricardo.elvir@undp.org
IP Address: 138.94.122.140

Record Tracking

Status: Original
9/2/2021 7:59:06 AM
Holder: Ricardo Enrique Elvir Lainez
ricardo.elvir@undp.org
Location: DocuSign

Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp
Astrid Mejia astrid.mejia@undp.org Coordinadora UDSR UNDP Headquarters Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	 Signature Adoption: Drawn on Device Using IP Address: 186.32.239.19	Sent: 9/2/2021 8:02:41 AM Resent: 9/2/2021 8:30:13 AM Viewed: 9/2/2021 8:22:38 AM Signed: 9/2/2021 8:33:08 AM
Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure: Not Offered via DocuSign		
Rose Diegues rose.diegues@undp.org Deputy Resident Representative UNDP Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	 Signature Adoption: Uploaded Signature Image Using IP Address: 181.115.60.1	Sent: 9/2/2021 8:33:09 AM Viewed: 9/2/2021 11:55:37 AM Signed: 9/2/2021 11:55:43 AM
Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure: Not Offered via DocuSign		

In Person Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp

Editor Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Agent Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Intermediary Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Certified Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events	Status	Timestamp

Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	9/2/2021 8:02:41 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	9/2/2021 11:55:37 AM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	9/2/2021 11:55:43 AM

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Completed	Security Checked	9/2/2021 11:55:43 AM

Payment Events	Status	Timestamps