## Annex 3: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project Title
 | Promotion of sustainable food systems and improved ecosystems services in Northern Kazakhstan Landscape |
| 1. Project Number
 | PIMS 6396 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country)
 | Kazakhstan |

**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***  |
| This GEF-funded project concentrates on the ecosystems of Northern Kazakhstan Landscape and it has been developed in full compliance with a human-rights based approach to development. In particular, the project upholds the following principles described as follows:* Accountability and the rule of law: the project will follow all standard UNDP policies on monitoring, evaluation, audits, and transparency in project implementation. The legal context of the project is defined by the CPAP signed by the Government and UNDP, which is incorporated by reference and constitutes a Project Document as referred to in the SBAA, and all CPAP provisions apply to this document.
* Participation and inclusion: At the national, oblast, rayon, and rural okrug levels, the project will engage multiple and diverse institutions, organizations and stakeholder groups. Their current and expected roles are summarized in the respective section of the Project Document and in the comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the project.
* Equality and non-discrimination: In designing and carrying out project activities, the project does not discriminate on the grounds of race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other. UNDP has ensured the meaningful, effective and informed participation of stakeholders in the formulation of the project, and will continue to do so in implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
 |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project will be fully compliant with gender mainstreaming requirements of both the GEF and UNDP. During the project development phase, a detailed gender analysis has been conducted. Stemming from the gender analysis specific to the proposed areas of interventions, it has been identified that the project scores as GEN2 per the ATLAS Gender Marker, meaning that the project has gender equality as a significant objective.The most critical findings that are relevant to the project design and will implement the project Gender Strategy and Action Plan are: 1) The female population makes up half of the total population of the pilot regions, where agriculture is the key production sector, including crop and livestock farming; 2) Women continue to occupy lower positions than men on the labor market of Kazakhstan; the levels of their professional qualifications and wages are lower; professional and industry segregation is high; 3) Women, often socially vulnerable, are more likely to be a part of informal employment and experience an inherent lack of decent involvement in the social protection system and the pension scheme in particular; 4) Women's limited access to financial resources for entrepreneurship, especially in rural areas, forces them to start small businesses, mainly in the informal sector of the economy, which brings low income.All project activities will be gender-sensitive and the principles of gender equality will be mainstreamed into the project intervention strategy. The key partner in this cross-cutting domain will be the Agrarian Union of Women of Kazakhstan, which will be involved in planning and implementing extension activities both in Output 2.5 and Outputs 4.1 - 4.3, as well as in monitoring and evaluating the interim and final outcomes of the Project. In the first year of the Project, a gender-sensitive assessment of national conditions and stakeholder needs will be carried out. The project, including demonstration/pilot projects, will enhance the capacity of female farmers and their associations in sustainable farming and leadership development. The project will create conditions for women to participate in decision-making processes on integrated land use planning at target rural okrugs.The following activities are recommended to mainstream gender into the project:1. Regularly collect all the relevant data on project participants, beneficiaries, etc. with breakdown by sex;
2. Ensure that project activities, including training and local decision-making mechanisms, have appropriate and adequate gender representation. Specifically, to suggest using 30/70 quota if other modalities are not functional;
3. Make sure that women and men are equally involved during consultations with local communities in project target regions;
4. Strengthen the focus on the management of protected areas, as well as on reducing risks of exposure of women (and children) to agricultural inputs potentially harmful to human health;
5. Engage men and women equally in decision-making regarding the project activities, including through involvement of women’s organizations and associations, female experts, and inviting women to project consultative and decision-making bodies, along with coordinating and networking mechanisms and platforms; and
6. Facilitate creation of income opportunities, including through employment, for male and female agriculture professionals.
