

Social and Environmental Screening Checklist

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Protecting priority coastal and marine ecosystems to conserve globally significant Endangered, Threatened, and Protected marine wildlife in southern Mindanao, Philippines
2. Project Number (i.e., Atlas Project ID, PIMS+)	Atlas Project ID 10536, PIMS+ 6499
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Philippines
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Design (endorsement stage)
5. Date	10 June 2021

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

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights-based approach

The project will uphold human rights principles based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This will be achieved by engaging all stakeholders (See Annex 9) in the project operations, from project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and abiding by UNDP's Process Framework in facilitating development interventions for most affected communities.

Under Component 2 (Conservation of endangered, threatened and protected marine wildlife [ETP MW] and priority habitats within targeted marine protected areas [MPAs]), the primary outputs to be achieved include the establishments of governance and coordination mechanisms for local conservation areas [LCAs] and provincial networks of MPAs that will be participatory in nature. The project will focus on coastal communities, particularly the most affected groups such as fisherfolks, Indigenous Peoples, women and men, and other vulnerable groups, as key stakeholders of the project. The project will strengthen the capacities of these groups in the management of MPAs for ETP MW and priority habitats, thereby contributing to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity, to improving fisheries productivity, and to community resiliency. The project will also facilitate development interventions through livelihood opportunities in selected communities directly impacted by the restrictions on resource use, particularly in strict protection zones, no-take marine or fish sanctuaries or refuges, within the LCAs, using the Process Framework. The project will respect community and cultural sensitivities and provide reasonable accommodations to strengthen inclusivity to persons with disabilities. The principle of positive discrimination will be adopted, where marginalized individuals and households in the coastal communities will be prioritized to ensure their opportunities to assert their socio-political and economic rights. The project design and interventions will adopt human rights-based approach in conservation management and enforcement efforts and promote the empowerment of people (women and men) to know and claim their rights and increasing the ability and accountability of individuals and institutions responsible for respecting, protecting, and fulfilling these rights. As such, the project will enhance the availability, accessibility, and quality of benefits from ecosystem services and will support the inclusion of potentially marginalized individuals and groups in the decision-making processes.

As the project will be undertaken in coastal areas where Indigenous Peoples have either ancestral water claims or are dependent for their livelihood, the project recognizes the Indigenous Peoples rights, including the requirement to obtain their Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), based on the provisions of Republic Act 8371. A grievance redress mechanism has also been developed for the project and is included in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (See Annex 10) prepared as part of the project.

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

The project aims to fully mainstream gender in project interventions, to foster gender equality and women empowerment. To ensure that the project design and activities fully incorporate and reflect the views of women and men, and provide equal opportunities for them to participate and benefit from project activities, a gender analysis was undertaken during the PPG phase. Based on this gender analysis, a comprehensive gender action plan has been developed (See Annex 11) with specific activities and budget to ensure gender is mainstreamed in all project components, and that the project contributes towards improving gender equality and women's empowerment in the project sites.

New or enhanced policies that will be developed with project support shall consider and respond to women's (particularly those in the fisheries and informal sector) needs, issues and well-being. This will include ensuring equitable access, control and use of marine and coastal resource, as well as representation of women and men in leadership and decision-making platforms such as MPA boards, provincial MPA networks and inter-agency enforcement and monitoring mechanisms. The project's proposed Process Framework shall also incentivize sustainable production and consumption practices among women and men community members, and enable them to become better stewards of their natural resource base. The project will also contribute to improved community (particularly the youth) awareness and action for marine conservation, and ensure that both women and men are able to access, share and apply knowledge relevant to ETP MW and their habitats.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams sustainability and resilience
<p>The project aims to strengthen the management effectiveness and address underrepresentation of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to conserve endangered, threatened and protected marine wildlife (ETP MW) and sustain ecosystem services for human wellbeing. MPAs and MPA networks (MPANs) are identified as nature-based solutions to maintaining climate change resilience and to rebuilding ecological and social resilience. Concomitant to MPAs and MPANs establishment is the protection of a network of coastal and marine ecosystems such as mangroves, seagrass, coral reef areas that provide essential ecosystem services such as biodiversity conservation, fishery productivity, coastal protection, and as carbon sinks (i.e., “blue” carbon) thereby contributing to mitigating climate change.</p> <p>Project sustainability is anchored in the robust policy framework which entrenches long-term institutional ownership of the project outcomes at national, provincial, and local levels. Project outputs will feed into well-established and developing programmes – such as the Protected Area Development and Management Program, CMEMP, Protection and Conservation of Wildlife Program, and Livelihood Development Program for Fisherfolk - led by government institutions (principally the DENR-BMB and DA-BFAR but also other line departments) working in partnership with local governments, active community-based organisations, the well-resourced NGO sector, the donor community, and private enterprises and individuals. Provincial and local LGUs and local communities will be capacitated to secure funding for and to co-manage the project supported MPAs for ETP MW and habitats within these MPAs over the longer-term. The increased sense of joint custodianship of MPAs and their natural resources will be further developed through an increasing awareness of the intrinsic values of MPAs to economic and social well-being. The project will implement a community-based approach to marine resource management and will engage a well-established network of local People’s Organisations (PO), Indigenous Peoples Groups, Fisherfolk Associations, and environmental NGOs in the project areas, whose participation will be essential to ensure full ownership and sustainability of project outcomes. To ensure resilience of the affected communities, the project will facilitate the development of livelihood options that balance people-focused development interventions (livelihood options, ecotourism) with environmental conservation objectives. The project will abide by UNDP’s Process Framework requiring the participation of affected communities in determining potential access restrictions, mutually acceptable levels of resource use, management arrangements and measures to address impacts. Economic incentives and public-community-private partnerships will be developed to sustain stakeholder participation beyond project closure. In collaboration with academic institutions and civil society organizations (CSOs), the project will ensure a science-based and participatory approach in the planning and conduct of ETP MW and habitat studies, assessments, and monitoring. A Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) program will also be developed targeting various stakeholders to mainstream conservation agenda for ETP marine wildlife and their habitats, to ensure that knowledge gained will be retained and used for adaptive management of MPAs and MPANs for ETP MW, with learnings and best practices which may be replicated in other sites.</p>
Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders
<p>The project supports the meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, particularly the marginalized individuals and groups. The project will strengthen the capacity of LGUs to manage coastal and marine resources in accordance with the intent of the Fisheries Code, which emphasizes the jurisdiction of LGUs over municipal waters, and the Local Government Code, which specifically provides for the administrative authority of the LGUs to control fishing activities, limit access to marine resources, prescribe zones for different uses and collect taxes of fees from the use of marine resources in municipal waters. The project will engage with different stakeholders through capacity building, and access to knowledge products that the project will generate. The project established Grievance Redress Mechanism to ensure that affected communities have an avenue to file their complaints and grievances. The project has an Accountability Mechanism, composed of Compliance Review and Stakeholder Response Mechanism. The Compliance Review is an avenue for affected persons or groups to respond to claims that UNDP is not in compliance with the Social and Environmental Standards. The Stakeholder Response Mechanism on the other hand, helps project affected stakeholders to jointly resolve their concerns and disputes. Stakeholders will be informed of the project’s Accountability Mechanism in various consultations and through the Communication, Education and Public Awareness program.</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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 Likelihood (1-5)¹</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, 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>
Risk 1: Coastal productive sector operations and communities in the project’s area of influence generate solid and liquid waste (e.g., macro-/micro-plastics,	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	Various threats from land-based industries in the three project sites were reported. In Dahican Beach in Mayo Bay,	Assessment Effluent and wastes coming from land-based industries, tourism establishments and the community have the potential to impact the water quality of Mayo Bay,

