

Project Information

<b>Project Information</b>	
1. Project Title	Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)
2. Project Number	PIMS (5640) and GEFID (9426) numbers
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Africa/Namibia

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 NILALEG Project will promote an integrated landscape management approach in key agricultural and forest landscapes, reducing poverty through sustainable nature-based livelihoods, protecting biodiversity and restoring forests as carbon sinks, and promoting Land Degradation Neutrality. This will be done in five Focal Landscapes that are inhabited by local people (see Annex Q: Profiles of the Landscapes). Significantly, the Project will enable the duty bearers, such as the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Agriculture, Water and Forestry, and Academic institutions (remote sensing and GIS units) to provide tools, guidelines and monitoring platforms that can help the right-holders (local people/communities in the five landscapes) to demand and claim their economic, social and environmental benefits on a sustainable foundation. In the long-term, this project enables Namibia to meet its international environmental obligations.

On the whole, an integrated management approach will enable Namibia to a) ensure maximum Global Environmental Benefits as a result of the GEF-supported investments; b) apply lessons from implementation of past project experiences; c) promote stricter alignment with international and national targets through a strong thematic and geographical focus; and d) build upon firm foundations provided by key national baseline programmes, with co-finance from partners directly supporting the project outcomes.

Furthermore, value will be added to planned investments by the Government, private sector, and bilateral & multilateral donors by bringing about a new integrated approach to landscape management, creating multi-stakeholder platforms at national, regional and landscape levels. These platforms will address issues of human right of the local communities including the San and Ovahimba by building their capacity to deal with interconnected issues of biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management, and climate change mitigation within the current system of Integrated Regional Land Use Plans (IRLUP). Local people working through the Community Based Organisations (CBOs) and Regional Councils will be assisted (capacities built) to ensure that IRLUPs are implemented.

The Project will thus enable these IRLUP Plans to be rolled out at landscape level to create mosaics of land use with specific management guidelines that maximise environmental sustainability and the extraction of value for livelihoods on lands that are used by local people (e.g. the San and the Ovahimba). Specifically, the local people’s roles working through their CBOs -as right holders - will be: (a) enhanced to pilot new approaches to small business development, (b) access finances in rural areas, and (c) scaling up these throughout the country. Broadly, this will break the cycle of poverty and environmental degradation that limits the local people to meet their basic human rights’ needs (access to food, water and land).

This is achieved by a strategy which simultaneously improves the national and regional enabling environment for an integrated approach to planning and managing landscapes and monitoring spatial results (Component 1), and pilots the approach at a landscape level, generating sustainable livelihoods in rural communities (Component 2); with the Financial mechanisms to be put in place for scaling up nationally (Component 3) based on capturing and sharing of lessons learnt and impact achieved through the new integrated landscape management approach (Component 4). Explicitly, the NILALEG Project design:

- Includes measures to assist the Namibian government to realize (respect, protect and fulfil) human rights under the three Rio Conventions and to implement human rights-related standards in line with national legislation, i.e. Environmental Management Act 07 of 2007.
- Enhances the availability, accessibility and quality of benefits and services for potentially marginalized individuals and groups (the San and Ovahimba), and to increase their inclusion in decision-making processes that may impact them (consistent with the non-discrimination and equality human rights principle) - see the Stakeholder Engagement Report (Annex F).
- Supports meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, in particular, marginalized individuals and groups (the San, Himba and Ovahimba), in processes that may impact them including design, implementation and monitoring of the Project, especially in the five (Omaipanga, Ruacana, Okongo, Nkulivere and Zambezi) Focal Landscapes.
- Provides or supports meaningful means (multi stakeholder platforms, access to Regional Councils and working with the Traditional Authorities) for local communities and affected populations to raise concerns and/or grievances including a redress processes for local communities when activities may adversely impact them (consistent with accountability and rule of law human rights principle) – per the Environmental Management Act and associated regulations