 |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| The project’s interventions, backed by Government commitments and regulations, will avoid the loss of ecosystem values, and organic soil carbon on an area of over 1.2 mln ha. This will be done through on-the ground interventions under Component II, and partnerships with local and international partners seeking to support sustainable supply chains in Northern Kazakhstan Landscape. Agricultural land restoration technologies will be tested for the benefit of environmental sustainability, management of high conservation value forests, and wetlands and lakes will be strengthened (Outcome 3). These interventions will be backed by improved agro-environmental subsidies designed to promote environmentally sustainable agriculture (Output 2.1), and aiming to ensure non-deterioration of the carrying capacity of soil and ecosystems on over 22 mln ha in the long run. The project will also contribute to generation of knowledge on green crop production (under Outcome 2).  |

**Part B. IIdentifying 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 customary people, might not be involved in project design and therefore not engaged in, supportive of, or benefitting from project activities. FPIC has not yet been applied.(Principle 1: q4, q6; Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6) | I = 3P =2 | **Moderate** | Project Outcome 2 envisages activities targeting primarily small holders, presupposing a switch to more sustainable agricultural patterns.  | This risk has been fully addressed during project design. The interests, roles, and engagement mechanisms of NKL landscape level stakeholders are reflected in the Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Analysis and Action Plan.The project will support farmer cooperatives as a mechanism for more influential participation of individual land-owners, providing a better reflection of individual concerns and opinions in the design, appraisal, implementation and monitoring of on-the-ground project activities. The community outreach tools have been proposed and will be tested through the implementation of the project Comprehensive Stakeholder Plan.  |
| Risk 2: Local governments (sub-national level) and community associations might not have the capacity to implement project activities successfully.(Principle 1: q5) | I = 4P = 3 | **Moderate** | Low capacities of small holders to achieve good harvests on land they own, while preserving soil qualities and ecosystem characteristics, is one of the key systemic challenges targeted by the project. There is also limited coordination among various stakeholders to address cross-sectoral issues. This will be addressed through Component I. | Under Outcome 2, the project will invest substantially in training farmers through the upgraded extension system on sustainable land management and crop production, using best national and international expertise that has proved successful, combined with on-farm support and consultations. A national experience exchange platform under Outcome 4 will also contribute to enhanced knowledge and skills of farmers about effective and sustainable approaches to crop production in the NKL region. The project will support ongoing work of the Inter-Ministerial Task Force that will address cross-sectoral issues related to sustainable land use, agricultural production and conservation of natural ecosystems in the NKL. Integrated land use planning exercises in the three selected rural okrugs will follow a comprehensive stakeholder engagement process as reflected in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. |
| Risk 3: Increased enforcement of landscape protections and new approaches to land management could change current access to resources, potentially leading to economic displacement and/or changes to property rights.(Principle 1: q3; Standard 1: 1.3; Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4) | I = 3P = 1 | **Low** | Enforcement issues are relevant primarily to the use of ecosystem resources (forests, lakes, wetlands) as targeted by Component III. Management of these resources, however, is centralized (i.e. managed by forestry entities, local governments or PAs, not communities), therefore the risk of economic displacement and changes to property rights is unlikely. Creation of a regional PA and ecological corridor under Outcome III, however, can potentially bring short-term negative impacts on livelihoods but overall positive benefits in the long run. Under Component II no change of land use patterns is envisaged. | The new PA under Outcome 3 will be fully established and gazetted through a comprehensive community-based stakeholder consultation process. Creation of the ecological corridor will not require withdrawal of lands of current land holders (e.g. farmers, hunting concessions). Interests, roles, engagement mechanisms of NKL landscape level stakeholders are reflected in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Gender Analysis and Action Plan. |
| Risk 4: Field- and policy-level activities related to the value chains of key commodities could inadvertently support child labour and other violations of international labour standards. (Principle 1: q1; Standard 3: 3.8) | I = 3P = 1 | **Low** | The risk is considered low as there might be child involvement in family farm work. Substantial child labor is not expected as the crops targeted by the project require mostly mechanized treatment. | To minimize this risk further, the project will conclude MoUs with proponents of demonstration projects under Outcome2 that will include compliance with UNDP’s social and environmental principles. Specifically, a strict standard for the exclusion of child labor and other labor violations. These standards will be further fully explained and disseminated to stakeholders as part of the project inception phase. |
| Risk 5: Existing conflicts related to land use and/or ownership could be exacerbated or reignited by project activities. (Principle 1: q8) | I = 4P = 3 | **Moderate** | While there are no conflicts as such among land-users, rather there may be a difference of perception on how best to manage land. The presence of this “difference of perception” often ungrounded from both economic and environmental sides, is one of the key systemic solutions targeted by the project.  | This risk is managed through the design of the project’s outputs and budget. On integrated land use planning (Outcome 1), a participatory approach will be used by the project to engage all relevant stakeholders at the rural district level and hear their voices and concerns so that resulting land use plans will present a balanced view of all stakeholders with due consideration of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation issues. Upon operationalizing a network of high-nature ecosystems (Outcome 3), including creation of a regional PA and eco-corridor, the project team will plan a participatory consultative process and public hearings at the design and pre-approval stages.  |