¹ Impact: 5 = Extreme; 4 = Extensive; 3 = Intermediate; 2 = Minor; 1 = Negligible
Likelihood: 5 = Expected; 4 = Very likely; 3 = Moderately likely; 2 = Low likelihood; 1 = Not likely

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>accidental oil/fuel spills by fishing and other vessels), which could have negative impacts on ETP MW and habitats.</p> <p>Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.10 Standard 3: 3.2, 3.8</p>			<p>rampant development of tourism establishments is causing noise and light pollution that impact turtle nesting, in addition to threats from wastewater and solid wastes. Upland mining activities also impact both Mayo Bay and Pujada Bay. In Don Marcelino, landslides and road construction have led to severe sedimentation.</p> <p>The 600 MW coal-fired power plant and the Tubalan Cove Business and Industrial Park established on the coast of Malita, and banana plantations upland also contribute to coastal water pollution and sedimentation. In Don Marcelino, agricultural runoffs from a nearby banana plantation are believed to be impacting nearby coral reefs.</p> <p>The coastal communities and tourism establishments in the three project sites also contribute to the generation of liquid and solid wastes (e.g., macro-/microplastics; A recent stranding incident of a Bryde’s whale in Mati City, was reportedly caused by choking with ingested plastic debris - May 5, 2021).</p> <p>Marine pollution may also come from accidental or deliberate discharge or dumping of oil into the sea, resulting in water quality deterioration that may impact ETP marine wildlife and their habitats.</p>	<p>Pujada Bay and coastal waters of Malita and Don Marcelino, that may negatively impact ETP MW and their habitats. Assessment of potential risks were based on consultations with LGUs in the three sites; the Environmental Management Bureau (EMB), the agency responsible for monitoring effluent from land-based industries; and the Maritime Industry Authority (MARINA), responsible for monitoring effluents from sea vessels. From these consultations and the site visit during the PIF stage, the PPG team conducted an initial analysis of various sectors and activities in the project’s area of influence. The PPG team determined that these contextual risks will be considered further during the baseline assessments to be conducted for each of the project targeted MPAs (see Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2) during the implementation phase.</p> <p>Management Measures</p> <p>The management of effluent and wastes from land based-industries are not directly under the project’s area of influence (AOI). The project’s accountability for such risks is limited. These risks will be included in the assessments and management plans prepared for the project, although the policies that will govern these risks will depend on the sectors (i.e., DENR – EMB for land-based industries and MARINA for effluent and wastes from sea vessels).</p> <p>The project supported MPA sites are located in areas where this risk is currently still low to moderate and where the LGUs are committed to improving the management and treatment of all pollutants before entering the marine environment of the MPAs. The project, under Component 3, Output 3.1.1 will conduct targeted awareness-raising and educational campaign to conserve dugong and marine turtle populations in MPAs. The project, in coordination with different government agencies, will also emphasize the status of solid waste management (SWM) implementation in project sites to encourage the participation of EMB and the DENR, as lead for the development and implementation of the National Program of Action (NPOA), MARINA, as the entity responsible for the implementation and compliance of regulations governing effluent and waste coming from sea vessels, and the LGUs in protecting ETP MW and their habitats.</p> <p>Under Output 3.1.3 (A project-based monitoring, reporting and evaluation program is maintained), the project will hire a Social and Environmental Safeguards Specialist to undertake social and environmental assessments and develop targeted management measures, as required. The part-time safeguards officer and the gender officer in the PMU will be responsible for the monitoring of, and reporting on, the project’s performance in the implementation of the SESP, ESMF, IPPF and gender action plan.</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>Risk 2: Development interventions (e.g., livelihood activities, eco-tourism, etc.) can have adverse impacts on ETP MW and habitats if not well implemented by project stakeholders and partners.</p> <p>Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.10 Standard 8: 8.2, 8.6</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Historical data from 2004-2014 records 7 dugong stranding in Mati City and 1 in Don Marcelino, out of 18 of the total reported strandings for the region: 3 mortalities reported due to drowning caused by fishing gear “pukat” entanglement, 1 trapped in a “payao” (fish aggregating device) paraphernalia; 3 rest of unknown causes, and 1 successful release. During PPG consultation (5 Nov 2020), DA-BFAR XI personnel reported an successful release operation of 1 dugong trapped a Otoshi-ami type gear (<i>lambaklad</i>) in Brgy Lanca, Mati City, outside of the project areas. In Malita, SPAMAST reported 13 dead dugongs between (2001-2008), and 1 stranding in 2017, with unreported causes.</p> <p>For marine turtles, at least 3 mortalities are reported for marine turtles in Mati City from 2011-2015, caused by drowning in “pukat” entanglement: 2 from accidental catches/<i>pukat</i> entanglement, 1 from ingestion of a nylon line with hook. No other marine turtle stranding/mortality information is available in other project sites.