# Annex 1. 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 at the design stage. Note: this template will be converted into an online tool. The online version will guide users through the process and will embed relevant guidance.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Increase resilience and adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable communities to climate change in Forested Guinea |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | PIMS 6016 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Guinea |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date | 12/05/2021 |

**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*** |
| In Forested Guinea, the proposed project region, the poverty incidence is the highest in the country (66.9%, against a national average of 56.88%) and most of the population depend on rainfed agriculture (approximately 97% of cultivated lands are rainfed). The combination of those factors with the region’s vulnerability to climate change puts the livelihood of smallholder farmers at stake and risk further eroding development gains. The objective of the proposed project is to reduce the vulnerability of communities in Forested Guinea to the additional risks posed by climate change. The project has a significant social and human rights benefits which will positively affect the overall well-being of vulnerable communities living in Forested Guinea.  First, the project will significantly benefit farming individuals and communities through a Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) approach, helping them cope to changing climatic patterns (e.g. shifting rainfall patterns, flooding, increasing heat, etc.), and scale up farming practices with context-adapted innovative climate resilient technologies, thereby ensuring that remote, socially and economically vulnerable communities receive equal access to protection.  Capacity building will provide additional social and human right benefits with better understanding and access to finance. Most of the potential beneficiaries such as micro-enterprise, and individuals with low income, often lack financial mechanisms, awareness and basic education and/or the ability to meet formal requirements of financial institutions. The capacity building approach focuses on supporting microfinance institutions or local banks to strengthen the institutional, regulatory and policy framework that will allow communities to access climate finance easily and make smallholders and small enterprise more profitable and climate-resilient.  Importantly, all project interventions will follow the UNDP Guidelines on equity, fairness and equal distribution of benefits among beneficiaries, and have been developed together with various stakeholders to ensure that no rights or laws are infringed by the proposed activities. This project will ensure that the principles of accountability and the rule of law, participation and inclusion, and equality and non-discrimination are taken into account by ensuring that there is an effective communication for the various stakeholders to share their insights and suggestions on the project, as well as their complaints if the project is not aligned with human-rights’ principles.  The human-rights based approach has also been mainstreamed during the project preparation through consultations with the stakeholders. Consultations were held on the intervention sites in August 2020 in order to identify local key stakeholders such as beneficiaries, communities, locally elected officials, prefectures, civil society, and other key stakeholders. The site selection was however done after this first mission. Additional engagement will be needed in order to ensure their Free Prior Informed Consent. This will be done through consultations with community representatives on the basis of environmental and social criteria integrating participatory approaches to encourage farmer organizations to volunteer to participate and to integrate UNDP’s human rights based approaches into their practices (for instance, pertaining to women’s empowerment and to Indigenous Peoples rights). Reports of stakeholder consultations will be made available as required on demand by the UNDP-CO.  Human rights-based approach to development programming, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and environmental sustainability, are integrated into Project design by mainstreaming the safeguards in the project activities themselves. Many activities are linked to capacity-building of the main stakeholders, aiming at reinforcing State capacity to address Climate change and take responsibility in supporting the agricultural sector in Forested Guinea. In these trainings, issues pertaining to human-rights based approaches in agricultural interventions, gender mainstreaming and environmental sustainability will be particularly emphasised. As per the downstream activities to be implemented locally in selected project sites, they are designed to take into account existing tensions and conflicts around the use of agricultural resources, as well as social discriminations between men and women, among women, or between communities, in order to benefit to all stakeholders, particularly to the most marginalized ones. Conflict-sensitivity will be adopted as a major component of project implementation.  Guinea has ratified a number of international instruments relating to human rights including the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression, among others. By providing support to Guinea to better address climate change related challenges at the national and local level, the project will assist the government to respect, protect and fulfil the rights to food under both international law and human related standards in Guinea law. Better adapted agricultural practices will result in enhanced availability, accessibility and quality of food for local communities but also for marginalized groups. In order to benefit to women, the project has integrated a specific output and associated support to women’s groups. Beneficiaries will also have access to a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) to raise concerns and/or grievances where activities may adversely impact |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| In Forested Guinea, gender imbalance is embedded into rain-fed cultivation with women bared access to productive land during the rainy season when water is abundant. As a result, women become even more vulnerable to the impact of climate change on rainfall patterns. Women tend to be excluded from decision-making and leadership roles, also the case on adaptation-related matters. The project will ensure and promote more equitable benefits through gender-sensitive adaptation measures and strategies that address these identified gender-related climate risks and vulnerabilities. Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) will provide tools and solutions that increase women’s adaptation options and the project will prone approaches that include women in relevant decision-making mechanisms to reflect their specific needs and concerns.  During the PPG phase, the project has consulted with women’s group and representatives and prepared gender-based vulnerability assessments in the different targeted villages and regions in order to address specific gender-related vulnerabilities. Consideration of gender specific indicators as well as allocation of budget resources to ensure that gender concerns are comprehensively dealt have been ensured in the project design. The Gender analysis conducted between July and September 2020, drew on the assessment of the integration of gender considerations in the national adaptation process of Guinee, conducted in 2019 (MEEF, 2019) and which provides an overview of the institutional landscape in terms of capacities and levels of commitment on gender equality. In addition to this, several key national assessments provided important information on the status of women’s rights in the country. These were complemented by data collected in Forested Guinea by local consultants to provide further information on the differences that exist between men and women in terms of their use and management of natural resources; the role that women play as the main managers of land and forests; the different priorities between men and women and the incentives to which they respond for the preservation of resources; and socio-economic inequalities which limit the adaptation opportunities of certain groups compared to others.  