



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji Initiation Plan

Project Title: COVID-19 Response support in the Pacific

Expected UNDAF/CP Outcome(s): United Nations Pacific Strategy (2018-2022) **Outcome 3: Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Empowerment:** By 2022, people in the Pacific in particular youth, women, and vulnerable groups, benefit from inclusive and sustainable economic development that creates decent jobs, reduces multi-dimensional poverty and inequalities, and promotes economic empowerment.

Expected CPD Output(s): UNDP Subregional programme document (SRPD) (2018-2022) **OUTPUT 1 (SRDP 3.1):** National and local institutions enabled to put in place evidence-based, risk informed and gender-sensitive policies, guiding participatory planning and budgeting processes aligned with SDGs

UNDP COVID Outputs:

Output 1: COVID-19 socio-economic and human rights impact and safeguarding progress towards the SDGs

Output 2: COVID-19 Inclusive and multi-sectoral crisis management and responses

Output 3: COVID-19 Resilient health systems response, including procurement and supply chain management

Initiation Plan Start/End Dates: 14 May 2020– October 2021

Implementing Partner: UNDP

Brief Description

This Initiation Plan (IP) outlines a proposal for a UNDP response to the COVID-19 crisis in response to the three UNDP global offers:

Output 1: Addressing the COVID-19 socio-economic and human rights impact and safeguarding progress towards the SDGs

Output 2: COVID-19 Inclusive and multi-sectoral crisis management and responses

Output 3: COVID-19 Resilient health systems response, including procurement and supply chain management

Programme Period: 2020-2021

Atlas Project Number: 00127582

Atlas Output ID: 00121499

00121503

00121504

Gender Marker: 2

Total resources required USD\$

Total allocated resources: USD\$ **897,300**

- Regular TRAC2 480,000

RRF 417,300

- Other:

- Donor

- Donor

- Government

Agreed by UNDP:

Resident Representative: Levan Bouadze

Levan Bouadze 14-May-2020

W

I. SITUATION ANALYSIS

The prevalence of the COVID-19 pandemic in the Pacific is relatively limited at mid-April 2020¹. However, the social and economic consequences of the measures taken to contain the pandemic are mounting. The closures of borders of major trading partners due to the pandemic is heavily affecting the Pacific Island Countries (PICs). It is already clear that the pandemic will not just go away in the near future and the significant disruption in the movement of goods, services and people will likely persist, negatively affecting industries such as tourism, shipping and fishing – the key drivers of the Pacific economies, as well as reducing remittances and raising the cost of imports of essential goods. Those industries are also the biggest formal and informal employers. Increased unemployment and lost livelihoods and heightened inequality stemming from COVID-19 will particularly affect vulnerable groups such as women, youth and small entrepreneurs, likely threatening the social stability of the countries.

Not only people are vulnerable to the crisis, the entire nations of the Pacific are vulnerable too. The impact of the pandemic and the economic crisis induced by it can be especially devastating for PICs that face high risks of climate-related disasters and highly vulnerable economies. According to the World Risk Index 2019, 4 out of 15 countries with the highest risk of disaster globally are in the Pacific – where Vanuatu ranks number 1, Tonga number 3 and Solomon Islands number 4.² Most recently, 4 countries - Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji and Tonga – in the region were hit by a devastating Tropical Cyclone Harold. Put simply, the PICs are frequently battered by climate-related disasters, which leaves them little space to be prepared for another disaster. Similarly, their economies are highly vulnerable to external shocks, given their dependence either on subsistence agriculture (fisheries) or sectors that are highly dependent on the international movement of goods and people. 4 of the 10 PICs are also Least Developed Countries, included in this category due to low GDP per capita, low Human Assets Index and high Economic Vulnerability Index.³ The ability of these small open economies to absorb impending negative shocks is limited.

Along with the major sources of budget revenues being hit by the pandemic, the PICs will need to find fiscal resources to expand spending to ensure, on the one hand, an adequate stimulus to their economies and maintaining productive capacities and employment, and on the other, provide adequate social services and protection to those needed.

