Annex 6: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| Project Title | Improving the flow of ecosystem services in biologically-rich watersheds of the Southern region of Haiti |
| Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 6314 |
| Location (Global/Region/Country) | Haiti |
| Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| Date | Submission Date October 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*** |
| Biodiversity and healthy ecosystems are key providers of ecosystem services supporting a range of human rights including those for food, health, life and safety. The targeted rural Haitian communities directly depend on biodiversity and ecosystems for their survival as they are exceptionally vulnerable to limitations in access to those services and biodiversity loss and are currently affected by food insecurity and climate-related hazards like floods and landslides. The project is expected to generate global environmental benefits by restoring tree cover, limiting land degradation and protecting biological diversity. It has been widely recognized that the severity of flooding in Haiti is a direct result of the lack of tree cover, and hence an important co-benefit of the project will also be to improve infiltration and slow run-off, resulting in reduced losses in the case of future flood events. This will especially benefit the local communities located in the buffer zones of protected or significant BD-rich areas, such as Parc Macaya and Lake Lachaux, in Southern Haiti. The project will support the inclusion of the communities in the targeted watersheds, so that local people are able and committed to conserving forest biodiversity. Pre-identified project sites are Aquin, Saint-Louis-du-Sud, Cavaillon, Les Cayes, Tiburon – Port-Salut, Corail – Anse-à-Veau.  Moreover, it will strengthen commodity-based watershed management, livelihoods and ecosystem services for approx. 321 832 smallholder farmers of which 170 633 women (49%) . The project promotes multiple environmental and social benefits at the landscape scale, ensuring the sustainability watershed areas and production systems by explicitly valuing not only the biodiversity value of these areas, but also the quantity and quality of farm-produced food, and the revenues received for livelihood support, through the creation of viable value chains as for example cocoa, coffee, fruit, medicinal plants, beekeeping, improved cultivation practice, enhanced transformation and storage of raw products. By supporting production and farming systems that require tree cover, the project will help to ensure access to income to help meet the basic rights to food security, water, education and health.  The project will directly work with the government of Haiti – in particular the Ministry of Environment (MdE) and its local representatives in the selected departments. It will enhance the government’s capacity for project management in the biodiversity area. Trainings will be provided to a range of stakeholders, in particular staff from the Planning unit of relevant institution. These trainings would cover matters like project management tools, resources monitoring, and project indicators/results monitoring.  Finally, the project will facilitate conflict resolution processes. It includes an output on ‘Conflict resolution mechanisms strengthened at the community level to limit tenure- and resource-use conflicts. This output will facilitate the resolution of conflicts over the access and use of land and natural resources in the targeted areas.  The human rights-based approach implies to consider the fact that different barriers to access to resources and services because of social norms, cultural values that limit the mobility and decision-making power may affect particular groups based on gender, age, culture or other. In addition to address gender equality as described below, the project will ensure a multigenerational inclusion and will particularly look at the implications on land tenure, access to business, perception over BD and the drivers of rural exodus. In addition, it will look into disabilities and chronic illness including HIV/Aids or short & long covid may affect participation and sharing the benefits from the income generation activities under the project. The project will also be informed by relevant age and land ownership or DB perception analyses carried out for the preparation of relevant UNDP-implemented projects in Haiti (including GEF project #9777 “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation”). |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project supports a participatory and gender-equitable approach to both the design and implementation of interventions.; it will strengthen commodity-based sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem services for 321 832 smallholder farmers, including 49% of women. However, it is acknowledged that, in the proposed project sites, men and women have different roles and interests in relation to the management of natural resources, and specifically in relation to the management of the production systems, as well as the overall livelihood support systems of the participating families. The promotion of tree-based production systems through the project may therefore have a number of potential gender-related implications, e.g. in relation to the control of economic resources within the family and community, balances in workload and levels of representation in decisions on natural resource governance (esp. with respect to conflict resolution). Given women’s roles in the charcoal value chain, sensitisation among project beneficiaries regarding environmentally damaging activities such as cutting down trees, may also indirectly limit women’s opportunities to use natural resources as a source of livelihood support. Therefore, the project will coordinate with UNEP GEF project “Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti” outcome 3.2 “At least two pilots of sustainable woodlots of fast-growing tree species established, with business plans for their management, to replace destruction of mangroves and native trees for charcoal production”. According to UNEP assessment, the demand from Haiti capital is the primary driver for charcoal production in comparison to local consumption needs.  