The inclusion of women’s farming associations in the first component of this project aims to better assess and act upon women’s needs and strategic interests in the planning and sharing of climate-smart agriculture techniques. One avenue for women to better access and even own land, is for them to buy plots and this is where the 2nd component of the project could help women farmers better secure their resources, as well as addressing some of their key concerns including the low level of equipment of women producers and / or the lack of improved equipment for certain essential agriculture activities; difficulties of access to improved seeds (short cycle and high yield) and inputs;  lack of information on existing opportunities; barriers linked to access to appropriate technology and innovation in production, processing and marketing; the weakness of advisory support and technical training and in terms of structuring groups and cooperatives.  Classified as GEN[2] (i.e. gender equality is a significant objective), the project will implement a dedicated Gender Action Plan (GAP) with the aim to 1) Establish a gender-balanced project management team that provides opportunities for women (national staff in particular) to take part and lead decision-making, implementation activities and monitoring processes; 2) Ensure that the project does not perpetuate existing inequalities but promote equitable opportunities for women in targeted areas to participate in, and benefit from activities; 3) Collect gender- and ethnicity-disaggregated data/information to inform M&E and adaptive management responses. To address these objectives, the detailed GAP in annex 9 follows a three-level approach: 1) Institutional level: Ensuring that a gender-responsive project management team implement the Gender Action Plan throughout the duration of the project (Objective 1)  ; 2) Mainstreaming level: Gender equality is integrated in the project logical framework to contribute in reducing gender gaps in access to and control over resources, with gender-responsive indicators so that they can be measured during regular M&E processes (Objective 2) ; 3) Monitoring level: Collect gender- and ethnicity-disaggregated data/information to understand how the project is achieving is gender-responsive objectives and to inform M&E and adaptive management responses (Outcome 4) |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The project will promote environmental sustainability with its focus on CSA for sustainable and climate resilient development through adapted techniques and approaches that favor agricultural development and environmental sustainability altogether. CSA aims to increase productivity in a sustainable way, enhances resilience (adaptation), reduce or removes GHGs (mitigation) where possible, while also contributing to food security and development. This environmental and sustainable approach not only improve the livelihood of the most vulnerable communities, who would otherwise be those most threatened and impacted by climate change, but also contribute to strengthening ecosystem services in the target areas. Specifically, benefits could include:   * Soil conservation (soil fertility, soil water availability) and reduction of erosion * Improved crop productivity * Supplemental irrigation and rainfall capture * Improved grazing management, the use of improved pasture and agroforestry species, and the use of nutritious diet supplements * Improved management of natural resources as a result of adoption of agroforestry practices on farming system   The project includes improved collection, analysis and utilization of climatic, hydrologic, meteorological and agro-ecological data by government, committees and farmers. This will lead to better modelling and decision making regarding the use of resources, particularly landscapes, which can have significant environmental and social benefits.  The site selection has been particularly sensitive not only to climate vulnerability but also to environmental degradation. Environmentally sensitive sites are targeted according to the following criteria: forest degradation sur to agriculture or forest exploitation, natural resources degradation (soil and water), proximity of mining activities.  The Climate-Smart Activity (CSA) technologies to be supported by the project (Outcome 1), the livelihood activities to be supported to access adaptation finance (Outcome 2) as well as the local actors who will benefit from support under the form of capacity-building activities (Outcome 3) will all be subject to selection criteria including key environmental aspects such as their impact on biodiversity. As planned in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), they will be screened according to UNDP’s Social and Environmental safeguards. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The government is part of the Project Board. The Project Board is responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. This means the project board will be responsible to monitor appropriate safeguards implementation.  The Implementing Partner for this project is the Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests (MEEF), under the National Implementing modality (NIM), over a period of five years, from January 2022 to December 2026.The Implementing Partner is the entity to which the UNDP Administrator has entrusted the implementation of UNDP assistance specified in this signed project document along with the assumption of full responsibility and accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources and the delivery of outputs, as set forth in this document. The project will be implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture for component 1 and in particular the agricultural research institute of Guinea (IRAG), and especially its branch “the agronomic center of Sérédou”, and the national agency for rural promotion and agricultural advisory services (ANPROCA). The project will also be implemented in partnership with the National Directorate of Meteorology (DNM) under the Ministry of Transport (MT).  Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (<http://www.undp.org/secu-srm>). UNDP as the Implementing Partner will: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism. The Project Board (also called Project Steering Committee) is responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition.  The project rationale lies on a community-based and gender-sensitive approach engaging deeply with all stakeholders, from government authorities to local communities, including indigenous peoples. Component 1 in particular, supported by the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and the Gender Action Plan, includes consultations activities in order to ensure that all climate-smart-agriculture packages answer local needs and contexts, and reaches all community members, including women indigenous peoples.  Stakeholders have been actively engaged from the project design phase so that they are empowered to engage in implementation and monitoring, and will be more and more engaged as the project progresses. This will also enable them to request accountability and raise grievances if necessary. Validation of all plans and designs by all stakeholders including community representatives, as requested by UNDP SES Policy, and availability of all key information (including SEP and GAP summaries) in languages understood by these representatives, will be done. The summary in languages understandable by all stakeholders of key documents (ProDoc, SESP, GAP, SEP, ESMF) will be made available at the local level at least 120 days before project approval, according to UNDP stakeholder engagement guidelines. These documents will also be presented and discussed during the validation and inception workshop, to be held within 60 days of project CEO endorsement. This will ensure both active participation and accountability. |