</p> <p>NFRDI is currently implementing the National Stock Assessment Program (NSAP) for all coastal regions in the Philippines in support of the Fisheries Management Area program of DA-BFAR (i.e., Region XI is under FMA 2). NSAP conducts regular fish catch monitoring of both municipal and commercial fisheries in selected landing sites in coastal region and prepares stock assessment reports for commercially important fish stocks (e.g., small pelagics) and includes the monitoring and reporting of catch and</p>	<p>Assessment</p> <p>Provisions of fishing boats, fishing gears, or “payao” (fish aggregating devices or FADs) are some of the livelihood enhancements traditionally provided by BFAR and LGUs to municipal fishers and/or fisherfolk organizations. However, recent information derived during PPG consultations suggests that certain fishing gears (i.e., “pukat” or nets, “<i>lambaklad</i>” or “Otoshi-ami” nets) and payaos were detrimental to both dugong and turtles. Several other cetacean strandings in project sites have also been reported, most suspected from drowning due to “accidental” fishing gear interaction or bycatch. Mortalities caused by ETP MW interaction with fishing gears cannot be estimated vis-à-vis population size due to patchiness of data and irregularity of reports and monitoring. Provision of new fishing boats inadvertently increases fishing effort thus may also contribute to overfishing in identified fishing grounds. Number, types and operational extent of fishing gears, boats, and fishing practices that negatively impact ETP MW and the marine ecosystems in project sites is currently not known.</p> <p>Ecotourism development has generated significant benefits through employment opportunities and led to improvement of livelihoods of those able to participate in the tourism industry. LGUs play an important role in creating participation options in the tourism industry as well as in related service or business industries. However, mass tourism experiences in other areas (e.g., Puerto Princesa, Palawan) have shown local vulnerabilities such as increased pollution and resource degradation, and risks of tourism dependency and other unintended socio-economic consequences (Boer 2012). Other examples include Boracay, Aklan and Panglao, Bohol. In project sites, tourism activities seem to be in its infancy, but the DOT XI is already providing technical assistance in the drafting and development of tourism plans to LGUs. PLGU Davao Oriental and Mati City have recently won awards for having 3 of the Most Beautiful Bays in the World (i.e., some LGUs have established environmentally critical for ETPMW (Mati City in Mayo Bay) but also gearing this same area for tourism. In Malita, Tubalan Cove is softly marketed as a tourism development site but is also a mariculture site and a Business and Industrial Park (under a national law). In Don Marcelino, the LGU is leveraging investments of local fish sanctuaries, declared within ancestral waters of a Bla’an tribe, with agribusiness and tourism development.</p> <p>While all these are ongoing, the project will assist the LGUs through strategic planning and zoning activities early on project implementation, taking into consideration the various CRM Plans, Local Fisheries Code, Tourism Plans, Zoning ordinances that have also been developed to ensure complementation and harmonization (Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). While coastal communities report on various stranding incidents in social media, both coastal communities, LGU and</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
			bycatch of protected species (to include ETP MW). Under the Fisheries Code as amended, DA-DILG released a Joint DA-DILG Administrative Order, Series of 2018, (Guidelines for the Establishment of a Data Collection Scheme in Municipal Catch Documentation and Traceability System in the LGU for Management of Fishery Resources) which provided standardized data collection system similar to NSAP to be adopted by the LGUs to ensure traceability of fish and fishery products and to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUUF).	<p>NGA representatives on sites need special training on ETP MW stranding response protocols.</p> <p>Management Measures On fisheries related activities, the project will partner with BFAR-XI, with NSAP XI, and the LGUs’ municipal catch documentation system, in determining fishing operations within project sites, the level of fishing effort (boats, gears, catches/bycatches), the identification of gears detrimental to ETP MW, and the planning and design for modification of such gears so impact are reduced and/or prevented (Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2).</p> <p>The project will facilitate the development interventions that balance people-focused development (livelihood options, ecotourism) with environmental conservation objectives (for ETP MW and habitats). The project will apply the UNDP’s Process Framework requiring the participation of affected communities in determining potential access restrictions, mutually acceptable levels of resource use, management arrangements and measures to address impacts. The project will also partner with government agencies, such as DENR XI for its BDFE program, DA-BFAR XI for its livelihood program, DTI XI enterprise development, and DSWD for their cash for work program, and other relevant agencies to ensure complementation of development interventions (Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2).</p> <p>Under Output 3.1.1, a targeted awareness-raising and educational campaign to conserve dugong and marine turtle populations in MPA will be conducted for all stakeholders to promote best practices and processes, including those from development interventions (e.g., livelihood activities, eco-tourism services, etc.) that will be implemented in this project.</p> <p>The project will appoint an NGO, CBO, or PO to support the implementation of livelihood development interventions through the Process Framework. Under Output 3.1.3 (A project-based monitoring, reporting and evaluation program is maintained), the project will hire a Social and Environmental Safeguards Specialist to undertake social and environmental assessments and develop targeted management measures, as required. The part-time safeguards officer and the gender officer in the PMU will be responsible for the monitoring of, and reporting on, the project’s performance in the implementation of the SESP, ESMF, IPPF and gender action plan.</p>
Risk 3: Project outcomes are vulnerable to climate change impacts, e.g. rising seawater temperatures that lead to coral bleaching; changes in marine trophic food chains due to changes in currents, storms, and water temperatures;	<i>I = 3 L = 3</i>	<i>Moderate</i>		Assessment The Climate Change Risk Screening (See Annex 20) was prepared during the PPG, and determined that the project risk level is moderate, considering that extreme climatic stresses (e.g., rising seawater temperatures, abnormal rise in sea levels, more destructive typhoons) may lead to destruction of habitats and disruption of

