Annex E Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | ‘Managing together - Integrating Community-centered, ecosystem-based approaches into forestry, agriculture and tourism’ |
| 1. Project Number | 5804 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Sri Lanka |

**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*** |
| Principles and standards derived from international human rights treaties will guide the project in all phases[[1]](#endnote-1). The Sri Lankan State has an obligation to ‘protect, preserve and improve the environment for the benefit of the community’ (Article 27 (14) of the Constitution), while communities also have the duty to ‘protect nature and conserve its riches’ (Article 28 (f)). Human rights obligations include the duty to ensure the level of environmental protection necessary to allow the full exercise of protected rights. Certain human rights, especially access to information, participation in decision-making, and access to justice in environmental matters are essential to good environmental decision-making.  The Project will:   1. raise the capacity of government duty-bearers to carry out their obligations under current policy to protect the environment (Outcome 1) 2. work with local government duty bearers to take tangible steps towards improving environmental protection (Outcomes 2,3,) 3. feed back project results into changes in national policy and practice (Outcomes 1, 4) 4. ensure access of the general public in their capacity as rights holders to information related to the environment (Outcomes 2,3,4) 5. work with the general public in their capacity as both rights holders and duty bearers, to take tangible steps towards improving environmental protection (Outcome 3) 6. maintain a spotlight on incidences in the project areas where women and disabled people are marginalized (Outcomes 2, 3, 4) 7. keep attention on socio-economic issues such as chronic debt, land-tenure injustices, public health problems in the Trial Landscapes (Outcomes 2, 3, 4) 8. link with other projects to encourage government to improve enforcement of environmental laws, in particular regarding trawling in the Gulf of Mannar (Outcomes 1, 2, 3) 9. screen each and every proposed project intervention for potential human rights impacts (Outcomes 3, 4) |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project's environmental objectives will be reached only if women in the project areas are more empowered. This is not a matter of a gender side-effect in an environmental conservation project: rather it is a matter of having to address the marginalization of women in the local communities in order for the project to achieve success. Livelihood-focused interventions and capacity development in the community will not merely take an equitable approach to gender, but will focus on women in particular in order to redress current imbalances in women’s access to highly skilled and remunerated work. Women could play a more active role in the political and economic activities within their respective communities. The project will encourage women to participate in decision making. Women's livelihood associations will form the basis for initial project consultations. It is anticipated that jobs that were formerly restricted to men, will have been opened up for women by the end of the project. This will not be a straightforward achievement for it involves decisions on child-care and other care within the family, but it is feasible. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| Mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and environmental sustainability is the prime goal of the Project (see main text of Prodoc). The model is one of capacity development for government officials, demonstrations in Trial Landscapes and Focal Village Clusters, and dissemination of results regionally and nationally. A key component of the project will be public information and involvement, and collaboration with the growing number of projects and programmes that either a) advocate mainstreaming in natural resource management, or b) will benefit from project collaboration with mainstreaming of biodiversity into their economic development interventions. |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *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.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6* | | | **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.*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Risk 1:** Livelihood-focused interventions might have deleterious impacts on wild species or habitats in protected areas or areas proposed for protection or recognized as environmentally sensitive or critical  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 3, Standard 1 and 2, Questions 1.1 & 2.2* | I = 4  P = 2 | **Moderate** | Some well-meaning attempts to reduce pressure on biodiversity through livelihood-focused interventions can result either in no benefit for conservation or in clear damage to biodiversity, sometimes years later and through complex socio-economic feedback. The benefits, costs and trade-offs have to be carefully assessed. There is also a low risk of social disruption in cases in which modified livelihoods based on natural resource management fail for any reason. | Project design includes mitigation of this risk through environmental and social assessment of each and every project intervention (see ToC: M8). All project interventions will be developed through long and careful participatory processes with local government, village communities and with partner projects and programmes (see Section lll Strategy). Care will be taken to avoid inadvertent impacts on key habitats and species through encouraging influx of people to the sites of livelihood-focused interventions. As the Project has been classified as High Risk (Single High Risk under Standard 5) an ESIA will be conducted and an ESMP prepared and implemented.  The project will apply the precautionary approach to any interventions in natural resource management. (see Under Question 5 below)  Potential impacts of climate change will be considered carefully in formulation of interventions as an integral part of Project activities and information programmes. |
