

Annex [2]. Social and Environmental Screening Template

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.]

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Ensuring Sustainability and Resilience (ENSURE) of Green Landscapes in Mongolia
2. Project Number	5784
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Mongolia

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 mainstream the human rights based approach by ensuring full participation of local level stakeholders, including civil society and elected representatives at appropriate levels. The project will achieve integration of human-rights based approaches through its Objective, which is *to enhance ecosystem services in multiple landscapes of the Sayan and Khangai mountains and southern Gobi by reducing rangeland and forest degradation and conserving biodiversity through sustainable livelihoods*. The project's main components are 1. Embedding systemic tools and capacity for enhancing ecosystem services through sustainable rangeland and forest management and biodiversity conservation, 2. Application of sustainable rangeland and forest management and biodiversity conservation to reduce land degradation/desertification and enhance ecosystem services, 3. Community livelihoods enhancement to restore and sustain biodiversity and ecosystem services.

During the PPG phase, a consultant with specific expertise in livelihoods, socio-economy and gender issues was hired as part of the multi-disciplinary PPG team. Consultation sessions and meetings (including two field visits to the project's demonstration landscapes) were undertaken to engage with all key stakeholders in order to fully understand the challenges, barriers and risks related to the project, and how these can be addressed through community-based natural resources management (CBNRM). As a result, the project will highly encourage the participation of local pasture user groups (PUG) and forest user groups (FUG) as grass-root institutions to mainstream the human rights based approach through community participation and empowerment of both local communities and local government to enhance ecosystem services through green and sustainable development. There are no indigenous peoples in the project area¹.

During the PPG phase various consultation meetings conducted to engage as many key stakeholders as possible, particularly at local level, in order to incorporate their perspectives in project activities, and reduce the risks of marginalizing any stakeholders. During these meeting and interventions it was revealed that in the demonstration landscapes, already more than 100 PUGs and FUGs are established, and most of them are under development in terms of institutions that are considered to be key users of natural resources. However, local government has not yet fully recognized their benefit to the rangeland and forest protection, due to inadequate and irregular collaboration among those key stakeholders. PUGs and FUGs need to have sufficient contractual arrangement with local government to ensure their contribution to green development.

Additionally, the participation of local communities in decision-making processes over natural resources management is inadequate. During PPG stage, *bag* governors noted the weak participation of local herders in developing annual pastureland planning. On the other hand herders have lack of interest to be part of the land planning workshop because their comments and opinions are not taken into consideration in the decision making processes. Therefore collaborative management among these 2 key stakeholders needs to be developed and increased through learning and doing, participatory planning and implementation. Further details are provided in the PPG Report on Socio-economic situation and in the Gender Analysis and Action Plan. Consultations during PPG strengthened and ensured the transparency and legitimacy of the proposed project activities, notwithstanding that during project implementation, activities should be adapted to ensure that the human rights of stakeholders are preserved and/or reinforced.

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

¹ In Mongolia, only the Tsaatan ethnic group, who live in the northern part of Mongolia, are considered as indigenous people. The ENSURE project area does not cover that part of the country.

The proposed project has been designed to take a proactive approach to mainstreaming gender equality into all project activities (project staffing, capacity development, workshops, best practice guidelines, livelihoods etc.), as already indicated in the PIF. During the PPG phase, the broad consultative process secured women's participation and input at all levels, with specific targeting and questioning to ensure that gender issues were adequately addressed. Consultation meetings and the field visits revealed that in the project demonstration landscapes gender disparities are apparent in the area of labor division (especially during natural disasters - extreme weather), decision-making over access to natural resources like pastureland and forest (particularly for female-headed herder households), and participation in the community activities. Even though the participation level of women is higher than men in different meetings organized by local government, it is still debatable if the voices raised by women are accounted equitably or not. Some local Pasture User Groups (PUGs) and Forest User Groups (FUGs) are led by women but there is no certain data collected on this matter nor on gender-disaggregated data.