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

The NILALEG Project recognises that Namibia’s social landscape has been characterised by gender inequalities in relation to land and land-based resources. These inequalities were (and to some extent are still) apparent in social, economic and political spheres of life. Until the recent past, women could not own land nor did they have ‘full’ rights over land on their own. Women’s access was always through their male relations; yet, they had no control over access to land and they could not control and participate in decision making over land and land-based resources. These gender and socio-economic inequalities were exacerbated during the colonial period (which ended in 1990), when women were confined to the private and reproduction roles in society. In contrast, men were exposed to the public and production roles through wage employment that enabled them to earn cash income. The production sphere where women were participant was subsistence farming on agricultural landscapes, whereby the NILALEG Project has a focus on. The disadvantages that are particularly facing women are the major source of inequality and inherent in some of the customary systems that precluded women from access, rights and control over resources.

Therefore, the NILALEG Project design has taken into consideration Gender equality and empowering women, promoting the active involvement of women. A full gender analysis and gender action plan is included in Annex G. Some of the key elements of the gender action plan are: (1) Capacity development to empower women’s participation in project coordination structures, (2) Women as beneficiaries of livelihood support, and (3) deliberate targeting and identification of vulnerable and marginalised male and female, to infuse “gender-neutral roles” in new nature-based enterprises. The findings from the gender analysis are meaningfully integrated into the Project’s strategy, theory of change and results framework. Gender roles and the need for men and women’s empowerment are further outlined in the Gender Analysis and Action Plan.

Furthermore, the gender analysis provides specific actions and interventions that will promote changes in application and practices to contribute to gender equality. Such includes (a) application of a meaningful participatory process for engaging women’s voices; (b) analysis of gender inequalities in the Project’s rationale, noting the different needs of different women’s categories (i.e. youth, old, persons with disability, marginalised); (c) incorporates age and sex-disaggregated data; (d) specific, measurable indicators related to gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Lastly, the NILALEG Project results framework includes: special measures/outputs to address gender inequality issues to transform the cultural, social, religious, and other constraints faced by women. Under Component 4: Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation - gender and impact assessment is explicitly included to ensures that Project is assessed (NILALEG currently is scored as 2 per Gender Marker) throughout its lifecycle and not only at design.

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

The NILALEG Project supports implementation of national environmental sustainability priorities identified in Namibia’s Second National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2013-2022; Nationally Determined Contribution in terms of the Paris Agreement; and Namibia’s Third National Report on the implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. Lessons and recommendations that emanated from the Namibia Country Pilot Partnership, National Programme to Combat Desertification, and Land Degradation

Neutrality Report 2015, have been taken on board to ensure that the project mainstream environmental issues at appropriate levels (national, regional and local) and take cognisance of geographical zones (focal landscapes). Thus;

- Strengthens environmental management capacities of country partners through: Institutional coordination and governance mechanisms for integrated landscape management;
- Promotes collaboration by partnering with tertiary and research institutions for longitudinal studies on project impact; Knowledge sharing for replication of best practice locally, nationally and internationally; Public awareness, advocacy, communications and knowledge management for project activities.
- Addresses environment-development linkages by implementation of the integrated landscape management approach in target landscapes; implementation and upscaling of the integrated landscape management approach (providing financing to CBOs for the on-the-ground interventions) - thereby specifically addressing the poverty-environment nexus; and
- Applies a precautionary approach to natural resource conservation, as well Sustainable Development Goals, especially SDGs 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 15.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?			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>
<b>Risk A: Erosion</b>	I = 3 P = 1	<b>Low</b>	The risk relates to: Removal of bushes/trees can result in disturbance to the soil, increasing its risk to erosion by wind and water.	<p>Project activities are designed to ensure the risk to erosion is minimised. Furthermore, the project proposes to implement a range of soil and water conservation measures which will restore eroded regions and protect areas where activities are proposed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preventing disturbance of the soil surface by not removing the roots of bushes.</li> <li>2. Use bush rollers as opposed to bulldozers or backhoes for mechanical control.</li> <li>3. Allowing a portion of the bushes/trees to stay on the ground surface.</li> <li>4. Selective retention of trees and bushes in wind exposed areas (wind breakers) and along slopes.</li> <li>5. Soil stabilisation efforts such as gully plugs, check dams and contour bunds.</li> <li>6. Afforestation and seeding of palatable grass species contribute to soil stability.</li> <li>7. Building capacities in soil and water conservation.</li> </ol>
<b>Risk B: Micro-climate alteration</b>	I = 2 P = 1	<b>Low</b>	The risk relates to: Indiscriminate removal of all trees from a savanna can result in negative consequences for regeneration of palatable species on account of changes to the micro-climate.	<p>Project activities are designed to prevent indiscriminate removal of bush, to protect large trees during de-bushing and to assist the re-establishment of tree species. To this end, the project will enhance capacities of communities and government stakeholders in scientific management of rangelands.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Selectively retain live tree/bush cover in the rangeland during bush clearing.</li> <li>2. Do not remove large and enormous trees with crown spread exceeding 3.5m.</li> <li>3. Use bush rollers as opposed to bulldozers or backhoes.</li> <li>4. Build capacities in scientific rangeland management.</li> </ol>