**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*** | | | |
| **Risk 1**  **The project’s support to agricultural and pasture activities could lead to adverse impact on the existing social tensions between land users within the different communities of the N’Zérékoré and Beyla prefectures. These tensions could also increase violent altercations which have arisen over the last years, and it may affect the distribution of benefits among beneficiaries, to the detriment of women and indigenous peoples.**  *P1, P4, P5, P6, P7, P15*  *5.1, 6.6* | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | The Forested Guinea region is marked by a high cultural diversity and a plurality of religions (Islam, Christianity, and animism). Manon, Kpèlè, Konia, Konon Loma, Kissi communities are all indigenous peoples. This ethno-cultural mosaic is completed by the Peulhs from Fouta, the Soussous from Lower Guinea, the Malinke from Upper Guinea and foreigners from neighboring countries.  Forested Guinea is one of the country's most vulnerable regions to social and ethnic-religious conflicts. The prefecture of N'Zérékoré is experiencing regular intermittent intercommunity conflicts[[1]](#footnote-1), and so is the prefecture of Beyla which has seen Konianke and Guerzé communities in intermittent conflict over the past years, and where human rights NGOs have reported trafficking of weapons of war[[2]](#footnote-2).  These conflicts often stem from persistent intra- and inter-ethnic rivalries, from the weakening of traditional authority due to the abolition of the chieftaincy in 1957, from the opposition of ethnic and religious leaders, from the lack of economic opportunities among the youth, from the modification of the state land code during the Sekou Touré regime, and from on-going suspicion of electoral fraud in favor of certain communities. The presence in the region of demobilized ex-combatants from the war zones of neighboring countries and of military recruits sent back from the camps of Kaleya and Kissidougou adds to the complexity and violence of the outbreaks, resulting in significant loss of human life as well as material damage[[3]](#footnote-3). The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights reported that revenge and mob justice are increasing at an alarming rate in Guinea.[[4]](#footnote-4)  The project, because it affects key land use aspects and aims at generating financial flux within these communities, may inadvertently trigger these recurrent outbreaks of violence between the different ethnic communities. The impact of such outbreaks, if not prevented adequately through a conflict-sensitive methodology, could give rise to significant social unrest.  This risk is particularly present in light of Output 1.2 which will affect tenure rights at the local level. Because tenure encompasses uses, the project support to the establishment of 13 collective parks may create tenure related tensions if not managed with appropriate consultations. These parks concern a total area of 6.5 ha (i.e., 0.5 ha/park), built with barbed wire supported by a quickset hedge, with a capacity of about 2000 head of oxen including cows and calves. Tensions could also be linked to the decision of the location of the two fodder crops (Panicum and Guatemalan gracies) for the benefit of agro-pastoralists, to be introduced and extended. If not managed adequately, these tensions could lead to economic and/or physical displacement. | | * All measures described below are integrated into an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) which outlines all steps required in order to ensure full compliance with SES requirement during project implementation. In accordance with the ESMF an environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA) and a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) will be carried out at project inception (in the first six months of project implementation, before any activities with potential adverse social and environmental impacts are implemented) to assess this and all other environmental and social risks. The ESIA will be immediately followed by an ESMP including targeted management plans (among which an Indigenous Peoples Plan with Free Prior Informed Consent Protocol). The ESIA process will draw upon the ESMF to assess the associated impacts, and to inform the specific management measures outlined in the ensuing Management Plans. * Given that the project’s downstream interventions (and notably the project’s support to agricultural and pasture activities)are yet to be specified on the basis of selection criteria of projects, the potential direct impacts are yet to be fully assessed and can’t be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty. Further screening will be needed as the projects are selected, through this SESP. The application of standard good practice such as Free Prior Informed Consent and participatory approaches when choosing project sites and discussing specific agricultural practices will be implemented. The SESP will be subject to further consultations on the field after the activities have been specified, leading to a potential update in the first six months of the project. * Context-specific assessments will be conducted and disclosed (with at least summary report in French) and made available in an accessible location in the first six months of the project, as part of Output 4. * The project’s support to agricultural and pasture activitieswill be implemented only after a local Conflict Analysis has been conducted in order to better understand the potential conflicts and social dynamics on the project sites. Farmers organizations and women’s groups will be provided adequate support and expected to work with all communities in order to not inadvertently fuel human rights violations. This can be integrated in the social baseline. The choice of new crops and locations should be done carefully following the social baseline, the conflict analysis, and on the basis of participatory approaches and extensive consultations with local communities. * In order to avoid and manage conflicts, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been designed and made available in French as well as in Koniaka, Kissi and Kpelle to all stakeholders before the activities start. The SESP conclusion (list of risks) should also be translated, made available and discussed with all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and women, as they should be informed of the project risk and be able to provide input on impact, likelihood and mitigation measures. * The Indigenous Peoples Plan, which will include a participatory-defined FPIC protocol, will address conflict resolutions mechanisms * The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) proposed in the ESMF will be subject to revisions based on the FPIC protocol. | | | |
| **Risk 2**  **The duty bearers of this project, the Minister of Agriculture and of Environment, but also local authorities and farmers’ organizations, have low capacities to (1) measure and manage the impact of climate change on agriculture, (2) to engage with all members of the communities in depth, and (3) to facilitate and monitor a grievance redress mechanism (GRM)**  *P2, P3, P13, P14, P15* | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | Introducing new Climate-Smart-Agriculture technology packages with which there is no prior experience among the duty bearers will be particularly challenging. This translates into a risk of the project suffering from poor coordination of on-ground activities which could result in delays and inefficiencies in time-bound interventions, e.g. provision of improved seeds/livestock ahead of the growing season, delays in procurement and supply of materials to project sites and beneficiaries. It could also result in poor monitoring and reporting of both financial and physical interventions.  The weakness of the justice system has meant that many citizens have lost confidence in it, and conflicts have arisen between the state administration and certain communities in the area. In this context, inadequate mobilization and information sharing may arise, and lead to low participation, particularly among women and more vulnerable groups. The low mobilization capacities of local authorities could in turn lead to low adoption of adaptation technologies and practices.  There is a substantial risk that potential grievances coming from marginalized communities and/or subsets of communities, including women, might not be fairly received and responded to. That could lead to adverse impacts not being adequately managed within the projects, as communities would not access an appropriate GRM easily. | | * In order to reinforce the capacities of the duty-bearers to conduct the project effectively and meet their obligations, all outcomes include targeted capacity-building. These activities will be completed by specific capacity-building activities on Safeguards Management, Gender equity, FPIC implementation and Stakeholder Engagement, as planned respectively in the ESMF, the GAP and the SEP. * Alignment of national priorities and coordination of agricultural policy between the national and the local level will be key. The project steering committee, comprised of UNDP, the MEEF and representatives of local communities, will be in charge of ensuring this alignment. It is key that that prefectures / local authorities are empowered in safeguards management, as planned in the ESMF, to make sure policies are adequately applied. * The ESIA will integrate a vulnerability assessments for the targeted sites and a cost-benefit analysis of adaptation options. Criteria to assess the options will be defined in the ESIA in order to ensure SES consistency. The project will deliver improved services to local communities to reduce their vulnerability to climate change, and address some of the underlying causes of vulnerability, hence reinforcing their capacities to act on the long-term. | | | |