The countries of the region are utterly unprepared to cope with this new type of crisis – the pandemic - as well as the accompanying economic crisis of this magnitude. The capacities of national authorities and health systems to cope with a possible public health crisis are very limited, should the pandemic take hold in PICs. Moreover, the countries are not prepared to deal with the medium-term economic consequences of the pandemic. As of mid-April, most of the Pacific Island Countries have drawn up different degrees of preparedness plans, however they have largely focused on the public health response; there is limited capacity to draw up plans and budgets to prepare for the social and economic impacts of the crises; and even less for formulating effective plans for building back better

¹ 18 confirmed cases in Fiji and so far no confirmed cases in other 9 PICTs namely Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI), Palau, Tuvalu, Tonga, Kiribati, Nauru, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands covered by UNDP MCO Fiji

² Bündnis Entwicklung Hilft and Ruhr University Bochum – Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict (IFHV) (2019). World Risk Report 2019.

³ UNDESA Committee for Development Policy (2018). The Least Developed Country Category: 2018 Country Snapshots.

to return to a more sustainable and resilient development path after the pandemic. It is not accident that the governments look up to the UN system for support in this respect.

Moreover, the availability of systematic social and economic data is extremely limited. For instance, household surveys are outdated in most of the Pacific Island Countries (carried out between 2001 and 2006). The World Bank has conducted its Enterprise surveys in only 5 out of 10 Pacific Island Countries that are covered by Pacific MCO, of which only one is relatively recent (2015) whereas the other four have been conducted more than a decade ago (2009). Other major surveys are also similarly non-existent, outdated or limited to small-scale, ad hoc surveys often carried out without sound methodologies that would also allow comparability of the results. Such lack of baseline data prevents the formulation of any evidence-based plans, strategies and budget allocations.

The UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji has started supporting the PICs in developing their early recovery strategies in response to this double crisis, particularly focusing on immediate actions to support health systems. However, given that the biggest impacts of the global pandemic are being transmitted through social and economic dimensions, the priority is increasingly shifting towards these dimensions. Moreover, the economic crisis induced by the pandemic is likely to stay in the medium-term, threatening the progress toward achieving the SDGs, necessitating strong UNDP engagement in supporting the social and economic response in the Pacific Island Countries. The SDG lens brings in the need to also address environmental and climate change related aspects—critical for building back better.

The United Nations is one of the biggest development players in the region bringing more than \$100m development assistance every year, of which UNDP remains the largest. Jointly UN has access to all levels of policy makers, and it is rightly placed to advice governments of PICs to deal with the crisis and “build back better”. UNDP has been actively working with the RCO in setting up a task force to lead in the social-economic impact assessment, which will be the foundation for sound policy advisory support. Initial consultations with other AFPs, IFIs and regional organizations show that there is common interest and each entity will contribute to this effort. This exercise if followed with solid policy response will contribute in reducing the near-term social and economic, as well as the longer-term environmental impacts of the twin crisis.

In addition, in the early days of the crisis all Pacific governments faced shortages in the necessary medical supplies specifically required for COVID-19 response. The United Nations, under the leadership of WHO and the JIMT, has also been supporting these requests to which UNDP will also contribute through its global procurement capacities.

II. PURPOSE AND EXPECTED OUTPUT

Output 1: COVID-19 gender sensitised socio-economic assessments and scenario planning for the Pacific are conducted and inform decision making

Activity Result 1.1: Socio-economic assessments completed

The aim is to understand the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 on 10 Pacific Island Countries in order to advise government on various policy options to address the social and economic impacts of the crisis.

Sub activities:

- Activity 1.1.1: Establishment of a joint government-development partners coordination mechanism. This mechanism would also ensure that the sectoral studies and surveys would be possible to repeat on a regular basis, enabling countries to follow developments over time, including measuring the effectiveness of policies implemented.
- Activity 1.1.2: Development of a framework for socio-economic assessments for each country taking into consideration particular needs and demands, while retaining a unified methodology consistent with that used in other countries to ensure comparability of results among PICs and internationally. This will define the scope.
- Activity 1.1.3: Sectoral studies focused on the most-impacted sectors, including the analysis of studies available pre-COVID-19, focus group discussions and key informant interviews to analyze the impact of COVID-19 and to map possible scenarios for future trajectories of these sectors.
- Activity 1.1.4: Household surveys focusing on livelihoods assessment, with a strong gender-sensitive design and implementation.
- Activity 1.1.5: Development of macroeconomic models to assess potential impacts of the crises.
- Activity 1.1.6: Preparation of reports and communication materials, dissemination of the findings.