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>changed migration patterns and time spent in developmental habitats for some ETP MW species.</p> <p>Standard 2: 2.1 and 2.2.</p>				<p>migration patterns of ETP MW and that an increase in the frequency and severity of severe storm surges and flooding may lead to an increase in damage to infrastructure and compromise the livelihoods of communities living in low-lying populated areas along the coast. In some project sites (e.g., Don Marcelino), local communities reported the presence of government funded seawall construction as mitigation to storm surges, but which negatively impacted nesting beaches and movement of nesting marine turtles.</p> <p>A more detailed assessment of climate risks and vulnerability will be carried out during project implementation.</p> <p>Management Measures In Output 1.1.2 the project will conduct a vulnerability assessment on the impacts of different climate change scenarios on marine turtle and dugong habitats in MPAs in Region XI.</p> <p>It will identify practical recommendations on habitat mitigation measures for piloting in Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.2.1 and will support the in-situ planning and implementation of these measures in the project-supported MPAs.</p> <p>It will identify practical recommendations on species mitigation measures for piloting in Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.2.1 and will support the <i>in-situ</i> planning and implementation of these measures in the project-supported MPAs.</p> <p>The project will also assess the efficacy of the networking of MPAs, through provincial MPANS, as a viable and practical climate risk-mitigation measure for ETP MW populations, ecosystems, and people. Larger MPAs and network of MPAs promotes effective management of a network of coastal and marine ecosystems such as mangroves, seagrass, coral reef areas which are important habitats to biodiversity and people. They provide essential ecosystem services such as biodiversity conservation, fishery productivity (e.g., nursery grounds for fishes), coastal protection from storms, and as carbon sinks (i.e., “blue” carbon) thereby contributing to mitigating climate change. The project will seek to conserve intact coastal and marine ecosystems in the project supported MPAs under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 so that they will continue to act as natural barrier to flooding events (by retaining sediment and reducing the force of incoming waves).</p> <p>The project will also integrate climate change issues into its educational programs under Output 3.1.1 in order to increase awareness of the impacts of climate change and promote adoption of adaptation strategies that can reduce the effect of climate change on fisheries.</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
				<p>Finally, the project will support development interventions following the Process Framework, to create livelihood and employment opportunities that will contribute to economic resiliency for affected communities. Risk management measures will be incorporated into the project’s Risk Register.</p>
<p>Risk 4: Newly deputized Bantay Dagat/Bantay Gubat members (i.e., community law enforcers), Aquatic Wildlife Enforcement Officers (AWEOs) (BFAR field personnel; employees of law enforcement agencies) and/or Wildlife Enforcement Officers (WEOs) (DENR field personnel) may cause some negative impacts on communities if their training is not properly carried out or somehow insufficient.</p> <p>Human Rights: P.5, P.6 and P.7 Accountability: P.13, P.14 and P.15 Standard 3: 3.2 and 3.8 Standard 6: 6.2 and 6.9 Standard 7:7.1 and 7.6</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Section 7 of the <u>Fisheries Administrative Ordinance (FAO) 233-2010 (Aquatic Wildlife Conservation)</u> provides for deputization of BFAR field personnel as Aquatic Wildlife Enforcement Officers (AWEOs) by the BFAR National Director (upon the recommendation of BFAR Regional Director). Section 8 of the same Ordinance provides for the designation of AWEOs designated by the PNP, AFP, NBI, PCG, and other law enforcement agencies, provided these personnel have undertaken necessary training. The Director and the law enforcement agency concerned may enter into a Memorandum of Agreement for the conduct of training and joint evaluation of performance of designated AWEOs. The functions and duties of the AWEOs are set forth in Section 14, to include inter alia, seize and arrest, surveillance, and monitoring of aquatic wildlife-related activities.</p> <p>Bantay Dagat, also known Fish Wardens are community-based, volunteer organizations in the Philippines trained by DA-BFAR on fisheries law enforcement and deputized by Local Chief Executives (LCEs) to work within 15 kilometers of the shore (i.e., municipal waters) with local and national government officials (i.e., DA-BFAR, DILG) and law enforcement agencies to protect the marine environment, especially patrolling against illegal fishing, and to provide assistance in rescue operations.</p> <p>Similar to DA_BFAR’s AWEOs, DENR also deputizes field personnel as <u>Wildlife</u></p>	<p>Assessment Community law enforcers (i.e., Bantay Dagat/Bantay Gubat) are deputized by Local Chief Executives after receiving training by either the DA-BFAR or DENR and law enforcement agencies. Intensive training is required for any of the deputization processes for community law enforcers on ENR and fishery laws, including enforcement processes and protocols.</p> <p>There is considerable overlap in the role and functions of government agencies, law enforcement groups, and the LGUs. During PPG consultations, Coastal law enforcement agencies such as the MARINA, PNP Maritime Group and Philippine Coast Guard, all expressed commitment and support to LGUs, including training support community members toward deputization as Bantay Dagat/Bantay Gubat and new members of government agencies as AWEOs/WEOs in this project and in participation in joint multi-sectoral patrols and coastal law enforcement operations in the LCAs and MPANs.</p> <p>PNP Maritime Group proposed partnerships with LGUs through bilateral MOAs for its “Adopt a Marine Protected Area (AMPA)” Project and for recruitment of marine guards coming from community groups for biodiversity conservation and enforcement.</p> <p>MARINA Central Office also proposed for the review and possible adoption of law enforcement models or programs implemented in areas in the country (e.g., Zamboanga; Cagayan). The proposal involves collaboration of law enforcement groups with government agencies and respective law enforcements units and personnel (e.g., DENR/DA-BFAR), the LGUs and their deputized community enforcers, the Communication groups (e.g., NTC, CoastWatch), and the Judiciary, for a collaborative Coastal Law Enforcement and Response (CLEAR) network that protects the environment, and the security and safety of people in project sites. These programs require that community enforcers deputized by the LGUs, and all the new recruits to the law enforcement groups, undergo training not only on Safety and Security as prescribed under each agency, but also on Environment, to which includes enforcement and engagement protocols (e.g., MARINA Region XI already reports of existing MAR POL monitoring in the region). The project will benefit from this inter-agency partnership and multisectoral collaboration.</p> <p>Management Measures Under Output 1.1.3 (Training resources are developed and the training of targeted MPA personnel is undertaken), the project will conduct training of targeted MPA</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
			<p>Enforcement Officers (AWEOS) under the Wildlife Act to patrol forests and local conservation areas in partnership with LGUS. DENR also deputizes Bantay Gubat, for local forest protection (inc. mangrove forests), and wildlife species (inc. dugong and marine turtles).</p>	<p>personnel (which include LGUs, barangay and community representatives) on MPA planning, governance, and enforcement in project sites, to address the conservation of ETP MW in MPAs. Under Output 1.1.3, training modules will also include topics on the Environment Code, the Fisheries Code, and relevant national laws and policies that will strengthen knowledge and understanding of community members to be deputized as Bantay Dagat or Bantay Gubat or new AWEOS/WEOS, applicable. All project-trained individuals will be officially certified at the end of training; re-training and up-training will also be conducted in succeeding years, as needed. Training will be provided for by the project in partnership with DENR/DA and law enforcement groups (e.g., PNP Maritime, MARINA, PCG). The networking of this group will be addressed under Output 2.1.1 (provincial MPA network) where possible institutional arrangement and agreements will be arrived (e.g., CLEAR; Joint Environmental, Security and Safety or JESS; etc.)</p> <p>To lessen negative impacts on communities arising from insufficient training, the project, as reflected in the ESMF, will integrate UNDP’s programming principles, including human rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and accountability in the training of targeted MPA personnel. Training on human rights-based approaches will also be extended to representatives from NGAs. They will also be trained on gender equality and women’s empowerment. Grievance redress mechanism will be set-up to address complaints and concerns against Bantay Dagat / AWEOS. Clear protocols that follow a no-harm approach will be established, which details the enforcement system to be set-up, protocols and procedures, apprehension process and incentive systems. Training, education, and information materials will be made available and accessible to stakeholders under Output 3.1.1.</p> <p>The Social and Environmental Safeguards Specialist will undertake further assessments and develop targeted management measures related to the impact of insufficient training on communities during implementation prior to any activities that may cause harm to communities, based on the assessment procedure in ESMF. The safeguards officer will be responsible for the monitoring and reporting of project’s performance of the SESP and ESMF (or IPPF as needed, if there are IPs that will potentially be affected) related to this risk.</p>
<p>Risk 5: Perceived economic displacement of fishers and resource users due to restriction of access and availability to resources in MPAs, including in established strict protection zones or no take zones, among others, within the proposed LCAs and the MPANs.</p> <p>Human Rights: P.5, P.6 and P.7; Standard 5: 5.2 and 5.4</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Under the Fisheries Code, the municipal/city government (also referred to as local government units or LGUs) have jurisdiction over municipal waters (Sect 16) which are waters within the 15 kilometers from shore of respective coastal municipality/city (Sec 18). The municipal fishers are given preference in</p>	<p>Assessment</p> <p>There is a common perception that local communities will be economically displaced due to restriction of access and availability to resources brought about by MPA establishment (e.g., fishers will not be allowed to fish thus leading to loss of income and livelihood). Contrary to this perception, several studies have already shown that MPAs have contributed to increasing fish biomass through spillover effect (e.g., Russ and Alcala, 1995) thereby increasing fish catch and fishers’ income. Evidence</p>