| **Risk 3**  **As women are traditionally excluded from decision-making processes, they could be excluded from the support planned for farmers and farmers organizations as well as in the national and regional institutions. This could inadvertently reproduce existing discriminations against women in project implementation. Conflict dynamics among communities could also lead to the exclusion of certain women from the support provided to women’s groups.**  *P9, P10, P11, P13, P14, P15* | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | Differentiated and uneven roles and needs exist between women and men in the agricultural sector in Forested Guinea. Women are usually in charge of subsistence agriculture, and not of commercial agriculture. They are also traditionally excluded from decision-making processes and may have difficulty accessing the support given at the village level. The overall low level of participation of women in political and public life, in particular in decision-making positions at all levels, led to strong recommendations from the CERD in 2014 to enhance the economic and political empowerment of women in rural areas through the use of temporary special measures, in order to ensure that women participate in decision-making and the management of resources, in particular land, water and forest resources[[5]](#footnote-5). However, despite the political will, women's participation in public and political life and in decision-making has not progressed significantly (MASPFE, 2019). Guinean women face discrimination in access to productive resources such as land, credit, material inputs, means of production and technology (Ministry of State for the Economy and Finance, 2013).  There is therefore a risk of women being excluded from the support planned for farmers and farmers organizations, especially when it comes to integrating them from the first steps of activities planning. While the project integrates gender mainstreaming objectives and the inclusion of women in all of its outcomes, Guinean women say that “it is difficult for them to speak frankly in front of their husbands or male elders and that the solutions that are found do not often enough meet their needs” (Human Rights Watch, 2018). This could inadvertently reproduce existing discrimination against women in project implementation, rural women lacking access to seeds and farming tools and not being sufficiently included in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes in rural areas, as for instance in the inclusion of CSA into local development plans.  The persisting high prevalence of violence against women, including domestic violence, sexual violence, rape and sexual harassment, as well as the  limited number of investigations, prosecutions and convictions in such cases, have both been noted in the area. These situations could be inadvertently reproduced within the farmers’ organizations supported by the project. Failure to attend to GBV as one of the major risks in the area could lead to further exclusion of women. This risk is reinforced by (1) the absence in the state party of a comprehensive law on violence against women and its failure to criminalize marital rape, (2) the lack of public awareness of the criminal nature of violence against  women and the lack of research on its root causes and consequences, and (3) the insufficient support for women who are victims of violence[[6]](#footnote-6).  Because of community conflicts in the area, gender mainstreaming activities, if not distinguishing among women from different communities, also risk reproducing discrimination of some women who could be excluded from the support given to certain women’s groups. | | * Gender aspects are integrated all outcomes of the project document and supported by the Gender analysis and action plan. The gender analysis develops a comprehensive situational analysis or increase the project’s understanding of gender issues and challenges in the three targeted areas. It enables the project to better understand the levels of participation and involvement of women and men in agriculture and in community-decision-making as well as different experiences of specific development challenges bear by subsets of the women groups. It also enables the project to better take into account women’s priorities, restraints and motivations when designing and supporting alternative livelihoods, as well as toidentify opportunities for greater equality and empowerment for women throughout project implementation. * Activities specifically targeting women and women’s groups have been designed with particular attention to establishing mechanisms to reduce the risk that existing discriminations against women are inadvertently reproduced in project implementation. These activities are regrouped under outcome 4 “ * The PMU will include a Gender Specialist to deal with this substantial risk and manage the effective implementation of the Action Plan. * All further screening, assessment and management to be conducted during implementation (as described in the ESMF) will also consider this risk. | | | |
| **Risk 4**  **Even though the project aims at making agricultural practices more sustainable by improving their adaptation to climate change and by promoting Climate-Smart Agriculture technologies, the exploitation of new crops and the increased agricultural production triggered by the project could cause serious damage to the natural habitats, including within the two biospheres present in the project area. This risk covers accidental release of products or waste from agricultural production units, uncontrolled use of herbicides and chemical fertilizers which can contaminate soils and surface water if used without proper protocols, as well as the potential introduction of new species revealing to be predators. Rehabilitation of pasture corridors could also cause harm to biodiverse ecosystems by triggering more erosion and landslides.**  *1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 8.1, 8.2, 8.5, 8.6* | I = 4  L = 2 | Moderate | Forested Guinea possesses unique wildlife and geological diversity. The project localities are located around two major reserves, the Ziama Biosphere Reserve (116 200 ha), located in the Kissidougou prefecture, and the Diécké Forest Reserve (64 000 ha), located in the Nzerekore prefecture. The Forest of Diécké is currently an important refuge for endemic species of fauna and flora, including the critically endangered western chimpanzee. It is one of 12 major sites for biodiversity conservation in West Africa[[7]](#footnote-7). The Ziama massif is considered to be the remaining part of the once continuous West African rainforest belt. It was designated Bioreserve status by UNESCO in 1980 and is home to 22 species of threatened fauna included in the CITES Appendices. It is home to 1 300 vascular plant species, 124 mammal species, and 286 bird species, including the forest elephant, the forest buffalo, the pygmy hippopotamus, the bongo antelope, and chimpanzees.  Both protected areas are currently suffering from anthropogenic degradation, illegal logging[[8]](#footnote-8), poaching, and agricultural (rice) production inside the reserves[[9]](#footnote-9).  The CSA packages (component 1) and the support to small entrepreneurs (component 2) which will both be supported by the project may lead to more extractive activities inside the reserve if clear assessments, criteria and measures are not put in place in order to ensure that the crops and projects are all located outside, and that intrants do not come from inside the reserve.  Agricultural and non-agricultural waste, use of pesticides and fertilizers, introduction of new species/seeds should also be appropriately managed in order to make sure that they do not generate any soil or water stream pollution, ultimately harming the region’s unique ecosystems and biodiversity.  