| Risk 6: Project activities and approaches might not fully incorporate or reflect views of women and girls, and ensure equitable opportunities for their involvement and benefit. (Principle 2: q2, q4) | I = 3P = 3 | **Moderate** | Kazakhstan has a strong focus on promotion of women. For land-based activities, it is important to note that women constitute a substantial part of small-holders; therefore, integrated land use planning (Outcome I), optimized use of croplands, pastures and rangelands (Outcome II) and landscape level biodiversity conservation (Outcome 3) would not be effective without engagement of women.  | This risk is assessed fully in the gender analysis completed during the PPG and managed through the Gender Action Plan. |
| Risk 7: Poorly designed or executed project activities could damage critical or sensitive habitats.(Principle 1: q5; Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6; Standard 7: 7.5) | I = 4P = 2 | **Moderate** | The project aims to introduce integrated land use planning and management on 230,000 ha; change agricultural patterns on 485,522 ha of croplands, livestock management patterns on 152,117 ha of pasture and grassland areas; and restore 5,000 ha of degraded birch-aspen woodland areas and 4,600 ha of wetland and lakes ecosystems. The above listed wide-scale project interventions could potentially affect wild species inhabiting neighboring or demonstration areas, especially given that the landscape is mosaic.  | The project will manage potential negative effects on biodiversity and ecosystems. To mitigate such effects, at every demonstration site, the project will start with an initial assessment of conservation risks and conservation values. The assessment will be aimed at revealing species and ecosystems of special conservation concern, areas of special importance for biodiversity (KBAs and local designations/nominations), hotspots, areas with high richness of species of concern, etc., and critically important ecosystem services and ecological processes at the pilot sites. Any project activity will be planned and implemented in a manner that excludes any damage to the identified populations and ecosystems and minimizes any risk to the critically important ecosystem services and ecological processes. Specifically, the habitats and ecosystems of special conservation concern will not be subjected to any actions that involve tillage, clear-cutting, irrigation, and other measures leading to habitat transformation. Herbicide treatment, use of fertilizers (including sludge) aside from arable land, significant changes in grazing pressure and grazing management, development of eco-tourism and hunting, and other non-fatal impacts on ecosystems will be accompanied by mitigating and compensating measures; the measures will be elaborated as a part of the demonstration project activities, explicitly planned, and fully implemented. Final assessment of every demonstration project will include a final assessment of conservation values to make sure the previously identified biodiversity is still secure and viable and has not been damaged by the project activities.The conservation status/well-being and indisturbance of valuable natural ecosystems and the viability of the populations of keystone species will be objects of the above-mentioned assessments of conservation risks and conservation values.The project will pay special attention to saving and restoring high nature value grassland ecosystems at the demonstration sites. Indisturbance and safety of steppe grassland and shrubland ecosystems (assessed through state of vegetation, absence of signs of disturbances, and conservation status) and population viability of a few steppe animal species (assessed through dynamics of population number/abundance and reproduction success for he selected species) will serve as indicators of the success of every demonstration project. Support high nature value forest maintenance and management will be rendered under project Outcome 3. The state of patchy forest ecosystems and wetlands will serve both as the indicator of the project demonstration activities, and will provide the background for assessments of conservation values and conservation risks, and relevant adaptive management measures for Output 3.2.  |
| 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 = 3P = 2 | **Moderate** | There are number of policy changes that will be initiated through this project focusing on integrated landscape planning (Component I), promotion of agro-environmental incentives (Component II) and landscape level approach to biodiversity conservation (Component III). The presence of models, Kazakhstan’s own previous experience under former and ongoing GEF-funded projects on wetland conservation, desert & semi-desert PAs, SLM & agro-incentives, and forest ecosystems point to a low likelihood of this risk. | Under project Component I, the SESA approach will be integrated into the design of the integrated land use plans as deemed appropriate. |
| Risk 9: Project activities and outcomes will be vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change. (Standard 2: 2.2; Standard 3: 3.5) | I = 3P = 4 | **Moderate** | Vulnerability of the current crop production systems to climate risks is one of the challenges that the project is aiming to address. | Attention to the current and potential impacts of climate change will be built in to all aspects of the project. This will be carefully factored in through the integrated landscape planning and management (Component I) and on-the-ground demonstration activities (Component II). As such, the project will upgrade agromet hardware and equipment of the KazHydroMet network in the key crop producing regions of NKL to ensure that climate risks are duly reflected, and potential future climate impacts are taken into consideration in integrated land use planning and decision-making in target rural okrugs. The project will also identify potential gaps in the existing system of PAs in the Kokshetau Uplands in order to effectively conserve biodiversity, while considering the potential for ecosystem change and ecological shifts due to climate change impacts. The potential climate impact on high conservation value forests in the NKL region will also be assessed and duly reflected in management plans of relevant institutions. The project’s work to establish sustainable crop and livestock systems will also be grounded in the best available and most recent climate science relevant for this region of the country. Demonstration projects under Outcome II are designed in view of potential climate risks for rainfed agriculture including the use of various soil moisture saving/increasing technologies, green manure, crop rotation, etc. |