During the PPG phase, a social and gender specialist carried out detailed analyses of these gender-based differentiations, beginning with a review of literature, and followed by field-visits and semi-structured gender-differentiated interviews with farm families, and meetings with women’s groups and other CBOs to identify and discuss gender issues and define corresponding gender strategies. Gender expertise is also provided by the UNDP country office and UNDP regional office. The PPG phase for the proposed project will also be informed by relevant gender analyses carried out for the preparation of relevant UNDP-implemented projects in Haiti (including GEF project #9777 “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation”). As an example, similarly to that project, in order to ensure that revenue-generation incentives are gender-responsive, community consultations will be conducted to assess which types of fruit trees and secondary products from native species as well as medicinal plants, typically managed in association with crops or in home gardens, would be of most interest to female beneficiaries. Women often take a leading role in small-scale processing and the commercialization of several tree products, besides the project foresees a range of financial services and entrepreneurship trainings through which women empowerment will be fostered.  The gender specialist will inform the preparation of the CEO Endorsement Request, in order to ensure that: i) all PPG studies and consultations are gender sensitive and allow women’s concerns to be expressed effectively; and ii) project indicators are, where appropriate, gender sensitive. A full gender assessment will be conducted, and a project-specific gender mainstreaming strategy and plan will be developed during the PPG phase. Some best practices that will be highlighted in the implementation of the project:  Participation of gender equality specialists in the implementation team,  Collaboration and support of women's organizations or organizations that promote and experience promoting gender equality.  Promoting the equitable participation of women and men especially in decision-making.  Special measures to reach the participation target for women,  Development of gender skills of project staff, partners and implementers  In summary, through the report on the basic situation of men and women that will focus on the development problem that the project aims to address and the significant participation of women in consultations during the project preparation process (PPG) based on gender-sensitive participatory approaches, the gender focus of the project will encompass:  Possible changes in gender equality because, from the planning stage, gender differences in tasks, roles and responsibilities in intervention areas will be considered in order to lead to gender-sensitive ecosystem service options.  The production of evidence on gender gaps and progress towards gender equality in the project in general using: indicators that will be broken down by gender not only for gender equality outcomes, but for all expected outcomes; qualitative indicators that measure change for women and men;  Consider the qualitative aspects of women's and men's participation (consultations, decision-making and recommendation making).  Developing a strategy to achieve gender equality outcomes from the basic status report and consultation with gender stakeholders on how to achieve gender equality outcomes.  The provision of additional information to the project's gender strategy in the various sections (justification, project description, change theory, activity matrix, budget, etc.) |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The proposed project is consistent with several national and international strategies adopted by Haiti, including:  - National Bio Strategy Action Plan (NBSAP)  - Sixth National Report to the CBD (2019)  - Climate Action Plan (2015)  -National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA, 2006) and  - National Aligned Action Plan to Combat Desertification (2015)  The proposed project includes consultations and planning at the watersheds level, to mainstream biodiversity concerns into rural development in southern Haiti. Interventions to promote integration of biodiversity and land management issues will also be undertaken across the targeted watersheds. All this will be done with a view to strengthen the environmental management capacities of country partners. Component 1 of the project focuses on governance strengthening and capacity-building to mainstream biodiversity protection into watershed management; through this component, the project will work to establish watershed level governance framework working with the local authorities and relevant stakeholders, building on existing capacities readily available at the national level, for example through the National Centre for Geospatial Information (CNIGS). However, the project will not address financial sustainability in the form of targeted budget allocations from the general budget with the various ministries or capacity deployment. It is expected that this necessary component will be part of the advocacy performed by donors and UNDP out of their general functioning budget in Haiti.  The project is expected to generate global environmental benefits (GEB) by restoring tree cover, limiting land degradation and protecting biological diversity. The proposed project will prioritise interventions in communes situated in the buffer zones of protected or significant BD-rich areas, such as Parc Macaya and Lake Lachaux. In particular, mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the watershed development plans will strengthen the role of target areas as buffer zones around protected areas.  Globally-significant biodiversity to be protected may include *Plagiodontia aedium* F. Cuvier*, Coccyzus rufigularis* Hartlaub*, Loxia megaplaga* Riley*, Pterodroma hasitata* Kuhl*, Turdus swalesi* Wetmore*, Caretta caretta, Chelonia mydas, Eleutherodactylus* amphibians*, Cedrela odorata, Cleyera bolleana* Kobuski*, Guaiacum officinale, Juniperus gracilior, Carpodiptera simonis* Urb., *Coffea arabica*, *Citrus* spp., etc. (all endangered or vulnerable).  In addition, the proposed project will enhance environmental services – such as clean water and soil nutrients – as a basis for continued resilience. GEBs will be generated through the implementation of sustainable landscape management practices on 3 220 ha of land, including forests and cropland. As a result, specific GEBs expected from the project interventions include:  the mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns into watershed management frameworks, contributing to limit the fragmentation of natural habitats.  