Activity Result 1.2: Scenario planning and support to formulation of plans, strategies and budgets

The activities under this output envisage the use of the baseline data and information gathered through socio-economic assessments to inform formulation or more detailed elaboration of plans, strategies and budgets. It would also have a forward-looking component where foresight-based scenario analysis would allow moving beyond extrapolating the past to analyze possible future paths.

Sub Activities:

- Activity 1.2.1: Organization of policy consultations with representation of government, private sector, civil society and development partners to discuss possible future scenarios and impacts of the crises and to identify strategies to address the social and economic impacts.
- Activity 1.2.2: Support to formulation of socio-economic crisis preparedness plans.
- Activity 1.2.3: Support to budget analysis and re-prioritization of revenue and spending with a view to help formulate economic stimulus and income support measures.
- Activity 1.2.4: Re-programming UNDP's offer/ activities in the 10 Pacific countries; identifying possible resources from other agencies who may not be able to deliver in 2020 as planned earlier and would be willing to team up with UNDP to enable delivery in support of COVID-19 response.

Output 2: COVID-19 Inclusive and multi-sectoral crisis management and responses

Activity Result 2.1.: Support to Pacific governments in inclusive and multi sectoral crisis management and response

Output 3: COVID-19 Resilient health systems response, including procurement and supply chain management

Activity Result 3.1: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Fiji

Activity Result 3.2: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Palau

Activity Result 3.3: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for FSM

Activity Result 3.4: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for RMI

Activity Result 3.5: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Tonga

Activity Result 3.6: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Vanuatu

Activity Result 3.7: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Kiribati

Activity Result 3.8: Medical supplies in support of the COVID response in the Pacific Governments procured for Tuvalu

III. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The project will be implemented through a direct implementation modality (DIM). UNDP will coordinate every activity with RC as well with AFPs based on their particular thematic inputs. The project will be managed by a dedicated UNDP personnel in country but also will draw on leadership and guidance from a specially recruited economist (remotely if border restrictions are not lifted).

IV. MONITORING

A quarterly progress report will be produced to ensure progress is monitored on an ongoing basis. A final Progress Report will be prepared at the end of the Initiation Plan, using the standard format available in the [Executive Snapshot](#) in addition to attaching the full project document if developed or an explanation if initiation failed to produce a full project.

| Monitoring Activity | Purpose | Frequency | Expected Action | Partners (if joint) | Cost (if any) |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Track results progress | Progress data against the results indicators in the RRF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs. | Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator. | Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management. | RC | |
| Monitor and Manage Risk | Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP's SESP. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to manage financial risk. | Quarterly | Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken. | | |
| Learn | Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project. | Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator | Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions. | | |
| Review and Make Course Corrections | Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making. | At least annually | Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections. | | |
| Programme Report | Reporting will be conducted as per RRF guidelines and requirements | | | | |

Results Framework

| | |
|---|---|
| Intended Outcome as stated in the UN Pacific Strategy Results and Resource Framework: | |
| ❖ Outcome 2: By 2022, people in the Pacific, in particular youth, women and vulnerable groups, benefit from inclusive and sustainable economic development that creates decent jobs, reduces multidimensional poverty and inequalities and promotes economic empowerment. | |
| Outcome indicators as stated in the Regional Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: | |
| <u>Outcome Indicator 2.1:</u> | Number of PICTs in which the proportion of men, women, youth and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions, according to national definitions, has decreased, based on the latest available data |
| Baseline (2016): | Baseline: 0 PICTs |
| Target: | Fully Achieved: 1 PICTs |
| <u>Outcome Indicator 2.2:</u> | Number of PICTs in which the percentage of the population with access to formal financial services has increased, based on the latest available data |
| Baseline (2020): | Baseline: 0 PICTs |
| Target: | Fully Achieved: 1 PICTs |
| Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: | |
| SP Output 2.1 | National and local institutions enabled to put in place evidence-based risk-informed and gender-sensitive policies guiding participatory planning and budgeting processes and aligned with SDGs |
| SP Output 2.2. | Number of countries with systems in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality, women's empowerment and inclusion of marginalized individuals and communities |
| SP Output 2.1.2 | Number of women and men enrolled in formal financial services, disaggregated by locality |
| Project Title and Atlas Project Number: COVID-19 Response support in the Pacific, 00127582 | |