<p><b>Risk C: Fire</b></p>	<p>I = 2 P = 1</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>The risk relates to: Large scale accumulation of crushed bushes and trees from de-bushing can also act as a source of fuel, increasing the chances of uncontrolled fires.</p>	<p>Project activities are designed such that “Fires will not be used as a management measure outside savannas and in forests and wooded regions of Kavango and Zambezi”.</p> <p>Adequate measures will be taken to ensure fires are controlled and contained in small areas minimising their spread to non-target regions. Rangeland management activities proposed in the NILALEG project will specifically address some of the root causes of large uncontrolled fires. These include optimal stocking density and frequent controlled fires which prevent bush encroachment and potential build-up of woody biomass. Furthermore, the project will build capacities in rangeland management among communities and communal farmers.</p>
<p><b>Risk D: Loss of biodiversity</b></p>	<p>I = 1 P = 1</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>The risk relates to: Indiscriminate removal of trees from savannas can lead to loss of endemic, economically and ecologically important species</p>	<p>Through component 3, nature-based enterprises are foreseen, which may necessitate the arrangements for Access Benefit Sharing (ABS) arrangements as provided for in the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM 2013 Policy) in or at some stages of the project implementation. Nature based enterprises proposed in the project will be done within existing national laws and forest protection frameworks. Extraction will be done scientifically and sustainably with measures to ensure regeneration and regrowth of the concerned species or plant.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is very unlikely that such events will take place during the project. In the event that valuable species are removed, the impact will be minimised as local capacities in the identification and protection of these species will be built and pro-active steps for conservation and re-introduction of certain species are proposed.</p> <p>Ensuring conservation of ecologically and economically important forest species is an important aim of the project. Important trees will not be removed during de-bushing operations.</p> <p>Local capacities in the identification, protection and re-introduction of important species.</p>
<p><b>Risk E: Arboricide use</b></p>	<p>I = 1 P = 2</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>The risk relates to: Indiscriminate application of herbicides can lead to loss of non-target species, including valuable tree species, and alteration of the species composition of the rangeland to favour non-palatable species.</p>	<p>The Project will not advocate for the indiscriminate use of herbicides. In the limited cases where arboricides are recommended, their application will be based on principles of minimal impacts on non-target species.</p> <p>A mix of targeted topical applications with mechanical control measures will be applied. Herbicides with lower environmental effects will be used. Awareness will be generated, and training provided to communities in scientific and safe use of chemicals in bush control.</p>