the promotion of genetically diverse cultivars, including local and traditional species;  the restoration of the tree cover selected from indigenous species.  Altogether, this will strengthen commodity-based livelihoods and ecosystem services for 321 832 smallholder farmers in the targeted areas.  Finally, the proposed project will implement awareness-raising in private sector on the benefits of sound environmental management for ensuring reliability of product; and among producers regarding the benefits of sound environmental management for productive and livelihood sustainability.)  The promotion of tree cover into existing farming systems, which will have multiple inherent benefits in terms of environmental sustainability through improved connectivity of landscapes for habitat integrity and biodiversity, soil protection, hydrological and nutrient cycling, carbon capture, and climate resilience**.** It will be complemented by support in small processing equipment/product transformation and storage for which green solutions will be sought not to offset the carbon capture and other environmental gains and to avoid creating a local trigger for fuelwood harvesting. In particular waste management (packaging) will be addressed and a product lifecycle/industrial ecology applied to identify potential for materials and resource efficiencies. Wherever feasible, options for symbiotic infrastructure (processing or other) over all the value chain or between them including with the surrounding communities will be sought.  Finally, the project also supports market-based instruments to promote sustainability in coffee and cacao, fruits and nuts systems through training on voluntary certification schemes, with improved environmental and social outcomes. As the financial resource and capacities despite the financial services provided may not enable farmers to reach international certifications, improvement of tracking systems will be the first step. It is likely that at the early-stage export demand for eco-products may not be a key driver of sustainability improvements in the value chain, especially as a balance with domestic demand needs to be striked and matched with a consumer’s awareness raising on the benefits of eco-products, however the project will ensure to promote a coherency with international certifications framework to facilitate future integration. The access to financial services will also enhance households’ resilience susceptible to absorb small-scale external shocks and household level/individual stresses.  Sustainability in face of disasters, climate change and crisis will be a direct outcome of the project in the long term. However, in the short to mid-term, the likeliness of a small-scale natural disaster event occurring in at least one of the communities being reasonably high, the project may face periods of inactivity or a temporary reorientation of farmers engagement into rebuilding their productive system. However, the distribution of risks amongst the sites/communities will ensure that rapid recovery can be engaged (example obtention of seedlings from another location). Equipment and storage will be designed to mitigate their risk of damage or loss in the case of adverse event. The orientation towards low maintenance conservative methods will also facilitate continuity of the productive system even in the case of health epidemics affecting the labor force, together with community management systems. Logistics, access to market and handling will all be screened in the light of possible sanitation measures.  Finally, the project foresees an exit strategy to be developed during the project document development phase. This exit strategy will be implemented by the Ministry of Environment with the support of the project. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| A mapping of all stakeholders and inclusive consultation process will take place. Particular attention will be made to ensure a representativity of all communities, gender, age, disabilities or chronic illness including Covid-19. For disabilities and illness, it will look at the mechanism that can ensure a participation to the livelihoods activities, and communities or family mechanisms to address time-bound activities in case of temporary incapacity.  Extensive consultations were already conducted to prepare the formulation of the PIF, which included governmental bodies, private sector representatives, donor organisations and Civil Society Organisations (CSO). Further consultations will be conducted with a special focus placed on the consultation of local farmers, as well as Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and professional organisations representing the private sector.  As expected for outcome of Component 3 (strengthening of market-based practices for commodity-related SMEs to further increase the demonstrated value of BD-rich ecosystems), extensive engagement with the private sector will be performed through training susceptible to eliciting an “entrepreneurship spirit” with local populations, working with cooperatives and other private organisations to strengthen transformation units, facilitating market linkages and funding. In this sense there may be more difficulties to ensure the engagement of particular segments of the value chains, as for example larger companies, exporters or consumers.  In addition to informing affected people of UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism, a project level grievance mechanism will be established (see Stakeholder Engagement Plan for details). |

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | | | **QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High** |
| ***Risk Description***  ***(broken down by event, cause, impact)*** | ***Impact and Likelihood (1-5)*** | ***Significance***  ***(Low, Moderate Substantial, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High*** |