| **Risk 2:** Reforestation interventions, whether through natural regeneration or planting, are poorly planned and implemented  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 3, Standard 1 and 2, Questions 1.6 & 2.2* | I = 3  P = 1 | **Low** | Low probability because there is high level of competence in forestry, but the impact can be high if exotic species used, for example, and the waste of resources can be high if poor consideration given to viability of planting methods. | Project design includes mitigation of this risk through environmental and social assessment of each and every project intervention (see ToC: M8). Expert consultation with foresters on the relative merits of natural regeneration and various possible planting regimes considering water availability and the use to which the forest will be put (eg wildlife habitat). The Project will not fund reforestation with exotic species and will advocate and demonstrate integrated pest management in place of agrochemical use. As the Project has been classified as High Risk (Single High Risk under Standard 5) an ESIA will be conducted and an ESMP prepared and implemented.  Potential impacts of climate change will be considered carefully in formulation of interventions as an integral part of Project activities and information programmes. |
| **Risk 3:** Livelihood-focused interventions in fisheries or aquaculture lead to damage to species or habitats  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 3, Standard 1 and 2, Questions 1.7 & 2.2* | I = 4  P = 2 | **Moderate** | **See comment under Risk 1** | Project design includes mitigation of this risk through environmental and social assessment of each and every project intervention (see ToC: M8). All project interventions will be developed through long and careful participatory processes with local government, village communities and with partner projects and programmes (see lll Strategy). As the Project has been classified as High Risk (Single High Risk under Standard 5) an ESIA will be conducted and an ESMP prepared and implemented. The Environmental and Social Management Framework elaborates on how assessment and mitigation of potential impacts will follow UNDP's SES.  Actual and potential impacts on natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystem services will be identified and addressed, employing qualified professionals to conduct assessments and to design and implement mitigation and monitoring plans.  Potential impacts of climate change will be considered carefully in formulation of interventions as an integral part of Project activities and information programmes. |
| **Risk 4:** Livelihood-focused interventions in non-timber forest products, *in-situ* or *ex-situ*, lead to damage to species or habitats  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 3, Standard 1 and 2, Questions 1.6 & 2.2* | I = 3  P = 3 | **Moderate** | **See comment above under Risk 1** | Project design includes mitigation of this risk through environmental and social assessment of each and every project intervention (see ToC: M8). All project interventions will be developed through long and careful participatory processes with local government, village communities and with partner projects and programmes (see lll Strategy). As the Project has been classified as High Risk (Single High Risk under Standard 5) an ESIA will be conducted and an ESMP prepared and implemented. The Environmental and Social Management Framework elaborates on how assessment and mitigation of potential impacts will follow UNDP's SES.  The project will avoid making livelihood-focused interventions too near to protected areas or critical habitats, partly to reduce risk from the intervention and partly to discourage influx of others to build on the success of early initiatives.  Potential impacts of climate change will be considered carefully in formulation of interventions as an integral part of Project activities and information programmes. |
| **Risk 5:** Cultural values and norms may be adversely affected by introduction of conventional mass scale tourism  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 3, Standard 4, Question 4.2* | I = 3  P = 2 | **Moderate** | According to some local community members the social fabric of communities, and some cultural relics such as the Doric Fort at Arippu are likely to subjected to deleterious impacts as a result of tourism. There are two aspects here: the intangible forms of culture such as practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills, and the tangible forms such as immovable objects, buildings and archaeological sites. | The project is designed to deflect conventional tourism options in preference of low-impact eco-tourism models. ). As the Project has been classified as High Risk (Single High Risk under Standard 5) an ESIA will be conducted and an ESMP prepared and implemented. The Environmental and Social Management Framework elaborates on how assessment and mitigation of potential impacts will follow UNDP's SES. There will be long and careful discussions with the local people before the project invests in any new tourism development. On the other hand, the project will be very circumspect in its engagement with private enterprise partners to ensure that such partners are genuinely committed to developing enterprises that will provide benefits in the long term through stabilizing impacts of local livelihoods on species and habitats. The Project will anticipate the need for a Cultural Heritage Management Plan as an outcome of the ESIA and ESMP development. Private sector operators will be encouraged to adhere to an agreed management plan for tourist activities at Cultural Heritage sites. |
| **Risk 6:** In order to implement the Project's landscape conservation strategic designs, the Government might decide to resettle people currently living in Proposed Elephant Corridors (PECs).  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 1, Q.3; Principle 3, Standard 5, Questions 5.1, 5.2, 5.4* | I = 4  P = 3 | **High** | Two of the three PECs in the Project Trial Landscapes have been proposed under different Projects. Implementation is expected to take place and to be funded by those projects. Precise delineation of any such corridors or forest areas will not be determined until the landscape designs and land use plans are completed by considering all relevant factors during the landscape planning process, so specific details of the need for any such resettlement are not available. | It is not possible at this stage to predict a) whether involuntary resettlements will be included and endorsed under the landscape designs, and b) exactly where and how many people would be involved. No Project funds will be applied to any involuntary relocations, but the causal pathway leading to negative impacts of any such relocations may ultimately be traced back to the landscape designs developed as an integral part of Project activities. A clear course of action is laid down in case involuntary relocations become the recommended course of action under the Project's landscape designs (see Annex E).  