During the PPG, a Gender Assessment was conducted and a Gender Action Plan was prepared. Therefore, gender equality was fully considered during the formulation of the project, and during implementation the project management will ensure the tracking of the key gender indicators set out in the Gender Action Plan, such as the balance of women participants in the capacity development and livelihood activities and the extent to which gender issues inform deliberations and recommendations. The project document makes specific reference to three GEF requirements for mainstreaming gender issues in projects:

- Gender mainstreaming and capacity building within GEF project staff to improve socio-economic understanding of gender issues: Gender awareness and capacity of the project PMU (Project Management Unit) staff (national and local, and also the appointed Community Facilitators) and consultants will be enhanced through induction and training conducted by a Gender Specialist hired during the first year of project implementation.
- A designated focal point for gender issues to support development, implementation, monitoring and strategy on gender mainstreaming internally and externally: The project Communication/Safeguards officer will act as Gender focal point. He/she will be designated with the overall goal to help the project to promote gender equality through effective and efficient implementation of the actions, and provide advice when needed. The project local coordinators will also have responsibilities for local gender mainstreaming.
- Working with experts in gender issues to utilize their expertise in developing and implementing GEF projects: With the early support of the gender specialist and gender focal points, the project will give special attention to ensure good participation by all people – men and women, rich and poor, young and old – and to bringing the most vulnerable people in the community into decision-making, including widows and female-headed herder households. The project manager along with the officers and consultants in charge of different Outputs should work closely with Communications/Safeguards officer (gender focal point) and Gender Specialist to develop gender-disaggregated data for the selected demonstration landscapes during the 1st year of the project implementation, as required in the Results Framework and Gender Action Plan.

The implementation of these requirements will be championed and monitored by the project-recruited Gender specialist and the project Gender Focal Points, with back-up from the UNDP-CO gender focal point, during project implementation. As a result, gender equality will be improved in environmental management, and women will be empowered to participate more fully in, influence and benefit from all project activities.

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

The overall objective of the project is “to enhance ecosystem services in multiple landscapes of the Sayan and Khangai mountains and southern Gobi by reducing rangeland and forest degradation and conserving biodiversity through sustainable livelihoods”. Thus, the overall impact on environmental sustainability is expected to be overwhelmingly positive and an important contribution to sustainable development in the project area.

Key actions conducted during the PPG include:

- i. Reviewed best practices and lessons learned from previous initiatives on sustainable rangeland and forest management, biodiversity conservation and CBNRM (with wide consultation at the PPG Inception workshop)
- ii. Incorporated successful approaches into planned activities in the consultant reports and the full project document.
- iii. Ensured wide consultation to ensure best outcomes for environmental sustainability at the project review / validation meeting.

Further details are provided in the Project Document and its annexes.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses).</i>	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			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)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>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.</i>
<p>Risk 1: Expansion of the network of protected areas (local, aimag and state level) could lead to access restrictions of grazing and to forests for PUGs and FUGs including customary tenure rights of pastoral herders</p> <p>Principle 1: Human Rights Standard 1.3: Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 5.4. Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Component 2, Output 1.3 proposes expansion of the network of protected areas (including locally protected areas) by 0.94 million ha in the target aimags. This risk in locally protected areas is considered to be Low, as there are unlikely to be significant restrictions on herders or FUGs. However, expansion may limit community rights of access to grazing and to forests in some zones of the strictly protected areas, including customary rights of nomadic herders to settle. The</p>	<p>During PPG, this risk was discussed with herders and local authorities, and the mechanisms adopted by government to mitigate impacts on related communities were assessed.</p> <p>Whilst herders can continue to graze in protected areas, according to the Land law there might be a risk that herders could not establish winter and spring camps within the protected area. However, this can be mitigated through agreement between the Protected Areas Administration, local government and the affected nomadic herders, including giving them the right to possess winter or spring camps outside the protected area. Further mitigation options could be developed via the project with support of community facilitators and other experts to design participatory</p>