<p>Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.6 and 6.9.</p>			<p>the grant of fishery rights (Sec 17) and use of demarcated fishery areas to engage in fish capture, mariculture and/or fish farming (Sec 20), and the priority to exploit municipal and demarcated fishery areas of the said municipality (Sec 21). The concerned LGUs in consultation with the Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Councils (or FARMCs, composed of resident fisherfolk) may establish fishery refuge and sanctuaries in municipal waters. The FARMCs may also recommend fishery refuge and sanctuaries, with certain provisions (i.e., at least 15% of total coastal areas, based on available science) (Sec 81).</p> <p>In the project sites, about 12 marine sanctuaries, fish sanctuaries or refuges, 1 environmentally critical area (ECA), and several strict protection zones have already been established by the LGUs or management bodies in project sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mayo Bay (Site 1): Mabiga & Cailucan FS (Tarragona Mun. Ordinance 2012-04); Mayo Bay ECA (Mati City Resolution 2011-275) - Pujada Bay Protected Landscape and Seascape (Site 2): Mamali FS (Mati City Ordinance 2011-275); Bigue, Dawan FS (Mati City Ordinance 2003-101); Butuasan & Mangihay FS (Mati City Ordinance 1997-29); North Pujada Is. FS (Mati City Ordinance 1995-11); the Strict Protection Zones (SPZs) are mostly mangrove areas (PBPLS PAMP 2012-2017) - Malita-Don Marcelino (Site 3): Tubalan Cove FS, Puting Bato FS; New Argao; unnamed: 500m from shore coastal waters (Malita SB Resolution 2008-55); Pamongot FS, Bowas FS, and Lawa FS (Don Marcelino Municipal Ordinance 2009-10) <p>Based on the JMC MPAN definition, these areas are collectively referred as locally managed MPAs (LMMPAs) as they are primarily community-based and community-led, with barangay representatives (i.e., barangay is the smallest unit of government in the Philippines), local fishermen's associations, fisherfolk groups, and other People's Organizations (POs) involved in</p>	<p>to this is provided locally (also see Davao Gulf MPAN Management Plan 2018) and even globally (see Cabral et al. 2020).</p> <p>MPA establishment in the Philippines goes through an iterative consultation process prior to its legal declaration as an MPA through a local ordinance. This is required by law to ensure full participation of local communities, particularly fisherfolk, in the identification, management and decision-making process.</p> <p>A review of local ordinances of the four LGUs (i.e., Tarragona, Mati, Malita, and Don Marcelino) have shown that various types of LMMPAs have already been established. The project has no intention to establish additional fish reserves for strict protection. Rather, the project is proposing to strengthen the management effectiveness of <i>local communities</i>, particularly fisherfolk organizations, who are managing these already established and locally managed marine or fish sanctuaries, or refuges. Some of these established marine or fish sanctuaries, or refuges are de facto "strict protection zones" or 'no-take' zones based on provisions in the local ordinances, while some have provisions for buffer zones allowing artisanal fishing practices, or multiple uses (e.g., recreation or tourism). Several of these marine sanctuaries were not fully enforced (e.g., no management plans, communication plans, enforcement plans; no demarcation of areas in place, and no clear management bodies, few organized and registered groups trained for effective management, etc.). The project proposes to provide technical assistance in defining fisheries and biodiversity conservation objectives within these established marine sanctuaries, including the identification and monitoring of intact habitats (e.g., seagrass beds, coral reefs, mangrove areas) to maximize protection activities in the delivery of results. The project may consultatively consider proclaiming additional small sanctuaries (e.g., nesting beaches), to protect key ETP MW populations and/or habitats (e.g., Dahican Beach, nesting sites for 3 species of marine turtles).</p> <p>The proposed LCA designations of Mayo Bay and the coastal waters of Malita and Don Marcelino will not pose as additional restriction to local communities' right and access to the marine resources. Rather, they will uphold provisions of the Fisheries Code giving coastal communities, particularly fishers' preferential use of municipal waters. As such, LCA designation will not restrict municipal fishers' rights and access to these waters, but rather protect their rights as provided by law (Fisheries Code). To achieve the full potential of community-established and managed areas, the project is proposing for the establishment and management of marine protected area networks (MPANs) (based on the DENR-DA-DILG JMC on MPAN) and complement DA-BFAR initiatives on Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM), ensuring evidenced-based fisheries management (e.g., a 3-month seasonal fishery closure from commercial fishing operations has been established in Davao Gulf by DA-BFAR with LGUS to protect small pelagics from fishing during reproductive peaks).</p> <p>Furthermore, during PPG consultation, various stakeholders (particularly LGUs) have different interpretations and understanding of MPANs. The proposed provincial MPA Networks will <u>not</u> restrict access of fishers <u>nor</u> will it take away revenues from respective LGUs income generated from resource users' fees. Rather, MPANs provide MPA management bodies and the LGUs the platform to develop and strengthen local capacities for joint MPAN management planning, sustainable financing (e.g., user fee system), law enforcement and monitoring, with support from national government agencies (DENR/DA/DILG) and law enforcement groups (e.g., PNP Maritime, Marina, PCG). Appropriate training modules and guidelines, as presented under the JMC MPAN (Output 1.1.3), and messaging will be developed to</p>
--	--	--	---	---