<p><b>Risk F: Reduced access to resources</b></p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>This risk relates to: Implementing restoration activities in human use landscapes could limit access to resources for local communities and their livestock in areas where restoration is being undertaken. The gazettement of new protected areas could impinge on the livelihoods of nearby communities, potentially restricting access to some resources.</p>	<p>NILALEG is a community-led project where stakeholders will play a fundamental role in all aspects of project implementation. This specifically includes the planning of interventions wherein spatially explicit management and restoration plans will be developed with their participation.</p> <p>All project interventions will be based on detailed micro-level planning with active participation of communities' members. A consensus on management and restoration measures will be a prerequisite to any intervention.</p> <p>Sites will be selected in a manner that alternative areas remain available for livestock and forest as well as NTFP extraction. Sites will be rotated to allow areas time for recovery while others are utilised.</p> <p>Most restoration sites will be accessible for measured and sustainable levels of exploitation - total exclusion of communities will be an exception for highly degraded and unstable sites alone.</p> <p>Capacities in participatory and sustainable forest/rangeland management will be imparted to communities and state officials alike and institutional mechanisms set up for the same.</p>
<p><b>Risk G: Over extraction of valuable species</b></p>	<p>I = 2 P = 3</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p>This risk relates to: The project hopes to improve livelihoods of local communities by increasing opportunities for processing and marketing of forest produce. This may lead to over-extraction and unsustainable extraction of important plants to meet growing commercial demands.</p>	<p>As a matter of fact, the Project is focused on ameliorating unsustainable extraction of natural resources by introducing and building capacities in rangeland management and reforestation. Scientifically established best practices will replace existing unsustainable methods and intuitions entrusted with enforcement of conservation and management of these resources will be strengthened. Government of Namibia policies regulating the extraction of timber and non-timber forest products through the issuing of licences and the collection of fees will be strengthened. This specifically includes the regulations of 2015 which provide an operational framework to the 2001 act. So, it is very unlikely that over extraction will take place during the project as communities will be supported in developing and implementing management plans that ensure sustainable harvesting.</p> <p>However, to ensure that this is minimised, there is a need to set up of extraction limits through dialogue with local communities and based on a detailed ecological assessments of resource availability, regeneration and sustainable yields for each landscape. The site management plans following the practices of developing Integrated natural resources management (as done in the Community Forests or Conservancies) will be done. Moreover, setting up of formal channels for sales of produce overseen by community leaders in line with the institutional</p>

				<p>arrangements specified in the national forest policy and best practices for its implementation.</p> <p>Training on scientific and sustainable methods of harvesting of resources where applicable. Minimising physical damage to the plant and timing extraction to periods/seasons where natural regeneration and recovery is assured.</p>
<p><b>Risk I: Limited access to land for continuous utilisation</b></p>	<p>I: 2 P: 4</p>	<p><b>Moderate</b></p>	<p>This risk relates to: Access to areas under restoration may be curtailed to varying degrees, depending on the types of restoration measures implemented. However, communities will themselves determine the areal extent, type of restrictions and period of restriction. Furthermore, most of these areas are already in extremely poor condition and offer limited resources and services.</p>	<p>To a limited extent the affected local population may be cut-off from utilising the degraded lands (when the restoration activities are being implemented);</p> <p>The Project will ensure that the limitation is temporary to enable for example lands to be restored so that they can be used for grazing purposes later (impact in future) and if necessary, proper measures for controlled access will be pursued in the specific Focal Landscapes.</p> <p>In order to ensure these risks are minimised and mitigated, stakeholders will play a fundamental role in all aspects of project implementation. This specifically includes formulation of spatially explicit management and restoration plans (micro-plans). Other safeguards include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A consensus on management and restoration measures will be a prerequisite to any intervention.</li> <li>2. Sites will be selected to ensure alternative areas remain available for livestock and forest as well as NTFP extraction.</li> <li>3. Sites will be rotated to allow areas time for recovery while others are utilised.</li> <li>4. Total exclusion of stakeholder will only be done in exceptional cases where the landscape is highly degraded and unstable. Most restoration sites will be accessible for measured and sustainable levels of exploitation.</li> <li>5. As a strategy, landscapes will be planted with fast growing multiple use species of grasses, shrubs and trees to broaden the resource base and increase the productivity of the landscapes.</li> <li>6. Soil and water harvesting through small structures with emphasis on dispersed, low cost structures will minimise inundation.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Risk J: Not all communities members (marginalized, women, youth, poor, people with disability) might be fully engaged in decisions that affects their landscapes</b></p>	<p>I: 4 P: 2</p>	<p><b>Moderate</b></p>	<p>This risk relates to: Duty bearers and right holders especially at regional and landscape levels not having capacities to constructively meet their</p>	<p>One of the Project components will address the capacity gaps to improve/strengthen the sustainable management of natural resources. Given that there are limited capacities at regional level, it is likely that if these capacities are not enabled/developed the duty bearers would not be able to provide the needed services and thus unable to meet their</p>