<p>arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?</p> <p>Standard 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)?</p> <p>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Standard 2.4: 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?</p>			<p>risk is therefore considered as Moderate.</p>	<p>approaches for enhanced co-management of protected areas under the contractual agreements. This will be fully supported through initiatives under Component 3 to enhance herder livelihoods.</p> <p>The project will address this most important risk for the project proactively, through a specific process: a) complete the assessment of risk conducted during the PPG; b) compile the conclusions on the risk, and recommendations for mitigatory measures as a specific section of a Livelihoods Plan; c) the Livelihoods Plan will be submitted to the Project Board during Year 1 for consideration and approval; d) the mitigation measures will then be implemented and the M&E and Safeguards officer will monitor and regularly report on the risk; e) the mid-term and terminal evaluation consultants will be required to specifically review the procedures and achievements for mitigating this risk. A draft contents list for the Livelihoods Plan is provided as Attachment 2 to this SESP.</p> <p>Demonstrated mitigation of this particular project risk could have important benefits for up-scaling successful mitigation measures elsewhere in Mongolia, and the results will be documented and disseminated through the project, for potential incorporation into government policy.</p>
<p>Risk 2: Piloting of livestock headage fees or PES mechanisms could potentially impact the economic availability and equality of access to grazing resources for marginalized groups</p> <p>Principle 1: Human Rights Standard 1.3: Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The project aims to trial the use of livestock-headage based fees and PES mechanisms as a basis for reduction of livestock densities with the resulting income being fed back into improvements to ecosystem services. These fees as one type of PES mechanism would apply only to richer herders with the</p>	

<p>resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?</p>			<p>largest number of livestock. Recent consultations by FAO and the Centre for Policy Development (NGO) demonstrate that herders in Mongolia are encountering pressing problems from over-grazing and pastureland use and support such measures and the approval of a new Pastureland Law. The risk is considered to be Low.</p> <p>In its efforts to revise and seek approval of the Pastureland Law, and to pilot innovative fiscal mechanisms for reducing grazing pressure, the project will take great care to ensure that no vulnerable or marginalized groups are disadvantaged, and that fees as PES mechanisms are only applied to those who can afford them, and that there are no impacts on adjacent ecosystems through displacement of impacts.</p> <p>Indeed, the main result of such mechanisms are to reduce the inequality of benefits that richer herders receive from the utilization of common pastureland resources</p>	
<p>Risk 3: Women’s access to natural resources such as to pastureland could potentially be limited</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>This risk arises for the same reasons as described under Project Risk 1 (Expansion of</p>	<p>A gender assessment was completed during the PPG along with a gender action plan. The project will fully address this risk through implementation of its Gender</p>

<p>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Standard 2.4: 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?</p>			<p>protected areas), and Project risk 2 (Livestock headage fees) and could raise a particular risk for women-headed households.</p>	<p>Action Plan, ensuring that targeted attention is given to issues concerning women through all its activities, including through participatory planning using PRA tools prior to undertaking any activities that may lead to realization of this risk. In particular, the proposed Livelihoods Plan section on access restrictions (described under Risk 1), will specifically include mitigation measures for women.</p> <p>A key focus of the project is to address inequalities experienced by women, and this will be achieved by ensuring enhanced proportional participation of women in all project consultations, trainings and activities. Special measures will be included, such as small grants to facilitate women’s livelihoods developments and a special award for women who demonstrate particular leadership or innovation for green development measures.</p>
<p>Risk 4: Project activities will occur within/adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas posing potential risk to sensitive habitats and species</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 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?</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 4</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>All activities proposed within or adjacent to environmentally sensitive or protected areas have the specific objective of enhancing the ecosystem services and biodiversity of those areas through more sustainable rangeland and forest management, sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation. The risk is therefore Low.</p> <p>No potentially negative impacts were raised during the PPG discussions. During the project implementation phase, all efforts will be made to ensure that the risk remains Low and fully mitigated by working closely with local stakeholders,</p>	