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
			<p>its establishment, management and decision-making process. However, majority of these community-established and managed areas are small and not properly integrated into ecosystem (e.g., FMA) or seascape approach (e.g., NIPAS), which limits their ability to function as an MPA that effectively contribute to achieving sustainable development, food security, biodiversity conservation goals, and resiliency to climate impacts. Linking MPAs into networks (MPANs) is recommended under the DENR-DA-DILG Joint Management Circular (JMC) on MPANs.</p> <p>Pooled resources from participating agencies, LGUs and MPA Management Bodies provide a multiplier effect for effective management of the MPANs, individual LCAs/MPAs but also of the individual marine marine/fish sanctuaries or refuges (as experienced in Davao Gulf MPAN, established with technical support from the SMARTSeas Project).</p>	<p>ensure improved understanding of SPZs/NTZs within LCAs/MPAs vis-a-vis MPANs (Output 3.1.1).</p> <p>Representatives of fisherfolk associations/Bantay Dagat and tribal chief (e.g., in Tarragona), given their limitations on jurisdiction (i.e., within their respective LGUs) and resources, showed interest on coastal law enforcement (CLE) training/re-training exercise (Output 3.1.1), and joint enforcement activities within the LCAs/MPAs/MPANs, in partnership with law enforcement groups. According to PNP Maritime, under their Adopt a Marine Protected Area (AMPA) program, the presence of police officers boosts the confidence of community fish wardens assigned to patrol MPAs, improves compliance among fishers to MPA and fisheries regulations, and transparency and accountability through check-and-balance.</p> <p>At the MPAN level, MARINA’s proposed collaboration among various agencies with LGUs and community enforcers using enforcement network of (e.g., Coastal Law Enforcement and Response [CLEAR] or Joint Environmental, Security and Safety [JESS]) will contribute to achieving project objectives and thus can serve as models for further review and refinement during project implementation (Output 2.2.1).</p> <p>Management measures</p> <p>There will be no physical displacement of individuals or groups arising from the legal designation of LCAs and MPANs in project sites nor will there be restriction of availability and access to resources of fishers. The project will not support physical displacement or relocation of communities at all.</p> <p>The project will not establish new or additional marine areas for strict protection that will cause economic displacement of fishers and resource users due to restriction of access and availability to resources in project sites. To address the misconception of “perceived economic displacement”, the project will integrate a targeted capacity building (Output 1.1.3) and IEC/CEPA activities (Output 3.1.3) in project implementation, to ensure that stakeholders, particularly fisherfolk and coastal communities, understands the objectives and merits of MPAs/MPANs, particularly in enhancing fisheries productivity and promoting conservation of biodiversity as well as in community resiliency from climate change impacts.</p> <p>The project will actively engage local communities and stakeholders in project activities to ensure that the “preferential use rights” of residential fishers in municipal water (i.e., 15 km from shore) is respected and ensured. Project will provide technical assistance and support to local communities, particularly the affected individuals and groups, in the development of livelihood interventions under the Process Framework (Output 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.2.1). The proposed MPAs (Output 2.1.1, 2.1.2), and MPANs (Output 2.2.1) cover municipal waters (i.e., 15 kilometers from shore) as areas of effective operations, MPAs and MPANs will deter</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
				<p>encroachment of commercial fishing operations into the MPAs and MPAN. Municipal fishers are still allowed especially when compliant to Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) and local Coastal Resources Management (CRM) Code or Fisheries Ordinances and regulations (e.g., municipal fishers require registration under BFAR/LGU’s Fisherfolk Registration (Fish R), and their boats and gears under the National Program for Municipal Fishing Vessels and Gears Registration (Boat R) program. The project will provide technical assistance in facilitating this process during project implementation.</p> <p>Project interventions will include strengthening of the communities’ capacity to effectively manage these resources, for effective management, sustainable financing, and coastal law enforcement. The local communities will be the primary stakeholder of the project. Applying the Process Framework, these affected communities will be prioritized as partners for development interventions (livelihood, ecotourism, BDFES, etc.) (Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). Networks of MPAs will improve the capacities of each community-established and managed areas and its relevant management body in law enforcement, biodiversity conservation, increasing fish stocks and other marine resources, among others (Output 2.2.1).</p> <p>The project will contract the service of community-based marine conservation NGO to consultatively prepare, develop and implement livelihood activities for affected stakeholders, based on the Process Framework. Furthering the learning of stakeholders, orientation and training on MPA/MPAN will be undertaken (Output 1.1.3 and Output 3.1.1) and hands-on experience (Outputs 2.1 and 2.2) in project implementation.</p>
<p>Risk 6: There is a risk that IPs in the project sites might not be adequately involved in project design and / or potentially be impacted by project activities, some of which will require a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).</p> <p>Accountability: P.13, P.14 and P.15 Standard 1: 1.2 Standard 4: 4.3 and 4.5 Standard 5: 5.2 and 5.4 Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.6 and 6.9</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>		<p>Assessment During stakeholder consultation meetings with NCIP Region XI, the local government units, and the Indigenous Peoples Mandatory Representatives, it was reported the presence of Indigenous Peoples with existing Certificates of Ancestral Domain Titles (CADTs) and pending CADT applications (See the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Annex 9). However, these CADTs are primarily Inland/upland areas of the project sites. Only the coastal water of Don Marcelino has ancestral water claim, within which 3 marine/fish sanctuaries are established. Based on the livelihood profile from Ancestral Domains Sustainable Development Plans (ADSDPPs), less than 5% are involved in fishing, and potentially will be affected by the project.</p> <p>As reflected in the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) (see Annex 10), the project will secure Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples consistent with the Republic Act 8371 or the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997 (IPRA), Expanded National Integrated Protected Areas System Act of 2018, and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Standards on Indigenous</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
				<p>Peoples (IPs). Additionally, the IPs will also be consulted and engaged in the development of management measures in accordance with Process Framework.</p> <p>Management measures Targeted assessments will be prepared following the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (See Annex 10). These will be developed following IPRA and in accordance with the UNDP’s policy on IPs. No project activities for indigenous peoples will commence without these assessments as indicated in the IPPF. IPs will be engaged in all phases of the project as detailed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 9).</p> <p>Culturally appropriate consultations through Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process will be carried out early in project implementation to secure Certification Precondition from NCIP.</p> <p>The Social and Environmental Safeguards Specialist will undertake further assessments and develop targeted management measures (IPP) related to the impact on IPs based on the IPPF. The safeguards officer and gender officer will be responsible for the implementation, monitoring and reporting of project’s performance related to IPP and IP related Gender Action Plan.</p>