| Risk 10: Workers in commodity supply chains (including smallholder producers) might be exposed to hazards common to those sectors, including exposure to chemicals (pesticides, fertilizers) that might be subject to international bans. (Standard 3: 3.7; Standard 7: 7.3, 7.4)  | I = 2P = 3 | **Moderate** | Many farms in the NKL region use pesticides and mineral fertilizers for crop production thus posing a risk of exposure to chemical. Other than that, the project promotes biological methods of weed control (i.e. moving away from herbicides), the use of alternative energy sources at distant rangelands, and production and use of organic fertilizers.  | Under Outcome 2, the project focuses on minimizing the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers at demonstration sites and switching to organic fertilizers, green manure, crop rotation, biological weed and pest control measures, etc. on farm fields as agreed to during the design of demonstration projects. At the start of the project, the project team will reconfirm proposed environmentally safe demonstration activities, and will ensure through regular monitoring visits, that farmers comply with the requirements. Several farms growing crops organically will participate in the project and their experience will be promoted through farmer exchange visits in the NKL region. Also, as part of the project’s work on improving the regional extension system, training programs will be designed and delivered regarding international standards relevant to use of chemicals in crop production and environmentally safe crop protection measures. |
| Risk 11: The release of non-hazardous and potentially hazardous pollutants; the generation of both types of waste; and the significant consumption of water could result from project support in target districts.(Standard 1, q.1.8, Standard 7: 7.1, 7.2, 7.5) | I = 2P = 3 | **Moderate** | The release of pollutants from livestock systems might only be connected to milk processing facilities, while in crop production it might be connected to machinery fumes during seasonal field work and processing of crop residues for fiber production.  | This risk will be managed through the design of activities to ensure full compliance with environmental standards.  |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?**  |
| **Select one (see** [**SESP**](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | **Comments** |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **X** |  |
| ***High Risk*** | **☐** |  |
|  | **QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?** |  |
| Check all that apply | **Comments** |
| ***Principle 1: Human Rights*** | **X** |  |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **X** |  |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | **X** |  |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | **X** |  |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | **X** |  |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **☐** |  |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **X** |  |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | NA | There are no indigenous peoples or minority groups in the targeted landscape. |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **X** |  |

**Final Sign Off**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor |  | UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted. |
| QA Approver |  | UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD)**,** Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC. |
| PAC Chair |  | UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases, PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.  |

**SESP** **Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| **Principles 1: Human Rights** | **Answer (Yes/No)** |
| 1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | No |
| 2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? [[1]](#footnote-1)  | No |
| 3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | No |
| 4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | YES |
| 5. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | 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? | No |
| **Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| 1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?  | No |
| 2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | YES |
| 3. Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment? | No |
| 4. Would the Project potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being* | YES |
| **Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| 1.1 Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?*For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | No |
| 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? | YES |
| 1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?  | No |
| 1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | Yes |
| 1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | Yes |
| 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]](#footnote-2) greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?  | No |
| 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?  | YES |
| 2.3 Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)?*For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions** |  |
| 3.1 Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | No |
| 3.2 Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | No |
| 3.3 Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)? | No |
| 3.4 Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure) | No |
| 3.5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions? | YES |
| 3.6 Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)? | No |
| 3.7 Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning? | 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)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | No |
| 4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes? | No |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| 5.1 Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | No |
| 5.2 Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?  | YES |
| 5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[[3]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 5.4 Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?  | YES |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| 6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | No |
| 6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | NO |
| 6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? *If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.* | No |
| 6.4 Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | NA |
| 6.5 Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | NA |
| 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? | NA |
| 6.7 Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | NA |
| 6.8 Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | NA |
| 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? | NA |
| **Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| 7.1 Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or [transboundary impacts](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)?  | 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*  | No |
| 7.4 Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?  | No |

1. Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In regards to CO2, ‘significant emissions’ corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)