			through participatory approaches. This will be supported through capacity development of PA staff and communities in co-management approaches to gain more support of local communities for PA management.	
<p>Risk 5: The project can generate a potential risk to the IUCN Red List “Vulnerable” musk deer as a result of the proposed translocation to re-establish a population in Bukhun Mountain demonstration landscape (Output 2.4).</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 1.4: Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?</p>	I=1 P=3	Low	<p>The latest surveys of musk deer by the Mongolian Biological Research Institute (2010). “Assessment of forest ungulates of Mongolia” reported a population of 950 in the project area. The species formerly occurred in Bukhun Mountain demonstration landscape.</p>	<p>The proposed translocation will only be undertaken following approval by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, following a detailed (GEF-financed) feasibility and design study, using the IUCN 2013 “Guidelines for Reintroductions and Other Conservation Translocations”</p> <p>https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2013-009.pdf . This will include development of detailed methodology, completion of surveys to confirm viability of source populations in the head of Orkhon river in Tsenkher soum which has a similar ecological condition, habitat suitability and rehabilitation in Bukhun Mountain, and community awareness and engagement to avoid disturbance at the relocation site.</p> <p>The overall impact is expected to be positive, resulting in a return of this iconic species to this part of its former range.</p>
<p>Risk 6: The project can generate a potential risk while restoring degraded saxaul and boreal forest, for example by inappropriate thinning of boreal forests or use of non-native species for re-afforestation</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability</p>	I = 1 P = 1	Low	<p>The project proposes measures to restore degraded saxaul and boreal forests including re-afforestation. Additionally, the project will support sustainable forest management by Forest User Groups, including sustainable use of boreal forests both for timber and for non-timber forest products.</p>	

<p>Standard 1.6: Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?</p>			<p>The issue was discussed thoroughly with forest experts and local related stakeholders. The risk is Low and can be mitigated through capacity development of FUGs and local Forest Units, and ensuring that any harvests are conducted within agreed forest management plans.</p> <p>Most forest restoration will be through natural regeneration. Only native tree species, typical of the area, will be used in any re-afforestation activities.</p>	
<p>Risk 7: The project can generate a potential risk from supporting the use and or cultivation of NTFPs for subsistence or commercial use (see Outputs 3.2 and 3.3)</p> <p>Standard 1.9: Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 4</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The project's "green development" approach includes combining both restoration and use of biological resources in the demonstration landscapes, in a way that benefits both conservation and livelihoods, including demonstration of ABS (Access and Benefit-Sharing) contracts between providers (local community) and users of genetic resources (businesses that are exploiting for economic benefit).</p>	<p>Project Activity 3.2.2 includes capacity development to local communities for enhancing the value chain for non-timber forest products that they are already collecting, such as berries, nuts and medicinal plants. The training will incorporate advice on sustainable harvesting, and local authorities will be fully engage to regulate harvesting through the contracts they have with pasture and forest user groups for resource use. The project will finance a specialist on biodiversity to ensure that harvests are sustainable.</p> <p>Project Activity 3.2.4 aims to facilitate development of business cases and support demonstration projects for commercial production and utilisation of genetic resources that support livelihoods and reduce threats to biodiversity (such as illegal or over-hunting and harvest). Potential projects include: a) small farm for red deer for medicinal use (velvet antlers) in Bukhun Mountain; b) cultivation of liquorice, red thumb and/or other rare plant species for use and restoration (eg in Zarman Gobi); c) tree nurseries for native tree species - particularly recommended for saxaul. None of these</p>

				<p>species are globally threatened according to the IUCN Red List, and projects will comply fully with local and national regulations.</p> <p>GEF funds will be used to support professional organisations to provide capacity building, feasibility and design studies, overseen by an independent biodiversity specialist to ensure no negative impacts. Seed grants and equipment (eg fencing and tools) will also be provided. Development of each project will be overseen local authorities and will require approval from them if it is to proceed.</p> <p>Improvement of rural livelihoods through the utilization of genetic resources under community management will incentivize locals to support the conservation of biodiversity. The overall outcome is expected to be positive and the impacts Low.</p>
<p>Risk 8: The outcomes of the proposed project are vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change, erosion, and extreme climatic conditions</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 2.2: Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 3.5: Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The Outcomes of the proposed project are certainly vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change, erosion and extreme climatic events due to the ongoing impacts being widely observed in Mongolia. These include temperature and precipitation changes, frequency of extreme events, erosion and melting of permafrost.</p>	<p>This impacts of climate change on landscapes, ecosystem services and livelihoods were raised by many stakeholders during the PPG project consultations, particularly at local level.</p> <p>All aspects of the project aim to reduce those impacts and vulnerabilities both for landscapes and for livelihoods through adaptation measures (eg restoring saxaul forest to stop desertification, more sustainable rangeland management) and through mitigation measures (reducing emissions from forest degradation), as well as water saving technologies. Diversification of livelihoods will also reduce the vulnerability of communities to individual impacts of climate change. The project will therefore enhance the resilience of landscapes and communities to the impacts of climate change.</p>
<p>Risk 9: The project raises a potential risk to communities from involvement</p>	<p>I = 2 P=3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Lisa to complete</p>	<p>Lisa to complete</p>