In view of these circumstances it is clear that the risks of deleterious impacts arising from poorly implemented involuntary relocations taking place in the Trial Landscapes must be addressed proactively. he Project will concentrate on finding solutions that provide for elephant conservation at the same time as ensuring the well-being of local residents and, in particular, avoid involuntary, or indeed voluntary, resettlement. If and when it is decided to pursue any resettlement, or endorse it by association, a full ESIA will be carried out (see end of Annex E) according to standards established in The Sri Lankan National Involuntary Resettlement Policy (NIRP) 2001[[2]](#endnote-2) OP 4.12, UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES)[[3]](#endnote-3), and the updated GEF policy on environmental and social safeguards[[4]](#endnote-4).  In the meantime the project will include as part of its already planned extensive community engagement a process for vetting options on addressing human-elephant conflict issues, which may include community-determined restrictions on natural resource access and potential voluntary relocation agreements where appropriate.  An ESMF has been prepared as a guide by which to assess the actions of government of other donor agencies that may implement involuntary relocations. When appropriate, the ESMF will guide the conduct of an ESIA and the preparation of an ESMP, and in the event of economic or physical displacement becoming likely, LAP and RAPs will be prepared as necessary as a basis to guide and advise government on measures to reduce potential involuntary resettlement as part of both the landscape planning and the implementation of the resulting landscape designs, including dealing with the risks of economic displacement and requirement for livelihood restoration. |
| **Risk 7:** Participation in community-based planning and implementation is dominated by people from traditionally empowered groups and under-represents women and other marginalized people, including those facing uncertain futures as a result, for example, of poverty, the recent three-year drought, and land-tenure disputes  ***Referred to SESP attachment 1:***  *Principle 2, Question 3* | I=3  P=1 | **Low** | Considerable attention has been given to gender matters in project design, and there is already a full Gender Action Plan, but a low risk remains that women will be underrepresented in decision making and as implementers of project activities. | Project staff will be well trained in community-centred participatory processes and will live on site full time in the communities they are working with, thus building up understanding of social pressures and how to address them in the context of the project. Participatory mechanisms will be slow in pace and will focus on ensuring that there is no "elite capture" of community benefits, and that traditionally less-empowered groups of society are engaged. The Project has prepared a comprehensive Gender Action Plan to achieve equitable participation in decision making and action for women in all aspects of the Project and its implemtation will be given high priority. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?** | | |
| **Select one (see** [**SESP**](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | | **Comments** |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***High Risk*** | **☑** | A total of seven risks have been identified, of which one has been assessed as high, four moderate and two of low significance. The following safeguards are triggered (high risks): Principle 1: Human Rights, Principle 3, Standard 5 – Displacement and Resettlement; (Moderate risks): Principle 3, Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management; Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation; and Standard 4: Cultural Heritage  The overall project risk categorization is ‘High’. Accordingly, an ESMF has been prepared to specify the processes that will be undertaken for the additional assessment of potential impacts, identification and development of appropriate rick management measures. |
|  | **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*** | **☑** | Linked to the potential for physical resettlement and economic displacement under Standard 5  SE Risk No. 6 High |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **☑** | Linked to the possibility that the Project's considerable efforts under its Gender Action Plan to achieve equitable participation in decision making and action for women in all aspects of the Project might fall short of expectations  SE Risk No. 7 Low |
| ***Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability*** | **☑** |  |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | **☑** | The project will apply the precautionary approach to any interventions in natural resource management. Actual and potential impacts on natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystem services will be identified and addressed, employing qualified professionals to conduct assessments and to design and implement mitigation and monitoring plans. The project will be wary of making livelihood-focused interventions too near to protected areas or critical habitats, partly to reduce risk from the intervention and partly to discourage influx of others to build on the success of early initiatives.  SE RIsk Nos 1,3,4 (Medium) and Risk No. 2 (Low) |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | **☑** | Although climate change will be taken into account in the conservation designs and land-use plans produced and partially implemented under the project, there is still a possibility for frustration of intermediate project aims as a result of unpredicted weather events.  