| The proposed project could inadvertently limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resourcesif the different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services are not considered.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: P6, P7, P11, P13, P14* | I = 3  L =2 | Moderate | If inadequately formulated and managed, there is the potential for a focus on perennial cash crops to have differentiated, and negative gender implications due to existing gendered differences in economic and productive roles in some commodity-based value chains. Given women’s roles in the charcoal value chain, sensitisation among project beneficiaries regarding environmentally damaging activities such as cutting down trees, may also indirectly limit women’s opportunities to use natural resources as a source of livelihood support. | To reach their full potential, women must be able to exercise some control over the natural resources they use. To ensure sustainable access to these resources, there is an urgent need for relevant strategies to remove socio-cultural and legal barriers to their integration into the development process and their participation in decision-making bodies. Therefore, analyses of gender differentiation in economic and productive roles has been carried out during the PPG phase and a comprehensive Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) has been prepared accordingly. This GAAP – as well as the GAAP prepared during the PPG phase of the project “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation” – will inform the design of the proposed project activities, and, as relevant, definition of indicators and targets.  Gender disaggregated data will be collected for each project activity and the project will also emphasizes integration of women’s group in local governance mechanisms and the equitable participation of women in local institutional planning structures).  The project-supported watershed management frameworks and community-based land restoration plans will ensure engagement of women in the process. The local watershed committees will also ensure engagement of women.  The project’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan also ensures ongoing engagement of women in the project. |
| The proposed project could potentially affect inter-generational relationships if the different roles and positions of youth versus elders in land tenure, biodiversity awareness, rural exodus pressure and business literacy are not considered.  Corresponding checklist items marked “Yes” in the following table: P6, P7, P13, P14 | I = 3  L =2 | Moderate | If inadequately formulated and managed, there is the potential for intergenerational conflict or inequitable project benefits due to existing age-related differences in economic and productive roles in some commodity-based value chains. | The project will develop relevant strategies to remove socio-cultural and legal barriers to the integration into the development process and participation in decision-making bodies of all age groups taking into account their specific needs and vulnerability. Therefore, the project agronomist will give particular attention to age differentiation in economic and productive roles. Insights provided by the project “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation” – will inform the design of the proposed agroforestry and alternative economic activities, and, as relevant, definition of indicators and targets.  The project will also emphasize integration of diverse age groups in local governance mechanisms and the equitable participation of all age’s groups in local institutional planning structures. In particular, the project-supported watershed management frameworks and community-based land restoration plans will ensure engagement across age groups.  Depending on the market-based solutions proposed, technological literacy and capacity building/training will also be designed taking into account potential inter-generational differences. |
| The outcomes of the proposed project would be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: 2.2* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | Haiti is one of the country’s most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change on agricultural production systems, so any interventions will carry this risk.  Climate change could affect the viability of coffee and cocoa production systems, but these are more resilient than most of the current annual production systems. | The project will promote production systems with high levels of structural and compositional diversity, the use of climate-resilient varieties, and the maintenance of overall diversity of livelihood support options and farm systems, in order to maximise climate resilience, and therefore decrease overall vulnerability to climate change compared to the baseline situation. The specific climate-resilient varieties of crops and trees as well as best management practices will be determined by the project agronomist and technical partners (AYITIKA, ORE, etc.) based on the agro-climatic conditions of each project site, and on available best practices.  The promotion of native products to develop small volume value chains could be explored such a medicinal plant, or local mushrooms (djondjon). Actually 6% of household farmers are involved in collecting djondjon in the bushes (20% of women head of households), according to the Ag census. In addition, the project will take into account food security criteria and transformation opportunities as for example for the breadfruit.  New shade loving species such as black pepper and vanilla can be introduced in cacao/coffee systems to maximize farms productivity. However, for vanilla, concerns can be raised on the level of care necessitated by the crop (pollination, cutting, complex storage conditions). A realistic analysis on the level of maintenance and storage risks the communities are willing to invest in the long term will be performed through consultations and historical/previous projects evaluations.  The watershed management frameworks and community-based land restoration plans will also consider climate risks and incorporate climate resiliency into these planning frameworks/ documents. |
| The proposed project would be susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme natural disasters.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: 2.1* | I = 3  L = 4 | Moderate | Haiti is one of the country’s most vulnerable to the impacts of extreme natural events.  Natural disasters could damage the target production systems and affect market access routes, but the target production systems would not be more susceptible than existing systems. | The project activities will support the diverse resilient livelihood and farming systems in order to minimise the socio-economic implications in case of failure of individual productions. Ecosystem restoration – especially in ravine and stream-side areas – will also increase the protection services provided by ecosystems against some of these natural disasters (e.g. floods). However, in the short to mid-term, the likeliness of a small-scale natural disaster event occurring in at least one of the communities may be reasonably high, the project may face periods of inactivity or a temporary reorientation of farmers engagement into rebuilding their productive system. However, the distribution of risks amongst the sites/communities should ensure that rapid recovery can be engaged (example obtention of seedlings from another location). Equipment and storage will be designed to mitigate their risk of damage or loss in the case of adverse event. The assessment will provide an identification of the risks with frequency of occurrence in order to design mitigation activities for the short, mid and long term or communities specific. |