<p>in anti-poaching monitoring/surveillance activities</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 3.5: 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?</p>				
<p>Risk 10: Through development of aimag ecotourism plans and local support for ecotourism, the project may add to pressure on cultural and natural heritage</p> <p>Principle 3: Environmental sustainability Standard 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)</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Tourism and ecotourism is currently developing slowly and at a small scale in a sporadic and uncoordinated way in the target aimags, causing problems with waste disposal etc.. At the request of the aimag governors, the project will assist at least one aimag (and potentially soum level) local authorities to improve their planning for tourism and ecotourism, to establish well-managed destinations, and to set standards for management of natural and cultural heritage use. It will also assist herders in demonstration landscapes to harness opportunities for ecotourism eg through homestays and handicrafts production. The results will therefore be positive and of Low risk</p> <p>The ecotourism plans will fully mainstream green development</p>	

		<p>approaches and sustainability, and will ensure that local government has a strategic framework for safeguarding both cultural and natural heritage, particularly the traditional nomadic lifestyles.</p> <p>No potentially negative impacts were raised during the PPG discussions. Rather, the various meetings with local stakeholders including representatives of herders revealed that eco-tourism plays an important role for local economic development as well as for promoting traditional nomadic lifestyles to keep the cultural heritage to the next generation. The events on traditional games showing nomadic culture can be supported by locals including government and herder communities as part of developing ecotourism which could also support the livelihood diversification.</p>	
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?		
	Select one (see SESP for guidance)		Comments
	<i>Low Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A total of 10 risks have been identified. Six have been assessed as Low risk, and three have been assessed as Moderate Risk. The moderate risks are:

		<p>Risk 1: Expansion of the network of protected areas (local, aimag and state level) could lead to access restrictions of grazing and to forests for PUGs and FUGs including customary tenure rights of pastoral herders.</p> <p>Risk 3: Women’s access to natural resources such as to pastureland and forests could potentially be limited</p> <p>Risk 8: The outcomes of the proposed project are vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change, erosion, and extreme climatic conditions.</p> <p>Risk 9: The project raises a potential risk to communities from involvement in anti-poaching monitoring/surveillance activities</p> <p>The overall project risk categorization is therefore Moderate. The project’s safeguard measures outlined above for each risk will be implemented under supervision of the M&E and Safeguards Officer to ensure that the risks are fully mitigated.</p> <p>Risks 1 and 3 are closely linked, and will receive special attention in a Livelihoods Plan to be prepared during Year 1 for submission to the Project Board for approval. Risk 3 is also mitigated through the preparation and implementation of the project mainstreaming plan. This plan will be implemented in all capacity building, livelihoods and other activities to ensure that institutions and individuals optimize gender outcomes</p> <p>The four risks rated as Low have been considered in the design of the project.</p> <p>Defined M&E and adaptive management procedures will be applied during project implementation. Key measures will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Livelihoods plan • All plans, tools and measures incorporate climate change adaptation considerations • Regular review of the SESP risks and their mitigation measures. <p>The independent Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation will be tasked to assess whether these mitigation measures have been met. This will be explicitly stated in the Terms of Reference of these consultancies.</p>
	High Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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	<p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p>Risk 1. Expansion of the network of protected areas (local, aimag and state level) could lead to access restrictions of grazing and to forests for PUGs and FUGs including customary tenure rights of pastoral herders.</p> <p>This risk will be mitigated through a targeted Livelihoods Plan prepared during Year 1. No project activities that could cause this risk to be triggered will commence until this Plan has been approved by the Project Board</p>
	Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	<p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p>Risk 3: Women's access to natural resources such as to pastureland and forests could potentially be limited</p> <p>The mitigation measures for this risk are incorporated in the Gender Action Plan and will be further specified in the proposed Livelihoods Plan to be completed in Year 1. No project activities that could cause this risk to be triggered will commence until the Livelihoods Plan is approved by the Project Board</p>
	Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:	<input type="checkbox"/>