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS | OUTPUT INDICATORS | DATA SOURCE | BASELINE | | TARGETS (frequency of data collection) | | DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS |
|---|--|---------------------------|----------|------|--|-------|---|
| | | | Value | Year | Year 2020 | FINAL | |
| Output 1: COVID-19 gender sensitised socio-economic assessments and scenario planning for the Pacific are conducted and inform decision making | <i>Indicators:</i> 1.1. Number of PICS with completed & established gender sensitized socio-economic assessments | <i>Government Reports</i> | 0 | 2020 | 10 | 10 | Workshops, consultations, Studies and surveys |
| | GEN 2 1.2. Number of PICS with policies/plans/ strategies informed by the gender sensitized socio-economic findings | <i>Government Reports</i> | 0 | 2020 | 10 | 10 | Workshops, consultations, Studies and surveys |
| Output 2 COVID-19 Inclusive and multi-sectoral crisis management and responses | 2.1. # of PICs supported with inclusive and multisectoral crisis management and responses | <i>Government Reports</i> | 0 | 2020 | 10 | 10 | Workshops, consultations, Studies and surveys |
| Output 3 COVID-19 Resilient health systems response, including procurement and supply chain management | 3.1. # of countries that have received medical supplies to support COVID 19 | <i>Government Reports</i> | 0 | 2020 | 9 | 9 | Wokrshop reports, media releases, articles |

WORK PLAN

Period: May 2020 – October 2021

| EXPECTED OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets | PLANNED ACTIVITIES | TIMEFRAME | | | | RESPONSIB LE PARTY | PLANNED BUDGET | | |
|---|--|-----------|----|----|----|--|--------------------|--|---------|
| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | | Source of Funds | Budget Description | Amount |
| Output 1: COVID-19 gender sensitized socio- economic assessments and scenario planning for the Pacific are conducted and inform decision making Indicator 1.1: Number of countries with completed & established gender sensitized socio- economic assessments Baseline 0 (2020) Target: Report focusing on and socio-economic impacts of the pandemic with recommended actions ¹⁰ | ACTIVITY RESULT 1.1. Socio-economic assessments at national level completed. | | X | X | X | UNDP /RCO/UNICEF /ADB/WB/ILO/ ESCAP | | | |
| | Sub-Activity 1.1.1.: Establishment of a joint government-development partners coordination mechanism | | X | | | | RRF | National/ International Consultants (economist surge) (100,000) | 100,000 |
| | Sub Activity 1.1.2 Development a framework for socio- economic impact assessment for each country taking into consideration particular needs and demands. This will define a scope | | X | X | | | | Workshops & consultation meetings (2,000@10 PICS) | 20,000 |
| | Sub-Activity 1.1.3 Sectoral studies focused on the most- impacted sectors, including the analysis of studies available pre-COVID-19, focus group discussions and key informant interviews to analyze the impact of COVID- 19 and to map possible scenarios for future trajectories of these sectors. | | X | X | | | | Dissemination and discussion of report findings (2,000@10 PICS) | 20,000 |
| | Sub-Activity 1.1.4: Household surveys focusing on livelihoods assessment, with a strong gender-sensitive design and implementation. | | | | x | X | | Studies/surveys (20,000@10) | 200,000 |
| | Sub-Activity 1.1.5 Development of macroeconomic models to assess potential impacts of the crises. | | | | x | X | | | |

Annex 1 - Risks

| # | Description | Date Identified | Type | Impact Probability & | Countermeasures |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Due to current travel restrictions and social distancing requirement the process of conducting the assessments could be impacted. | 11 May 2020 | Operational Risk | Probability – 5 Impact - 1 | Ensure the methodology for conducting the social economic impact assessments are modified to take into consideration social distancing policies as well as remote technical support requirements. |
| 2 | Delay in procurement of materials and equipment to carry out the Socio Economic Impact Assessment. Delay in payments to the enumerators and survey supervisor. | 11 May 2020 | Financial risk | Probability - 1 Impact – 4 | Ensure that necessary requirements for processing payments are in order i.e. vendor details are entered in the finance system. |
| 3 | Political leaders do not accept the results of the socio-economic impact assessment. | 11 May 2020 | Political risk | Probability - 1 Impact - 5 | Ensure that the lead government implementing agency consciously briefs Government heads on the progress and findings of the assessment to promote local ownership and leadership on the implementation of the assessment as well as the findings and recommendations. |
| 4 | Delayed in workplan implementation due to natural disasters | 11 May 2020 | Environmental Risk | Probability – 5 Impact - 1 | Workplan/Field work to be scheduled outside disasters/cyclone seasons for each PIC country |