<p>Risk 7: Existing gender biases and / or socio-economic roles may limit the opportunities for women to fully participate in project decision-making and activities or to benefit from the employment, income or other benefits generated by the project.</p> <p>Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: P.10, P.11 and P.12; Accountability: P.13 and P.14 and P.15 Standard 6: 6.3 and 6.9</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>		<p>Assessment During PPG consultations, a number of women’s groups showed involvement in various community based socio-economic enhancement activities. In fishermen associations, the majority are composed of men and very few are with representation of women. However, according to some fishers, women usually have other roles, to include vending of fish catches. Some women will also act as ad hoc representatives of households during community consultations when men are at work or fishing. Most women are not registered as members of fishing group associations, or BFAR’s/LGU’s Fish R program, and their participation and inputs to community decision making were not well documented.</p> <p>Management Measures Gender will be mainstreamed throughout the project. A Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan has been prepared for the project (See Annex 11). Gender mainstreaming will also be incorporated in various capacity building interventions of the project. The project will thus ensure compliance to the guidelines of the JMC MPA/MPAN which state that at least 40% of members of the management body should be women (Output 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1). The Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) Program that will be formulated and implemented in the project sites (Output 3.1.1) will consider and mainstream gender dimension. The project will assess and propose solutions to overcome the cultural, social, religious, and other constraints on women’s participation in the project.</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>Risk 8: Exclusion of disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups and limitation in capacity among community members, resulting in exclusion from full participation in project livelihood activities</p> <p>Human Rights: P.5 P.6, P.7; Accountability: P.13, P.14 and P.15 Standard 6: 6.3 and 6.9</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Particular attention is paid to the rights and special needs of indigenous elders, youth, children, persons with disabilities, including consideration of special measures to improve their participation in decision-making and their general well-being.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the gender officer assigned in the PMU will monitor and report on the project’s performance in the implementation of gender action plan.</p> <p>Assessment This group has not yet been identified during the PPG Phase. However, the project anticipates the presence of these individuals and groups in project sites and the possibility of their exclusion from being involved in project activities and the benefits of development interventions.</p> <p>Management Measures The project will ensure to leave no one behind by protecting and supporting disadvantaged and vulnerable individuals, specifically those with special needs, indigenous, elders, youth, children, and persons with disabilities.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and the Grievance Redress Mechanism prepared for the project will ensure that disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals directly impacted by the restrictions on marine resource use in the MPAs will not be excluded from full participation in project livelihood activities.</p> <p>No project activities that could result in economic displacement, reduced access to ancestral water or resources, or require livelihood restoration support for economically displaced communities, including indigenous people, can commence until required further studies have been completed and approved and the identified social and environmental mitigating and monitoring measures are put in place.</p> <p>The project will develop the Process Framework to ensure that members of potentially affected communities can participate in the design of project components, to ensure their participation in livelihood activities.</p> <p>The gender officer will be responsible for the implementation, monitoring and reporting of the project's performance related to Gender Action Plan. The project will also hire community-based marine conservation NGO to consultatively prepare, develop and implement livelihood activities for affected stakeholders, based on the Process Framework.</p>
<p>Risk 9: There is a risk that tourism operators and other key sectors dependent on project sites for ecosystem services might use the project to greenwash their operations</p> <p>Human Rights: P.5, P.6 and P.7; Accountability: P.13, P.14 and P.15 Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Ecotourism development has generated significant benefits through employment opportunities and led to improvement of livelihoods of those able to participate in the tourism industry. LGUs play an important role in creating participation options in the tourism industry as well as in related service or business industries. However, mass tourism experiences in other areas (e.g., Puerto Princesa,</p>	<p>Assessment Tourism operators (hotels, beach resort owners, tour operators) and other key sectors may use the project to market themselves as environment friendly and to advocate the conservation of ETP MW and their habitats, but their actual practices may negatively harm the environment, including ETP MW and critical habitat. Such actions may include the lack of proper wastewater treatment system, disregard for the carrying capacity of tourism sites, clearing of beach forest areas to give way to construction of buildings, installation of beach lights, potentially add light pollution in nesting beaches, disorienting turtle hatchlings, among others. Some of these</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
			Palawan) have shown local vulnerabilities such as increased pollution and resource degradation, and risks of tourism dependency and other unintended socio-economic consequences (Boer 2012).	<p>establishment may want to go into partnership with the LGUs and the project as a form of greenwashing.</p> <p>Certain coastal areas (e.g., Mayo Bay) have already been subjected to potentially destructive tourism practices. The SUC’s in the area (e.g., DOCST) has conducted a study to identify certain tourist practices (e.g., jet ski) to be detrimental to ETP MW individuals and populations and is working with the DOT and the LGUs in coming with plans for better management of tourism practices in the area. Additionally, due to the pandemic, health protocols have also been developed by the LGUs with DOT, to ensure safety and security of tourists and coastal communities.</p> <p>Management Measures</p> <p>The project will ensure compliance with UNDP’s Policy on Due Diligence and Partnerships with the Private Sector and the Risk Assessment Tool and the Risk Assessment Tool Guidelines (2013) to strengthen the risk management capacity of the project to work with the private sector. The project will ensure that potential partners and stakeholders comply with government environmental regulations and standards, evidenced by certificates of compliance and relevant permits from concerned agencies (e.g., effluent, air emission, toxic and hazardous wastes - EMB; solid wastes and sanitation, sanitary permits, and health certificate - LGU; effluent from boat - MARINA; DOT accreditation; among others).</p> <p>Under Output 1.1.2, the project will also provide training on JMC on Marine Wildlife Interaction to LGUs, community organizations and the tourism operators for the better management of ETP MW, particularly if promoted for use as tourism products. Under Output 3.1.1, a targeted awareness-raising and educational campaign to address proper conduct of both tourism operators and tourists/recreational users alike to reduce the impacts of their activities on the environment and secure safety and security of local communities.</p>
Risk 10: There is potential risk that “upstream” aspects of the project (Outcome 1), which includes planning, establishment, management, financing and monitoring of network of MPAs, and capacity building interventions, may cause environmental and social impacts	<i>I = 3 L = 2</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	Outcome 1.1 objective is improved institutional capacities and decision-support tools that provide the framework for the planning, establishment, management, financing and monitoring of a network of MPAs that will more effectively conserve ETP MW.	<p>Assessment</p> <p>Outputs under Outcome 1 includes national oversight for, and inter-agency coordination in, the conservation of ETP MW is enhanced (Output 1.1.1); policies, guidelines and plans that enable the conservation of ETP MW in MPAs are improved (Output 1.1.2); and training resources are developed and the training of targeted MPA personnel is undertaken (Output 1.1.3).</p> <p>Management Measures</p> <p>A scoped Strategic Environment and Social Assessment (SESA) will be prepared, as needed, and in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including assessing potential risks and impacts of outputs and activities under Outcome 1 that are currently not specified. Based on the SESA, the Environment and Social Management</p>