Such risk could be of a substantial impact if the support provided is directed towards significant agricultural production. | | * A Biodiversity Action Plan will support the CSA approach to ensure the sustainability of this system. It will be closely linked to the Local Development Plans to ensure biodiversity conservation within landscape management and to take into account broader environmental constraints. * Stakeholder consultations will be key to determine local techniques and practices and informed by local planning and landscape management approaches. This is meant to ensure sustainable use of resources and avoid adverse impacts on ecosystems and people’s livelihoods. * Per the ESMF, one specific stream of the Biodiversity Action Plan will be designed and implemented for the project activities taking place in the two reserves’ neighboring sites – or sites connected through water streams to the reserve. * The project will work to strengthen institutional capacities to ensure effective and efficient management of agriculture in regard to climate change, including the mitigation of potential adverse impacts to habitats. * The project will collaborate with Research centres in order to investigate sustainable practices such as direct seeding, agroforestry, improved techniques, and others so that they can be promoted and implemented on project demonstration sites. Support to research will enable the project duty bearers to better understand potential solutions, and to promote them (ex: use of direct seeding) * Currently, the availability of pesticides and fertilizers in the area is low. However, to prevent any increase with the expected higher yields and production, a Biodiversity Action Plan addressing pest management will be developed as part of the ESMP. The project will comply with the SES and national legislation on the use of pesticides and ensure that appropriate straightforward management measures are incorporated in the capacity-building activities and implemented in the project activities on the ground. * The ESIA, including a cost-benefit analysis of adaptation options, will be undertaken for the targeted sites will detail viable options that adhere to the SES. They will identify socially acceptable and environmentally suitable locations and alternative livelihoods activities to be supported by the project. Environmental assessment of those alternatives will be included in these assessment, included appropriate measures of avoidance and if not possible of mitigation, such as an apparatus for waste water purification for aquaculture activities. * UNDP ensures that Projects avoid the release of pollutants, and when avoidance is not feasible, minimize and/or control the intensity and mass flow of their release. This applies to the release of pollutants to air, water, and land due to routine, non-routine, and accidental circumstances. UNDP Projects ensure that pollution prevention and control technologies and practices are applied during the Project life cycle, utilizing performance levels and measures specified in national law or in good international good practice, whichever is more stringent. If less stringent measures (as compared to good international practice) are appropriate, the Project will fully justify the chosen alternative through the assessment process, demonstrating that the alternative is consistent with these requirements. The technologies and practices applied will be tailored to the hazards and risks associated with the nature of the Project. | | | |
| **Risk 5**  **Improving agricultural productivity and enabling local communities to access finance for crops and small businesses could lead, in the long term, to more local development involving larger application of pesticide, damages to the ecosystems, and/or to deforestation. These could add to the current vulnerability of both Forest Reserves.**  *1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12* | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | The project aims at implementing CSA packages in agropastoral landscapes covering an area of at least 10,000 ha and benefitting 14,000 households. The project will stimulate small-scale agricultural production over through Farmers organizations, but plans to expand and scale up through the support to Local Development Plan. Output 1.4 plans “a sliding 5-year investment plan for the scaling up of the CSA is developed and embedded into the local development plans of target municipalities”. This work is completed by policy work at a broader scale targeting the creation of institutional and policy frameworks to enable local communities and authorities to access finance for CSA and other adaptive practices in the sector of agriculture.  These activities lead one to believe that the project may scale up and diffuse more resilient and more efficient agricultures practices beyond the 14,000 targeted households.  This also means that the risk of environmental damage caused by development activities will increase in parallel. Larger application of pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers could be encouraged by more access to agricultural finance, and the development of local infrastructure is also likely to be triggered by overall increased agricultural productivity. This economic dynamism can also lead to economic displacement of populations coming to the area attracted by the new opportunities, as the region is already a historical place of migration in West Africa. More economic development, more infrastructure and increased demographic pressure could in turn damage ecosystems, and lead to more deforestation.  The remaining forests of Guinea are particularly vulnerable: the country registers one of the highest deforestation rates in the world, and the forest cover has shrunk from 14 million ha in the 60s to 700 000 ha today[[10]](#footnote-10). An increased deforestation at the local level could have substantial impact on the local climate, as forests still act as a stabilizing force for the climate, regulate local ecosystems, protect soil and regulate water on farms. In addition, local livelihoods could be negatively affected, as forests supply goods and services that can drive sustainable growth such as Non-Timber-Forest-products and traditional pharmacopeia. Forests are also a place of cultural heritage for local communities, and should be preserved as such. | | * A SESA will be designed to address upstream risks including this one linked to finance access. The ESMF will be applied by the small grant program and other financial instruments supported by the project so that they continue to operate in a manner in line with the SES after the project ends. * The Local Development Plans of targeted municipalities will be updated with the project support (Output 1.4). These plans will reflect a prospective vision and integrate the concerns and risks linked to a sliding 5-year investment plan. Such Plans will be supported by the Biodiversity Action Plan which will present the biodiversity baseline in all local sites and detail all biodiversity mitigation measures to be integrated into the Local Development Plans to ensure that biodiversity features and ecosystem services are either maintained or restored. * Environmentally harmful practices such as the use of pesticides will be carefully managed through the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) * UNDP seeks to avoid use of pesticides in supported activities. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and Integrated Vector Management (IVM) approaches are to be utilized that entail coordinated use of pests and environmental information along with available pest/vector control methods, including cultural practices, biological, genetic and, as a last resort, chemical means to prevent unacceptable levels of pest damage. If after having considered such approaches recourse to pesticide use is deemed necessary in the legal agricultural framework, UNDP will advise, through capacity-building activities, safe, effective and environmentally sound pest management in accordance with the WHO/FAO International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management[[11]](#footnote-11) for the safe labelling, packaging, handling, storage, application and disposal of pesticides. Hazards of pesticide use are to be carefully considered and the least toxic pesticides selected that are known to be effective, have minimal effects on non-target species and the environment, and minimize risks associated with development of resistance in pests and vectors. * Output 1.2 will generate small grants for farmers organizations to enable them mobilizing CSA packages, and target a variety of crops and breeds, and agricultural practices (rice, cassava, groundnuts, cattle breeding, market gardening). More resilient crop varieties are expected to require a lesser use of pesticides even if access increases on the long term. However, because we cannot assume the risk of use of pesticide and resources, as well as potential toxic agricultural waste release, a Biodiversity Action Plan addressing pest management will be developed during the first phase of the project as a key-document accompanying the adaptation of the agriculture sector to climate conditions in a sustainable and environmentally-friendly perspective. It will demonstrate how IPM will be promoted to reduce reliance on pesticides and describes measures to minimize risks of pesticide use. | | | |