| Invasive alien species that have detrimental effects on ecosystem services and biodiversity may be introduced or promoted.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table:* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | 2 250 ha of biodiversity-rich ecosystems will be restored in pilot watersheds to strengthen the provision of ecosystem services. | The plant species used to restore degraded ecosystems will be carefully identified by scientific experts (incl. staff from the Botanical Garden of Cayes) to ensure that only native/endemic species are used, as proposed by the « Guide méthodologique pour la revégétalisation des berges des rivières et des embouchures du littoral », MDE (2020). This will ward off the use of species, in particular invasive alien plant species, that may have negative consequences for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Indigenous tree species will be used, complemented where appropriate by useful exotic species that are known not to be invasive or detrimental to local ecosystems, such as topinambour can be promoted near the fences as buffer crop to increase resilience and food security.  The project does not recommend aquaculture or fishing support as there are other partners in the area addressing the needs of the fishing communities. Besides, they entail a risk for fish species to be introduced in the to compete with endemic and native species, particularly potential contamination during disasters events or change in parasitic proliferation, asn (ex floods overspill).  Activities involving the removal of existing IAS will also ensure best practice management measures in place to ensure proper removal and disposal so as not to further the spread. |
| The proposed project could inadvertently cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services – including through the generation of waste and the misuse of genetic resources.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: 1.1,1.2,1.3,1.13,3.6,8.1, 8.2* | I = 2  L = 3 | Moderate | The overall objective of the project is precisely to improve habitat conditions, ecosystems health and ecosystem services. However, the uncontrolled development of commodity-based value chains could potentially run counter to these conservation objectives. It is unlikely that this risk will materialise given the limited scale at which these value chains operate. | The project interventions contribute to improving ecosystems’ health and services. To ensure this, appropriate species will be selected (see previous mitigation measure); moreover, staff members of MdE and MARNDR at national and local level will be trained to increase their understanding of ecosystem management and to build capacity of the MdE and MARNDR to fulfil their mandates.  With regards to the generation of waste during restoration activities, the protocols for these interventions will be designed by restoration experts with demonstrated experience in Haiti. Although such a risk is likely to be low, any risk to generate hazardous waste will be identified in the protocols and mitigation measures will be adopted accordingly.  One potential limited environmental risk of expansion and promotion of the coffee and cacao value chains is the potential for wet coffee milling to result in the release of organic pollutants (from leachate) to watercourses, if significantly expanded and inadequately managed. Watercourses, which act as habitats for aquatic flora and fauna may thereby be negatively impacted by increased Biological oxygen demand (BOD).  In the very limited locations where wet milling might occur within the areas of intervention of the project, the project will support the use of “ecological” washing and milling facilities in order to minimize the environmental impact of these existing facilities. The project will also provide technical assistance to farmers on converting waste coffee pulp into organic compost.  With regards to genetic resources, the project will specifically aim to mainstream the use of genetic resources into national legislation, with a view to update laws and policies.  Invasive alien species that have detrimental effects on ecosystem services and biodiversity  At the field level, restoration protocols will take into account genetic concerns, in particular with the promotion of indigenous species and avoidance of exotic ones. Good practice in seedlings and genetic diversity within an indigenous species will also be applied to promote biodiversity and resilience to parasites and adverse events. A differentiation has to be made between the trees and the plantations cultivars that call for different commercial objectives while at the same time should respond to pest resilience. Cocoa cultivars for example may valorize a specific genetic profile associated with a particular end product quality. Attention to microbiology (ex fermentation processes and bacterial diversity) will take into account both the reproducibility of results and the indigenous bacterial profile of the soil/location.  The potential environmental impacts and the mitigation hierarchy to avoid potential adverse impacts where possible, will be fully considered and an integral component of the watershed management frameworks (which will be developed based on principles of a SESA approach) and the community based land restoration plans. Necessary measures to protect habitat will be fully incorporated in these planning frameworks. |