			obligations. Further, local communities may not be able to claim their rights due to a number of reasons (e.g. people with disability may not have access to the correct/appropriate documents at the or within the focal landscapes, or that the vital information may not be in their local languages). These are likely to limit their claims.	obligations. Hence, the Project has a capacity development scorecard and framework to be implemented to assess the level of capacities at the beginning, at mid term and at the end. Through the capacity building interventions, the Project will ensure that Annex Y, G and Q are used as critical inputs to guide the implementation.
<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?</b>				
<b>Select one (see <a href="#">SESP</a> for guidance)</b>			<b>Comments</b>	
<i>Low Risk</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Moderate Risk</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>High Risk</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>	
			While the project activities have potentially adverse environmental outcomes, these will be very limited in scale as the project essentially aims to enhance natural resources and their management through active engagement of communities. Best practices in rangeland management, sustainable forest management and agro-forestry are the core of its implementation strategy. NILALEG includes activities with potential adverse social and environmental risks and impacts, that are limited in scale, can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, and can be addressed through application of standard best practice, mitigation measures and stakeholder engagement during implementation. It is therefore suggested that a draft EMP <sup>1</sup> is further developed/refined during the first six months of the project to ensure that the measures and interventions to avert these risks are properly planned for.	

<sup>1</sup> Environmental Management Plan (EMP)



<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?</b>		
Check all that apply		<b>Comments</b>
<b>Principle 1: Human Rights</b>	X	Potential limitations on access to natural resources will be carefully managed in close consultation with communities, to ensure that human rights are NOT affected.
<b>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</b>		
<b>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</b>	X	The project activities are indeed adjacent and within critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas. However, all the activities are focused on restoring and protecting these sites through strengthened cooperation across the spectrum of relevant institutions including traditional groups, government agencies and CSOs, CBOs and NGOs.
<b>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>	X	Agricultural activities in Namibia are always likely to be sensitive or vulnerable to impacts of climate change. However, the sustainable land management approaches promoted will support adaptation to climate change.
<b>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</b>		
<b>4. Cultural Heritage</b>		
<b>5. Displacement and Resettlement</b>	X	During the project implementation, there will be some micro-level areas that will not be available for local communities to access, or to use resources from, in order to enable the restoration activities/interventions to occur. The risks are minimal, and the communities will be involved in decisions pertaining to the extent of area and period of exclusion. No communities will be displaced through project activities.
<b>6. Indigenous Peoples</b>	X	It is recommended that a draft Indigenous Peoples Plan that was drafted and developed during the design phase is further finalised during the first six months of the project.
<b>7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>	X	Waste produced through new nature-based enterprises supported through the project

			will be non-hazardous, and will be managed in accordance with Namibian legislation, with efforts made to minimize, recycle and resuse waste products wherever possible.
--	--	--	---

**Final Sign Off**

<b><i>Signature</i></b>	<b><i>Date</i></b>	<b><i>Description</i></b>
QA Assessor:		UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer.
QA Approver:		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR).
PAC Chair:		UNDP chair of the PAC.

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

*Answer all questions in the checklist as if mitigation measures are not in place, so as to ensure that all potential risks are identified.*

<b>Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks</b>		<b>Answer (Yes/No)</b>
<b>Principles 1: Human Rights</b>		
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? <sup>2</sup>	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.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
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
<b>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</b>		
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
4.	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 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?	No

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<b>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:</b> Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
<b>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</b>		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?	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?	Yes
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	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?	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area?	No
<b>Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant <sup>3</sup> 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)?	No
<b>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</b>		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No

<sup>3</sup> In regard to CO<sub>2</sub>, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources).

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?	No
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?	No
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
<b>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</b>		
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)?	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
<b>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</b>		
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? <sup>4</sup>	
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	No
<b>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</b>		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited	Yes

<sup>4</sup> 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.

	by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?	
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
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	Yes
<b>Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>		
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)?	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?	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