ANNEX 3. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TEMPLATE

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

Project Information

| Project Information | |
|--|---|
| 1. Project Title | COVID-19 Response support in the Pacific |
| 2. Project Number | 00127582 |
| 3. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Fiji (covering 10 countries) |

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

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

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

The socio-economic impact assessment will be conducted through an SDG lens. The process of conducting the Socio-economic impact assessment follow a human rights based approach in that the human rights of both the interviewers and interviewees are protected – this relates to how the interview was conducted, what information was solicited and how this information is used and disseminated.

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

The Socio-economic impact assessment will target the views and opinions of representatives of vulnerable communities and households including Women and Girls in terms of the impacts of the COVID 19 crisis and recommendations for addressing the impacts. This information will be used to inform leaders, politicians, policy makers, planners and development partners on the best policy responses and programmes to support vulnerable groups including women and girls in terms of inclusive and resilient economic and social empowerment.

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

The COVID 19 Socio-economic impact assessment will consider the environmental and climate change related aspects for building back better to return to a more sustainable and resilient development path after the pandemic.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</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 Probability(1-5) | Significance (Low, Moderate, High) | Comments | Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks. |
| The Project could be negatively impacted by climate change or distare affecting countries | I = 1 P = 2 | Low | Disaster and climate change are reality and countries need to manage this | Action will be contextualised to respond to the situation |
| QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization? | | | | |
| Select one (see SESP for guidance) | | | | Comments |
| | | | Low Risk | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | Moderate 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 relevant? | | | | |
| Check all that apply | | | | Comments |
| Principle 1: Human Rights | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| 1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 4. Cultural Heritage | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 5. Displacement and Resettlement | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 6. Indigenous Peoples | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Final Sign Off

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

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

| Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Principles 1: Human Rights | | Answer (Yes/No) |
| 1. | Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | N |
| 2. | Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ⁴ | N |
| 3. | Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | N |
| 4. | Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | N |
| 5. | Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | N |
| 6. | Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | N |
| 7. | Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process? | Y |
| 8. | Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | N |
| Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | | |
| 1. | Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | N |
| 2. | Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | N |
| 3. | Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment? | N |
| 4. | Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <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> | N |
| Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below | | |
| | | |
| Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management | | |
| 1.1 | Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? | N |

⁴ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i> | |
| 1.2 | Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | N |
| 1.3 | Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5) | N |
| 1.4 | Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species? | N |
| 1.5 | Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species? | N |
| 1.6 | Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | N |
| 1.7 | Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | N |
| 1.8 | Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i> | N |
| 1.9 | Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) | N |
| 1.10 | Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | N |
| 1.11 | Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i> | N |
| Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation | | |
| 2.1 | Will the proposed Project result in significant ⁵ greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change? | N |
| 2.2 | Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? | N |
| 2.3 | Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i> | N |
| Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions | | |
| 3.1 | Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | N |
| 3.2 | Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | N |
| 3.3 | Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)? | N |

⁵ In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 3.4 | Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure) | N |
| 3.5 | Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions? | N |
| 3.6 | Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)? | N |
| 3.7 | Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning? | N |
| 3.8 | Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)? | N |
| 3.9 | Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)? | N |
| Standard 4: Cultural Heritage | | |
| 4.1 | Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | N |
| 4.2 | Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes? | N |
| Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement | | |
| 5.1 | Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | N |
| 5.2 | Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)? | N |
| 5.3 | Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ⁶ | N |
| 5.4 | Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | N |
| Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples | | |
| 6.1 | Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | N |
| 6.2 | Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | N |
| 6.3 | <p>Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?</p> <p><i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i></p> | N |

⁶ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 6.4 | Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | N |
| 6.5 | Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | N |
| 6.6 | Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? | N |
| 6.7 | Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | N |
| 6.8 | Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | NN |
| 6.9 | Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? | |
| Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency | | |
| 7.1 | Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts? | N |
| 7.2 | Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | N |
| 7.3 | Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i> | N |
| 7.4 | Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | N |
| 7.5 | Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | N |