| The project proposes utilizing intangible forms of cultural heritage (namely traditional *lakou* gardens) for commercial or other purposes.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table:* 4.4,4.5 | I = 1  L = 1 | Low | Traditional *lakou* gardens have a strong potential in terms of biodiversity conservation and support the resilience of local communities. As such, the project will promote this form of intangible cultural heritage. The lakou gardens have the additional benefit to be traditionally mostly managed by women. | The practice of keeping a traditional garden for household consumption and commercial use will be promoted, as this can have several socio-economic and environmental benefits. Any communities approached by the project in this perspective will be informed of the scope and nature of the proposed development, and the potential consequences of such development. Specific activities that could involve commercial use of cultural heritage will not proceed without meaningful, effective participation of affected communities and unless good faith negotiations with affected communities result in a documented outcome that provides for fair and equitable sharing of benefits from such commercial use and appropriate mitigation and safeguarding measures per the mitigation hierarchy. The project will seek to ensure that any such commercial use does not distort the meaning and purpose of the community's cultural heritage. .  In addition, scientific research to better understand and promote the principles of lakou gardens will be conducted. In particular, agro-technical support will be proposed to obtain an optimal performance of both vertical and horizontal garden exploitation. |
| The watershed management frameworks and land restoration plans could potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to natural resources to accommodate restoration processes, potentially resulting in changes to livelihoods and economic displacement.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: P6, 5.2, 5.4* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | The overall objective of the project is precisely to improve habitat conditions, ecosystems health and ecosystem services, including provision services. This may require restricting access to some natural resources, especially during the time of restoration. In addition, land-use changes may affect some livelihoods (e.g. coal producers). | Watershed management frameworks and land restoration plans may restrict availability, quality of and access to natural resources to accommodate restoration processes and sustainable land management. In addition, the project supports a transition to sustainable livelihoods. Therefore, a risk of economic displacement is identified.  Participatory and community-based governance of natural resources is fully mainstreamed into the project design. Therefore, the project will ensure that any restrictions of access to natural resources will be through community-based watershed management arrangements where the relevant community decides to restrict its own access based on an appropriate community-decision making process that reflects voluntary, informed consensus. Farmers that choose to transition to sustainable livelihoods with the support of the project will do so voluntarily. The project is not expected to lead to loss of livelihoods.  To ensure this, watershed management frameworks and land restoration plans will be co-developed with local communities, to ensure that no unduly restrictions are introduced without the informed consent of concerned parties (Output 2.1). However, restriction on trees cutting (total, limited to dry wood or to invasive species), rotational exploitation systems (wild forest non-timber products exploitation, fish stocks replenishment) or the definition of no-take portion (ex fruits and flowers for the use of birds, insects and other animals, medicinal plants for natural reseeding) may all be measures that could be perceived as restrictive in the short term, while offering productivity benefits in the long term.  A Process Framework will be utilized to establish the collaborative process for determining appropriate restrictions and mitigation measures in such situations. The Process Framework will be integral to the development of the watershed management frameworks through a process not only focused on measures for environmental sustainability but also about measures for the sustainability of people’s livelihoods. The Process Framework will lay the foundations for watershed management frameworks that identify activities which may be continued sustainably as distinct from those which must be restricted for environmental conservation and replaced with other more sustainable income generating activities. The Process Framework includes a description of the participatory processes by which potentially displaced persons will participate in determining potential access restrictions, mutually acceptable levels of resource use, identification of potential impacts, and management arrangements. It will outline eligibility criteria for measures to assist affected persons in improving and restoring livelihoods where affected, manage conflicts and grievances, arrange for participatory implementation and monitoring, and specify the necessary  budget.  In addition, the project will support conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms at the community level to limit and resolve tenure- and resource-use conflicts and identify potential concerns as early as possible (Output 1.7).  The project also aims to help reduce the existing youth rural exodus. This aspect will be investigated with the communities to understand the drivers for migration and the opportunities for green jobs through the value chains supported.  It should also be noted that that the project concept fully acknowledges the interdependence between ecosystems and livelihoods. No ecosystem restoration activities will be undertaken without taking into account the socio-economic implications of such activities. This is why the watershed management frameworks and land restoration plans that will be developed collectively and apply an integrated approach to natural resources management that includes consideration of socio-economic development.  NB: No eviction or physical relocation of populations will be undertaken under the project. |