| **Risk 6**  **Climate change, which manifests itself mainly through more violent storms during the rainy season, has generated major shifts in the seasonal calendar, increased heat waves, perturbations in agricultural practices and among the fish populations, and has affected storage capacities – this can increase conflicts and social tensions, and lead to the loss of benefits among farmers’ organizations.**  *2.1, 2.2* | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | The project is designed with resilience in mind for activities sensitive to climate change. It integrates projections on increased heat waves, floods, changes in the seasonal and agricultural calendar. However, changes could happen more rapidly than anticipated and/or unplanned climate hazard could threaten the projects’ outcomes.  Among the major climate-related risks, wildfires hazards rank as high. This means that there is greater than a 50% chance of encountering weather that could support a significant wildfire that is likely to result in both life and property loss in any given year. Based on this information, the impact of wildfire must be considered in all phases of the project, in particular during design and construction. Project planning decisions, project design, construction and emergency response planning methods should take into account the high level of wildfire hazard. Note that damage can not only occur due to direct flame and radiation exposure but may also include ember storm and low level surface fire. In extreme fire weather events, strong winds and wind born debris may weaken the integrity of infrastructure. It would be prudent to consider this effect in the design and construction phase of the project. Further detailed information specific to the location and planned project should be obtained to adequately understand the level of hazard.  In addition, medium risks should also be taken into consideration as they could harm or destroy part of the projects achievements on the ground: there is a chance of more than 20% that potentially damaging and life-threatening river and urban floods occur in the coming 10 years, and more than a 25% chance that at least one period of prolonged exposure to extreme heat, resulting in heat stress, will occur in the next five years[[12]](#footnote-12). | | * The project has been designed to provide adequate support to the agrarian sector in order to better adapt it to climate change and modified agricultural conditions. * Capacity enhancement of State entities and natural resources users will be supported and monitored to ensure that communities’ livelihoods are better adapted to climate change. * Alternative livelihood activities are designed to be climate-smart; promotion of innovating agro-pastoral techniques is emphasized. * Wildfire, erosion, flooding and other hazards management systems will be part of the capacity-building activities planned in Outcome 1.1 and 3.2. They will comply with Standard 2 as per the Biodiversity Action Plan. * Trainings to farmer organizations will take into account the whole chain of production in order to ensure that a better adaptation of cultures corresponds to appropriate storage facilities. | | | |
| **Risk 7**  **The project might generate an increase of GHG emissions at the local level due to (1) the expected increased agricultural production, on the short-term and especially on the long-term; (2) particular emphasis locally on rice production ; (3) potential deforestation due to development pressure**  2.4 | I = 2  L = 2 | Low | Global rice cultivation accounts for 4% of greenhouse gas emissions, as lowland and irrigated rice fields are areas of stagnant water that release methane and nitrous oxide by rice fields would have been largely underestimated according to a study published Monday. However, the small scale of this production and the rainfed rice / lowland rice pair makes it possible to limit the climatic risks and  improves food security without creating high GHG emissions risks.  Development pressure on the long term may generate deforestation, but it is to be noted that the project plans reforestation activities from the start. | | As the project is Substantial risk, this low risk will be considered in the course of the implementation of the ESMF, and management measures will be put in place where necessary for compliance with the SES. | | | |
| **Risk 8**  **The project activities could lead to work-related accidents involving local workers during the construction of water reservoirs, irrigation systems, etc.**  *3.1* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | The project will support small-scale infrastructure and construction development (Irrigation and anti-erosion systems) that will require the use of local workforce.  Financial products will be developed with the project support, in order to facilitate, among other alternatives, the acquisition of solar irrigation systems (consisting of reservoirs and solar pump for water drainage), and the construction and/or acquisition of improved stoves, solar cookers and solar dryers (output 2.1). The project will also explore the possibility of setting up an irrigation system that will, in some cases, enable them to take advantage of changes in rainfall, and (ii) the possibility of setting up anti-erosion systems on exposed crops (output 1.2). | | * These projects are not yet selected and will need further safeguards assessments, as outlined in the ESMF. The SESP will be used to screen all construction activities once identified. Technical and feasibility studies will be conducted for each activity as part of the ESIA. * The risk of work-related accidents of local workers will be taken into account in the Health and Safety Plan which will set the standard for the technical and feasibility studies. | | | |
| **Risk 9:**  **Most of the agricultural sector in the project area is informal and fails to comply with national and international labor standards. Hence there is a risk of violation of workers' rights within the cooperatives supported by the project, linked in particular to the presence of migrants and human trafficking in the area. In addition, forced labor and child labor have been reported in the country and could be present in the farmers’ organizations supported by the project.**  *7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6* | I = 4  L = 4 | Substantial | The agricultural sector is associated with several human rights issues. The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recalls that the labour legislation, to the extent possible, should cover workers in the informal economy, including in relation to protection from economic exploitation, the minimum wage and occupational health and safety[[13]](#footnote-13). Violations of international labour standards may be present within the Farmers Organizations which will be supported by the project and should hence be monitored and prevented.  Moreover, Guinean and non-guinean citizens are also reported victims of trafficking and forced labour in the fields of agriculture, diamond and gold-mining[[14]](#footnote-14). Reports of  internal and cross-border trafficking of men, women and children for purposes of among others, forced labour  and domestic slavery. This happens within a legal lack of clarity in article 337  of the Criminal Code on the various forms of trafficking and servitude, which hampers  enforcement of the law and causes legal uncertainty for the victims[[15]](#footnote-15). | | * As per the ESMF, the ESIA will cover labor related risks and provide options for the ESMP to integrate appropriate mitigation measures. * Inspections of all activities will be carried out by the Ministry of the Agriculture and local authorities. In order to ensure the protection of children and all workers against trafficking, forced labour and other worst forms of labour in agriculture, it is expected to step up inspections of those activities. * The project will work closely with few farmers organizations within this project, and responsible parties will ensure that these organizations comply with all national and international labour standards. Training to farmers organizations which will receive small grants (Output 1.2) on adapted practices will recall these standards and monitoring of working conditions will be diligently followed as planned in the ProDoc. | | | |