	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management		
	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	x	<p>Risk 8: The outcomes of the proposed project are vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change, erosion, and extreme climatic conditions</p> <p>The risk is Moderate due to the severity of climate change issues. The results of the project are all expected to minimize this risk and to increase the resilience of landscapes and livelihoods to climate change. Appropriate adaptation measures have been identified and built into the project activities</p>
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	x	<p>Risk 9: The project raises a potential risk to communities from involvement in anti-poaching monitoring/surveillance activities</p> <p>Lisa to complete</p>
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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? ²	No
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?	No
5.	Are there measures or mechanisms in place to respond to local community grievances?	No
6.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
7.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
8.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
9.	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?	No
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

² 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.

	<i>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</i>	
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	<p>Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?</p> <p><i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i></p>	No
1.2	<p>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?</p>	Yes
1.3	<p>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)</p>	No
1.4	<p>Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?</p>	Yes
1.5	<p>Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?</p>	No
1.6	<p>Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?</p>	Yes
1.7	<p>Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?</p>	No
1.8	<p>Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?</p> <p><i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i></p>	No
1.9	<p>Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)</p>	Yes
1.10	<p>Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?</p>	No
1.11	<p>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?</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		

2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ³ 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)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	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)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	Yes
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		

³ 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.]

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? ⁴	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 rights, lands and territories of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether Indigenous Peoples possess the legal titles to such areas)?	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?	No
6.4	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.5	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.6	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.7	Would the Project potentially affect the traditional livelihoods, physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
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?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No

⁴ 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.

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? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	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

SESP Attachment 2. Draft contents list for the Livelihoods Plan

The Livelihood Plan will be developed and completed in PY1 thoroughly defining the mitigation measures for Risks 1 3 and 2 identified in the SESP:

Risk 1: Expansion of the network of protected areas (local, aimag and state level) could lead to access restrictions of grazing and to forests for PUGs and FUGs including customary tenure rights of pastoral herders.

Risk 3: Women’s access to natural resources such as to pastureland could potentially be limited (by Risk 1)

Risk 2: Piloting of livestock headage fees or PES mechanisms could potentially impact the economic availability and equality of access to grazing resources for marginalized groups

Particularly, this plan will complete the assessment conducted during PPG and describe the measures to ensure mitigation of any risks to the capacity, production levels, and standards of living of herder communities (PUGs and FUGs) potentially restricted from access to grazing land both due to expansion of protected areas or due to piloting of livestock headage fees or PES mechanisms.

Also the livelihood plan should set out the mechanisms to review the business models for any new livelihoods initiatives that the project might promote to communities to help mitigate the risk that the project promotes non-viable businesses.

A. List of content of the Livelihoods Plan

1. Introduction

- Brief description of the project and aims of the report
- Description of the project Outputs and Activities that contain potential risks on restrictions of grazing and to forests for PUGs and FUGs, particularly to women
- Description of the project Outputs and Activities that contain potential risks on promoting non-viable businesses to communities, especially to vulnerable group of people

2. Socioeconomic Surveys

- Results of the census, assets inventories, natural resource assessments, and socioeconomic surveys
- People and communities potentially restricted from grazing including women and vulnerable group of people
- Local businesses that might be not practical or feasible to the local communities

3. Legal Framework

- All relevant international, national, local, and customary laws that apply to restriction activities, with particular attention to laws and customs relating to legitimate tenure rights
- Project-specific mechanisms to address conflicts

4. Restriction of grazing land-related Property

- How affected people whose livelihoods are land and grassland-based have been involved in a participatory process to identify lands they can access, including lands with productive potential, locational advantages,
- Relevant mechanisms to allow restricted herders or communities to have official land titling in somewhere out of PA, if that is the solution. Indicate to whom titles and use rights will be allocated, including by gender.