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” response). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Question 5 and 6 not required for Low-Risk Projects</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)?
Risk Description	Impact and Likelihood (1-5) ¹	Significance (Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
				Plan will be developed detailing the management measures to be implemented to mitigate any potential social and environmental impacts of the project.




QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?																								
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Low Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Moderate Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Substantial Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">High Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>					Low Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>				Moderate Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				Substantial Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>				High Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Low Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>																							
Moderate Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																							
Substantial Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>																							
High Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>																							
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)																								
Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High Risk projects.																								
<u>Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Status? (completed, planned)																				
<i>if yes, indicate overall type and status</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Targeted assessment(s) Completed at PPG: gender analysis, stakeholder analysis; climate risk screening (Annex 20) The following targeted assessments are planned: i) number, types and operational extent of fishing gears, boats, fishing practices, and ecotourism development																				

				interventions (Risk 2); ii) users or user groups that might be affected (Risk 5); and iii) Project's impact on IP's human rights, Cultural Heritage and / or traditional livelihoods (Risk 6).
		<input type="checkbox"/>	ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment)	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)	Scoped SESA for the policy work under Outcome 1 (Risk 10) (planned)
Are management plans required? (check if "yes")		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<i>If yes, indicate overall type</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Targeted management plans (e.g., Indigenous Peoples Plan, Resettlement Action Plan, others)	Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF; completed) Indigenous Peoples Plan (planned) Process Framework (planned) Stakeholder Engagement Plan (completed) Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (completed)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan)	Planned
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework)	Completed
Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?			Comments (not required)	
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

	Human Rights	✓	Risks 4, 5, 8 and 9
	Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment	✓	Risk 7
	Accountability	✓	Risks 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	✓	Risks 1, 2, 6 and 9
	2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks	✓	Risk 3
	3. Community Health, Safety and Security	✓	Risk 1 and 4
	4. Cultural Heritage	✓	Risk 6
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	✓	Risk 5 and 6
	6. Indigenous Peoples	✓	Risk 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
	7. Labour and Working Conditions	✓	Risk 4
	8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	✓	Risk 2

Final Sign Off

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

Signature	Date	Description
DocuSigned by:  QA Assessor: Maria Theresa V. Espino-Yap, Programme Analyst, Climate Action Programme	03-Jan-2023	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.
DocuSigned by:  QA Approver: Edwine Carrie, Deputy Resident Representative	22-Jan-2023	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.
DocuSigned by:  PAC Chair:	25-Jan-2023	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.

DS
TR

DS
KDC

Selva Ramachandran, Resident Representative		
---	--	--

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		
<p>INSTRUCTIONS: The risk screening checklist will assist in answering Questions 2-6 of the Screening Template. Answers to the checklist questions help to (1) identify potential risks, (2) determine the overall risk categorization of the project, and (3) determine required level of assessment and management measures. Refer to the SES toolkit for further guidance on addressing screening questions.</p>		
<p>Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind</p> <p>Human Rights</p>		Answer (Yes/No)
P.1	Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
P.2	Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g., government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	No
P.3	Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g., project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.4	adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
P.5	inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? ²	Yes
P.6	restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	Yes
P.7	exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	Yes
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
P.8	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.9	adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
P.10	reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	Yes
P.11	<p>limitations on women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?</p> <p><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></p>	Yes
P.12	exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?	Yes

² Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender and transsexual people.

<i>For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.</i>		
Sustainability and Resilience: Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below		
Accountability		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.13	exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	Yes
P.14	grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders?	Yes
P.15	risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project?	Yes
Project-Level Standards		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
1.1	adverse impacts to habitats (e.g., modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	Yes
1.2	activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g., nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes
1.3	changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	risks to endangered species (e.g., reduction, encroachment on habitat)?	Yes
1.5	exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade?	No
1.6	introduction of invasive alien species?	No
1.7	adverse impacts on soils?	No
1.8	harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.9	significant agricultural production?	No
1.10	animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	Yes
1.11	significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms? ³	No

³ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#).

1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g., collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) ⁴	No
1.14	adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks		
<i>Would the potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
2.1	areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions?	Yes
2.2	outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? <i>For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events</i>	Yes
2.3	direct or indirect increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disasters 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
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
3.1	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g., roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams)	No
3.2	air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?	Yes
3.3	harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g., collapse of buildings or infrastructure)?	No
3.4	risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g., temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health?	No
3.5	transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g., explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.6	adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities' health (e.g., food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)?	No
3.7	influx of project workers to project areas?	No
3.8	engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property, or to support project activities?	Yes
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
4.1	activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site?	No
4.2	significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes?	No
4.3	adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g., knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	Yes

⁴ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Nagoya Protocol](#) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

4.4	alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance?	No
4.5	utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g., practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes?	Yes
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
5.1	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	No
5.2	economic displacement (e.g., loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	Yes
5.3	risk of forced evictions? ⁵	No
5.4	impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	Yes
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
6.1	areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.3	impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to screening question 6.3 is “yes”, then the potential risk impacts are considered significant and the project would be categorized as either Substantial Risk or High Risk</i>	Yes
6.4	the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.5	the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above.</i>	Yes
6.7	adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.</i>	Yes

⁵ Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights.

Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)</i>		
7.1	working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments?	Yes
7.2	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	No
7.3	use of child labour?	No
7.4	use of forced labour?	No
7.5	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity?	Yes
7.6	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle?	Yes
Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
8.1	the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
8.2	the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	Yes
8.3	the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals?	No
8.4	the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Montreal Protocol, Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention</i>	No
8.5	the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
8.6	significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	Yes