SE Risk Nos 1,3,4 (Medium) |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | **☐** |  |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **☑** | According to some local community members the social fabric of communities, and some cultural relics such as the Doric Fort at Arippu are likely to come under threat from tourism. So there are two aspects here: the intangible forms of culture such as practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills3 , and the tangible forms such as immovable objects, buildings and archaeological sites3. The project will take all necessary measures to avoid significant adverse impacts, selecting private sector partners in tourism with this requirement in mind. The Project will anticipate the need for a Cultural Heritage Management Plan as an outcome of the ESIA and ESMP development. |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **☑** | Unlikely to take place under the project but impact is potentially high so full ESIA will be commissioned if and when displacement and or resettlement is proposed as a means of facilitating use of the landscape by both humans and elephants and other wild species. Every effort will be made to avoid resettlement of people and if firm proposals are made, the project will assist government to assess impacts through a survey of potential PAPs, publish justification for the resettlement plan well in advance, and continue to monitor social and environmental impacts after resettlement at sites of both destination and origin.  SE RIsk No 6 (High) |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **☐** |  |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** |  |

**Final Sign Off**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| **Principles 1: Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| 1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | No |
| 2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? [[5]](#footnote-1) | No |
| 3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | Yes |
| 4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | No |
| 5. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? | No |
| 6. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | No |
| 7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process? | No |
| 8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | No |
| **Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| 1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | No |
| 2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | No |
| 3. Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment? | Yes |
| 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?  *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* | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **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?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | Yes |
| 1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | Yes |
| 1.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5) | No |
| 1.4 Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species? | No |
| 1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species? | No |
| 1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | Yes |
| 1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | Yes |
| 1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.9 Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) | No |
| 1.10 Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| 1.11 Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area?  *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.* | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |
| 2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[[6]](#footnote-2) greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change? | No |
| 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? | Yes |
| 2.3 Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) now or in the future (also known as maladaptive 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 |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions** |  |
| 3.1 Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | No |
| 3.2 Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | No |
| 3.3 Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)? | No |
| 3.4 Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure) | No |
| 3.5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions? | No |
| 3.6 Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)? | No |
| 3.7 Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning? | No |
| 3.8 Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)? | No |
| 3.9 Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)? | No |
| **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) | No |
| 4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes? | Yes |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| 5.1 Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | Yes |
| 5.2 Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)? | Yes |
| 5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[[7]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 5.4 Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | Yes |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| 6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | No |
| 6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the 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 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.* | No |
| 6.4 Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | No |
| 6.5 Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.6 Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? | No |
| 6.7 Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | No |
| 6.8 Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.9 Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? | No |
| **Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| 7.1 Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or [transboundary impacts](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | No |
| 7.2 Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 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?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol* | No |
| 7.4 Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |

1. http://web.unep.org/divisions/delc/human-rights-and-environment [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. http://www.treasury.gov.lk/documents/10181/272149/RPF-NAPPP+-+For+disclosure.pdf/aa720af8-413f-4394-9ec7-1693ff487bc3 [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-standards.html [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Policy%20on%20Environmental%20and%20Social%20Safeguards%2C%20DRAFT%20for%20Consultation%2C%202018-08-31.pdf [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
6. In regards to CO2, ‘significant emissions’ corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct nand indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
7. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)