6. Mitigation measures / Income restoration

- Measures providing sufficient opportunity for those whose grazing area are restricted.
- Potential arrangements under agreement between the Protected Areas Administration, local government and the affected nomadic herders
- Measures supported by community facilitators and other experts to design participatory approaches for enhanced co-management of protected areas under the contractual agreements.
- Special assistance to be provided to vulnerable groups, including women headed households, poor, elderly, disabled people
- Measures providing adequate opportunity for those affected by the implementation of mechanisms such as livestock headage fee or PES

5. Institutional Arrangements

- Institution(s) responsible for delivery of each item/activity in the entitlement policy; implementation of income restoration programs; and coordination of the activities associated with and described in the livelihoods plan
- Agency that will coordinate all implementing agencies. Does it have the necessary mandate and resources?
- Describe mechanisms for ensuring independent monitoring, evaluation, and financial audit of the Livelihoods Plan and for ensuring that corrective measures are carried out in a timely fashion

6. Implementation Schedule

- List the chronological steps in implementation of the Livelihoods Plan, including identification of agencies responsible for each activity and with a brief explanation of each activity

7. Participation and Consultation

- Describe the various stakeholders
- Process of promoting consultation/participation of affected populations, giving priority to women and vulnerable group of people
- Process of involving affected communities and other stakeholders in implementation and monitoring

8. Grievance redress

- Describe the process for registering and addressing grievances and provide a cost-free process for registering complaints, response time, and communication modes

- Describe the mechanism for appeal

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

- Ensure monitoring program seeks to measure whether communities restricted from grazing area have adequate standard of living and access to livelihoods equal to what they enjoyed before
- Define key monitoring indicators derived from baseline survey. Provide a list of monitoring indicators that will be used for internal monitoring, including number and location of restricted persons
- Ensure monitoring seeks to measure whether project promoted businesses are practical and bring positive impacts not only on environment and economy but also on social aspects
- Ensure monitoring program is regular and ongoing following project completion until durable solutions are reached
- M&E and Safeguards officer will monitor and regularly report on the risk

10. Costs and budgets

To carry out this particular activity under service contract, involving multi-disciplinary experts.

The team of consultants will consist of 3-4 members;

- 1 team leader
- 1 socio-economy specialist
- 1 protected area and community managed area expert
- 1 field assistant

It requires 8-10 weeks of team work, including travel days to the field.

The approximate total budget, including travel costs is USD 20,600 (80% professional fee, 20% travel cost).

The simple TOR for a team is attached as an attachment 3

SESP attachment 3.

Draft TOR for team to prepare Livelihood action plan

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

Project Title: Ensuring Sustainability and Resilience (ENSURE) of Green Landscapes in Mongolia

Type of Position: Develop Livelihoods Plan

Type of Contract: Service contract of team of (3) experts including (1) field assistant

Duty Location: Ulaanbaatar and expected to travel to all 4 demonstration landscapes

Language Required: Mongolian and English

A. The objective of the assignment

The objective of this assignment is to prepare a Livelihoods Plan for the ENSURE project.

Particularly, this plan will complete the assessment conducted during PPG and describe the measures to ensure mitigation of any risks to the capacity, production levels, and standards of living of herder communities (PUGs and FUGs) potentially restricted from access to grazing land both due to expansion of protected areas or due to piloting of livestock headage fees or PES mechanisms.

Also the livelihood plan should set out the mechanisms to review the business models for any new livelihoods initiatives that the project might promote to communities, to help mitigate the risk that the project promotes non-viable businesses.

B. Scope of work and key principles

1. Review relevant project documents
2. Carry out necessary additional socio-economic surveys
3. Complete PPG assessment of risk for herders and specific issues for women and vulnerable groups
4. Carry out consultations with key stakeholders
5. Develop the mitigation measures for communities potentially restricted from their grazing land
6. Design grievance mechanisms applicable to local social context, if necessary
7. Prepare livelihoods plan

C. Qualifications and experiences

The consultant team should possess the following qualifications:

- Familiarity with UNDP Safeguards policies and Mongolian government regulations and procedures related to PA and land (pastureland) etc
- The team leader should have at least a Master's degree in social science and land or related training
- Minimum of five years of experience with legitimate land tenure issues, particularly have experience working with local herders' communities and PAs on rangeland and its planning and implementation
- Experience working on gender and land related matters
- Excellent oral and written communication skills in Mongolian and English.