| Local stakeholders may not own the project enough to be fully involved in project implementation to ensure a community-based approach.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table: P14* | I = 3  L = 2 | Moderate | Should it materialise, this risk would threaten the timely implementation of the project, as well as the participatory dimension of several of its planned interventions.  Based on historical experiences there is a risk that the balance of interest from the communities to receive financial assistance while adopting the project language outweigh their full commitment to BD, an ownership that will also be highly dependent on the exit strategy. | Outputs have been designed to ensure they are community-based and locally owned. Extensive and early consultations have been undertaken at the PIF phase and the PPG phase to build engagement and ownership during design to help prevent this risk. In addition, a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been prepared during the PPG phase. The project also aims to strengthen local community-based mechanisms for sustainable land management, such as the local watershed committees. |
| Potential child labour in promoted value chains.  *Corresponding checklist items marked “*Yes*” in the following table:* | I = 3  L = 2 | Moderate | There is a low risk of the use of child labour in home gardens, cacao and coffee agroforestry systems in Haiti.  This risk was initially investigated through the stakeholder consultations for the PPG phase of the project “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation”,  and was not considered significant. The 2017 report produced by the Bureau of International Labour Affairs of the US Department of Labour “Worst forms of child labour” Report from Haiti identifies the following sectors as the most at risk of involving child labour in Haiti: sugarcane agriculture, fishing and livestock, domestic work and construction. These sectors will not be targeted by the proposed projects. | The Project will not employ persons under the age of 18. The identity and age of all Project workers will be verified, using documentation such as a birth certificate, national identification card, passport, or medical or school record. If a child under 18 is discovered working on the Project, measures will be taken to immediately terminate the employment or engagement of the child in a responsible manner, taking into account the best interest of the child.  As a guideline, ILO child labour definition will be applied, referring to child labour when the activity is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children; and/or interferes with their schooling. Activities such as assisting in a family business outside school hours is considered positive; they provide them with skills and experience and help to prepare them to be productive members of society during their adult life.  According to the stakeholders consultations for the PPG phase of the project “Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation”, children contribute to the household commercial activity with tasks appropriate to their age and which contribute to the payment of their educational and health needs while teaching them occupational skills. However, in the light of possible eco-ethical certifications, the project will investigate as well if there may be conflicts in this regards. It will also look into possible gender differentiation in labour/resource access being transmitted from a young age and options for awareness raising.  The process to develop the integrated watershed management frameworks will be underpinned by the principles of SESA and will include consideration of potential of existing child labour in the value chains to ensure these risks are identified and the watershed frameworks identify measures to ensure proposed activities do not lead to child labour. The project and the watershed frameworks aim to support sustainable land management and sustainable value chains, including |
| Working conditions and  occupational health hazards in promoted value chains and land restoration activities is a risk.  Corresponding checklist items marked “Yes” in the following table:7.1, 7.6 | I = 3  L = 2 | Moderate | The project is unlikely to affect the status of occupational health hazards prevailing in the existing value chains and will rather improve community health through environmental services benefits.  In addition, some of the land restoration activities may involve activities that could present some occupational health and safety risks. | The project will ensure that the working conditions of project labour meet national labour laws and international commitments, consistent with UNDP’s SES 7. While the project will not involve significant project labour, some project workers may be engaged in land restoration activities that could present some level of occupational health and safety risk. Applicable parties should apply the following principles related to OSH:  • take all reasonable precaution actions to protect the health and safety of workers  • ensure that workers are not exposed to unnecessary or unreasonable risks  • implement an OSH management system consistent with international standards (e.g. ILO-OSH 200122, ISO  4500123)  • implement preventive and protective measures according to the order of priority:  o eliminating the hazard  o controlling the hazard at its source  o minimizing the hazard  o providing appropriate personal protective equipment  • document, investigate and report all accidents and occupational diseases, their causes, and implement appropriate corrective actions  • support the submission of safety observations (positive and negative) without retribution  • develop incentive programs to promote safety culture at the project and implement disciplinary actions to violators.  Land restoration plans that propose activities that may present occupational health and safety risks will include OSH measures to ensure the risks are effectively managed and incorporated into any contractual arrangements for workers involved in conducting the restoration activities.  Health hazards risks in the value chains selected particularly with a low maintenance approach won’t be affected by the project and may rate as low compared to other livelihoods activities. However, the project will analyse potential risks for vulnerable groups (as per risk above people with disabilities, chronic illness, pregnant mothers, children) and labour repartition. It will also look into the lessons-learnt from the covid epidemics and identify mitigation measures in the value chain. Logistics, access to market and handling will all be screened in the light of possible sanitation measures. The use of technology may also support more efficient and space/time distribution of people movements and interactions.  The project presents additional benefits by limiting the pressure and thus human presence and poaching in the protected area, a measure for vector control.  As an added benefit, the increase of natural corridors also acts as a zoonic epidemics mitigation measure by reducing over density in limited forest areas. This may not apply in locations where aquaculture will be introduced, thus a strict monitoring of fish densities will be performed.  Specific value chains may require adapted occupational health safety measure as for example safe bee keeping practice. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **X** | The risks identified in relation to the effective execution and sustainability of project activities, including potential social and environmental threats, are related to complexities of implementing watershed approaches, project management, and exogenous risks (e.g. climate change impacts and natural hazards). | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***High Risk*** | **☐** |  | | |