| **Risk 10**  **The project may act as a disease vector : small scale water storage may have potential to provide breeding areas for mosquitos which represent a nuisance and increase the prevalence of Malaria or other significant mosquito borne diseases, while travels of staff and consultants into the area may increase the risk of COVID-19 spread.**  *3.4* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | The creation of water works supported by the project to adapt agricultural practices to increased droughts in the two areas may be sources of proliferation of vectors of waterborne diseases (cholera, bilharzia, guinea worms, malaria, etc.) which can harm beneficiaries.  The lack of medical facilities and the dilapidated condition of existing facilities, the lack of training for medical personnel, the low number of medical personnel per capita and the excessive burden health-care expenditure represents for low-income households[[16]](#footnote-16), all lead to believe that an increase in water-borne diseases would lead to a considerable health and sanitation issue at the local level.  The PMU staff, as well as national and possibly international consultants, are expected to travel to the area regularly for support and monitoring. Given the current global COVID-19 pandemic and the low level of medical facilities and healthcare in the region, they could facilitate the spread of COVID-19 into the area, with considerable consequences. | | * Initial environmental, technical and socio-economic studies led for each specific field activity as part of the ESIA will include specific measures to avoid the spread of waterborne disease. Because this risk can’t be avoided, mitigation measures will be implemented to tackle the adverse effects. The following measures will be taken before the start of operation of the developed site as per the Health and Safety Plan to be designed in the first 12 months of the project: (a) extension of insecticide-impregnated mosquito nets to limit the spread of malaria in the area; (b) improvement of the health coverage of the area and the encouragement of the future operators of the site to carry out regular medical check-ups; (c) Raising awareness and educating the population on hygiene measures. They will be integrated within the Health and Safety Plan. * These measures will favor the prevention of risks and impacts and taken into consideration the differentiated exposure to and higher sensitivity of marginalized groups. * The Health and Safety Plan, which will constitute a section of the ESMP, will also cover COVID-19 prevention measures. | | | |
| **Risk 11**  **There is a risk that discrimination against Indigenous Peoples could be reproduced within the project (e.g access to CSA packages and trainings), as Indigenous Peoples have raised concerns in a sometimes violent way over their weak representation and participation in political and public affairs.**  *4.3, 4.5, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9* | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | Agricultural areas targeted by the project are managed by small-holders and the project will impact at least 14,000 farming households of as direct beneficiaries in the Forested Guinea  Forested Guinea is home to numerous small indigenous peoples groups who initially fled here to escape domination by the Malinké. These groups include the Kissi, Kpelle (Guerze), Loma, Kono, Manon and Conagui. Kissi are a rice growing ethnic group in the Guékédou and Kissidougou areas of the Forest region. Other Kissi live just inside the borders of Sierra Leone and Liberia.  Culturally and linguistically, Kissi are unrelated to the dominant Mandé speaking population in the north, and have therefore been neglected in the political and economic life of present-day Guinea. Kpelle is the term used by another ethnic group of the Forest region to designate themselves. In French, they are referred to as Guerze. In Guinea this group is mainly concentrated in the Nzérékore administrative district. They are linguistically most closely related to the Mende of Sierra Leone and thus represent an ancient intrusion of more northern people into the rainforest area of the south-west. Loma are concentrated to the east of the Kissi in the Macenta administrative region. Unrelated to their Kissi neighbours, they represent an early incursion of savanna peoples into the forest zone about 500 years ago. In Guinea, they are gradually being assimilated into the larger Malinké populations[[17]](#footnote-17)  Over the last years (see risk 1), conflicts have arisen, and recent inter-community outbreaks of violence have been documented in Forest Guinea. These violences have been followed by temporary population displacements from some communities in fear of retaliation from government authorities[[18]](#footnote-18).  In this context, the support given to local authorities and farmers groups from certain ethnicities could be seized as a way to further marginalize other indigenous peoples by, for instance, cutting them out of the benefit-sharing mechanisms.  In addition, it should be considered that the introduction of CSA technologies may cause a loss of indigenous traditional agricultural knowledge, as climate finance will orientate them towards new practices.  Last, weak representation of indigenous peoples in the processes related to the Local Development Plans (output 3.4) and the national policy (output 3.5) could lead indirectly to physical and/or economic displacement of local communities and indigenous peoples. | | * Guinea voted in favour of the UNDRIP in September 2007. The UNDRIP will guide project implementation and the support provided to the agricultural sector throughout the project. Responsible parties will make sure that the project activities strengthen national laws and local regulations in line with the respect of indigenous peoples rights. The prefectural and communal-level authorities have designed regulations to try to ensure reciprocal respect for agricultural and pastoral spaces, on which the project will build adapted practices. All these measures will be enclosed within the Indigenous Peoples Plan, to be developed on a participatory basis during implementation per the ESMF. * Separate culturally appropriate consultations will be held in the early phase of the project with indigenous peoples representatives at the national level and with indigenous communities on project demonstration sites about changes to the management of the forests they traditionally use, and upon which their livelihoods rely, 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. * Training and material support provided to farmers organizations and women’s groups will be based on inter-community dialogue, ensuring that all local and indigenous communities participate equitably. In that sense, the project represents an opportunity exists to support forums to increase peaceful dialogue and encourage agreement. * Participation of all communities in farmers in the farmer organizations will be encouraged in a culturally sensitive way. It will ensure a sufficient number of indigenous participants and primarily promote sustainable traditional and customary use practices and prohibit involuntary restrictions on land and resource use. * The project will ensure that communities are able to represent themselves through their own organizations, not via proxy groups made up of people from other interest groups. Farmers organizations are expected to establish transparent and accountable mechanisms for the equitable distribution of local benefits. * The PPG team has consulted local communities and indigenous peoples for project activities in all project localities, according to the SEP. In the first twelve months of the project, as part of the Indigenous Peoples Plan, a FPIC protocol will developed. It will detail all measures needed to seek and obtain consent from local communities. Consent will be sought and obtained before any activities with potential adverse impacts on their rights, needs, lands or interests are implemented. * A Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been developed as part of the project design to articulate participation mechanisms and processes. It will inform mitigation and management measures for (potential) risks associated with the presence of different ethnic groups in the targeted landscape during project implementation. The breadth and detail of participatory mechanisms and processes are scaled to the Project’s potential social and environmental risks and impacts and particular circumstances: because this standard bears a “Moderate Risk”, the project only requires relatively streamlined consultation processes. The SEP plans an FPIC protocol which paves the way to ensure that their Free Prior Informed Consent is requested and obtained. This SEP and FPIC will be translated in both French and local languages and made available to all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples. They have been designed on the basis of consultations held during a second mission in December 2020. * Preservation of traditional knowledge will happen through the study and encouragement of existing climate smart practices. Where possible, agricultural knowledge will be studied and preserved through the partnership with local research centres. The Indigenous Peoples Plan will plan adequate measures to avoid the loss of indigenous agricultural knowledge. * The ESIA and SESA will both address the risks related to economic and physical displacement of indigenous peoples. The Livelihood Action Plan and Resettlement Action Plan will then address those risks with adequate mitigation measures. The GRM, also embedded in the ESMP, will allow communities to raise grievances if they feel their consent and/or interests have been compromised. | | | |
| **Risk 12**  **Gender-Based Violence is a prominent issue in the area – by supporting local farmer groups, the project could reproduce existing forms of violence, while the support to women groups may exacerbate them if they create power struggles at the household or village level**  *P12* | I = 3  L = 4 | Substantial | 92% of women aged 15-49 were victims of violence (Ministry of State for the Economy and Finance, 2013); 80.7% in 2016.  Women in Guinea are subject to various forms of violence, discrimination, and injustice due to the persistence of socio-cultural prejudices (UN, 2016). Domestic violence is the most frequent and takes many forms: physical assault, psychological or sexual violence, threats or coercion that can lead to death. More than one woman in two (63%) is a victim of domestic violence, with higher proportions in urban areas and in the regions of Faranah, Kindia, Conakry, and N'Zérékoré (MASPFE, 2017a[[19]](#footnote-19)).  These violences (physical, sexual, psychological, oral or economical) may be reproduced within the project activities, especially when supporting farmer organizations.  There is a risk that these violences are even exacerbated by the project’s support to women, if this creates power struggles within the household and/or if the project staff does not comply with the Gender Action Plan. | | * For a project focused on land management, it is necessary to understand any differences between household members and between community members in terms of decision-making and governance in complex rural and agrarian systems. Access and use of wood and non-wood forest products, as well as property rights over natural resources concerning land, forests, or animals are some of the many areas of exploration which require a deeper understanding of specific local characteristics. To gather information in all of these areas, visits and interviews in Forest Guinea are essential, as well as ensuring the collection of data on gender (in)equalities. A dedicated Gender Focal Point in the PMU will ensure data collection in a gender-responsive manner in the field (e.g. conduct key informant interviews focused on gender-related issues (i.e. barriers to access and control resources, sexual and reproductive health and rights, political representation and participation, gender-based violence, etc.), focus group discussions with women’s groups, and with groups of people of different age and ethnicities, etc.). * In line with national policies as well as UNDP guidelines, the project will adopt the following principles in its day-to-day management: (1) Demonstrate gender responsiveness in all interactions with project stakeholders; (2) No use of language or behaviour denoting bias and disrespect for any individual based on gender or ethnicity; (3) Avoid gender stereotyping in project documents, and communication outputs; (4) Support zero tolerance for sexual harassment, gender-based violence and/or sexual exploitation and abuse of men, women, girls and boys that may occur in connection with any of its supported activities. * The project will organise a training for the PMU on gender-integrated planning and project implementation and on risks related to gender inequalities including Gender-based Violence. There are a few courses available: NAP-Ag course focuses on adaptation planning[[20]](#footnote-20), and UNDP also produced with GEF a free online course on Gender and Environment, and versions recently launched in French. * To address the risk of Gender-based Violence highlighted in the SESP and in the Gender analysis, establish a process in the Stakeholder Response Mechanism to record GBV cases and related complaints and decide how to respond in collaboration with local CSOs and existing institutional mechanisms in place (if any) | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | **X** | |  | | |
| ***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) | Completed: Gender analysis, stakeholder analysis |
|  | | **X** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | | **X** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Planned |
| ***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) | GAP: completed SEP: completed  IPP: planned  HSP: planned  BAP: Planned  RAP: planned  LAP: planned |
|  | | **X** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) | Planned (including several targeted plans; See above) |
|  | | **X** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) | Completed |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** | | |  | | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | | |  | |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | | | **X** | |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | **X** | |  | | |
| ***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*** | | | **X** | |  | | |
| ***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/default.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)? | **YES** |
| 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? [[21]](#footnote-21) | **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)? | **YES** |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | NO |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | **YES** |
| P.11 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*. | **YES** |
| **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? | **YES** |
| **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? | **YES** |
| 1.3 changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5) | **YES** |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | **YES** |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | NO |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species? | **YES** |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | **YES** |
| 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? | **YES** |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | **YES** |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[22]](#footnote-22) | **YES** |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[23]](#footnote-23) | NO |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | NO |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the 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?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events* | **YES** |
| 2.3 direct or indirect increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disasters 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 |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | **YES** |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the 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) | **YES** |
| 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? | **YES** |
| 3.4 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | NO |
| 3.8 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | NO |
| 3.9 influx of project workers to project areas? | NO |
| 3.10 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? | **YES** |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | NO |
| 4.3 adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | **YES** |
| 4.4 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)? | **YES** |
| 5.2 economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)? | **YES** |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[24]](#footnote-24) | 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)? | **YES** |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | **YES** |
| 6.3 impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?  *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* | **YES** |
| 6.4 the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | **YES** |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | **YES** |
| 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* | **YES** |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | **YES** |
| 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.* | **YES** |
| **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? | **YES** |
| 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*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*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? | **YES** |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | **YES** |
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