| **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 | | | | |
| ***Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)*** | **X** |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* |  | **X** | Targeted assessment(s) | Planned: Gender  Stakeholders Analysis  Site assessments for land restoration plans |
|  | **☐** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | **☐** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | NOTE: While a separate, stand-alone SESA is not proposed or required, the integrated watershed management frameworks that are supported by the project will be underpinned by the principles of a SESA process. |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | **X** |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* |  | **X** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) | Completed: Stakeholder Engagement Plan  Gender Action Plan  Planned: Incorporation of social and environmental management measures/plans in watershed management frameworks and community-based land restoration plans. This will include a Process Framework in the watershed management plans. |
|  | **☐** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) |  |
|  | **☐** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) |  |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** |  | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** |  |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **X** | In the proposed project sites, men and women have different roles and interests in relation to the management of natural resources, and specifically in relation to the management of the production systems, as well as the overall livelihood support systems of the participating families. The promotion of tree-based production systems through the proposed project may therefore have a number of potential gender-related implications, e.g. in relation to the control of economic resources within the family and community, balances in workload. | | |
| ***Accountability*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **☐** |  | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | **X** |  | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **X** |  | | |

**Final Sign Off**

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| 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](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/Pages/Homepage.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **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? | *Yes* |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | *Yes* |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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? [[1]](#footnote-1) | 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 |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | *Yes* |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | No |
| P.11 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?  *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being* | Yes |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  *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*. | No |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | No |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | Yes |
| 1.2 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? | No |
| 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) | Yes |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | No |
| 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? | Yes |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | Yes |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-2) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3) | Yes |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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 or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | Yes |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | No |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | No |
| 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? | No |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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) | No |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | Yes |
| 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** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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)? | No |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[4]](#footnote-4) | 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** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 6.1 areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)? | No |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 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)?  *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* | No |
| 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?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above* | No |
| 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?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | No |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note applies to project and contractor workers)* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | Yes |
| 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?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](https://ozone.unep.org/treaties/montreal-protocol?q=treaties&q=treaties/montreal-protocol)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) | 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? | No |

1. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)