## Annex 4: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)

# Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)

*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 | Supporting a Green Economy - Decoupling Hazardous Waste Generation from Economic Growth in Rwanda |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | Atlas Project ID: XXXX; UNDP-GEF PIMS: 6482 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Rwanda |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design (ProDoc stage) |
| 1. Date | 05/03/2021 |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach*** |
| *The project will benefit population groups who are exposed to hazardous chemical substances in their work environment or due to their occupations, population groups living and/or working near contaminated sites, vulnerable groups such as informal workers engaged in the application of pesticides or recycling/waste management, and population groups which are particularly exposed, through the following approach:*   * *Assess and understand the degree of relevance to the project of each vulnerable population group and ensure there are no groups which remain unidentified.* * *Support meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, in particular marginalized individuals and groups, in processes that may impact them, including design, implementation and monitoring of the project through capacity building and the creation of an enabling environment for participation.* * *Undertake a human-centered design approach to co-create better solutions with these population groups and increase their inclusion in decision-making processes that may impact them.* * *Collaborate with civil society on generating and disseminating information, as well as raising awareness on POPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals.* * *Raise awareness on the global impact of our individual actions and disseminate information on safer alternatives which are being promoted/introduced with government support, as well as ways on how to dispose of waste and waste products containing hazardous chemicals.* |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| *A detailed Gender Analysis has been conducted to identify potential gender-responsive measures that can be introduced during project implementation in order to address gender gaps, promote gender equality and improve women’s participation and decision-making (women empowerment) with respect to the sound management of chemicals and wastes. This was followed by development of a Gender Action Plan to mainstream gender throughout the project’s activities, incorporate measurable indicators related to gender equality and women’s empowerment and collect gender-disaggregated data and gender statistics wherever possible. The Plan also includes the collection of sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics working closely with gender experts, organizations and/or institutions that have expertise on gender issues. The plan follows the UNDP “Guide into Mainstreaming Gender into UNDP Chemicals & Waste Projects“. Boosted with the implementation of a communication strategy and a gender action plan, the project anticipates reducing the direct exposure to hazardous chemicals of 300,000 beneficiaries (150,000 female + 150,000 male).* |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| *The project primarily aims to minimize the risk posed by POPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals to human health and the environment and to promote compliance with the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions through:*   * *Establishment of an enabling policy/regulatory framework to create (financial) incentives for the sound management of chemicals, the introduction of safer alternatives, minimization of hazardous waste generation and its environmentally safe treatment.* * *Minimizing hazardous waste generation through the introduction of safer alternatives and cleaner (production) processes in selected industries and priority sectors.* * *Improving private sector and institutional capacity for the sound environmental treatment and disposal of hazardous waste streams.* * *Raising awareness to support behavioral change, capturing and disseminating experiences, lessons-learned and environmental best practices.* |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| *The project will:*   * *Provide meaningful means for local communities and affected populations to raise concerns and/or grievances including a redress processes for local communities when activities may adversely impact them.* * *Support stakeholder participation in preparation of legislations, strategies and guidelines by solicitating feedback from various relevant sectors including the private sector and local community. This is highlighted in the project’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan.*   *In addition, UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism, which includes the Social and Environmental Compliance Review (SECU) and Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) will also serve as an additional layer of grievance redress and empower stakeholders to push for 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:** Duty bearers, such as customs officials, enforcement officers and other government officials, may not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project  Related to:   * Human Rights; P.2 * Accountability; P.14 | I=3  L=3 | Moderate | Customs Service Department officers and other government officials might not be adequately trained on their duties and responsibilities and may not be able to perform their functions properly and misinterpret new legislation implementing them improperly. | | The project was designed to provide targeted training to customs officials and will address the needs of the participants (Activity 1.6.1) and training for various other stakeholders engaged who will be engaged in the various components. Training needs assessment will be undertaken (guided by the SES, as noted in the ProDoc), and a post-training assessment will be conducted to ensure that the information has been delivered to the participants as required and will have a meaningful impact on their job performance. In line with the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that has been prepared for the Project, additional capacity building will be done as needed per the ESMPs. | | | |
| **Risk 2:** Risk to enterprise viability and worker employment, in the course of the transition to alternatives to new POPs and mercury-containing products and during the implementation of the Polluter-Pays-Principle system  Related to:   * Human Rights; P.5 * Accountability; P.13, P.14 * Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions; 7.1, 7.5 | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | Some enterprises, especially those with limited resources, may not be able to provide alternatives to banned new POPs and mercury-containing products or abide by standards in line with the Polluter-Pays-Principle system. | | As in the ESMF prepared for the Project (Annex 8 of the ProDoc), upstream activities such as ban on the import of new POPs and mercury-containing products (Activity 1.2.1) or applying a Polluter-Pays-Principle System (Activity 1.4.1) that may have environmental or social implications will each undergo a participatory Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). This will ensure that economic impacts on small and medium sized enterprises and their workers are taken into consideration in the decision-making process while developing the legislative tools. In addition, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 7 of the ProDoc) will ensure participation of affected stakeholders during these activities. | | | |
| **Risk 3:** Marginalized population relying on their income as informal waste-pickers, who are predominantly women, will have found their waste resources reduced  Related to:   * Human Rights; P.5 * Gender Equality and Women Empowerment; P.9 * Accountability; P.13, P.14 * Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement; 5.2 | I = 3  L =3 | Moderate | The project will promote more organized recycling of waste through the waste valorization pilots and this may result in certain cases in shifts from informal to formal waste management activities. There is thus a risk that marginalized population groups, predominantly women, relying on their income as waste-pickers, will have found their waste resources reduced. | | In line with the ESMF, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be carried out and an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) developed at prior to implementation ofthe PET waste valorization pilot (Activity 5.1.1), while additional waste valorization pilots will be subject to a SESP to determine the level of assessment/management required. The resulting ESMP will include a Livelihoods Restoration Plan to address this risk if it was found to be significant. | | | |
| **Risk 4**: Affected stakeholders and marginalized groups may have grievances regarding selected contaminated site for remediation and companies involved in waste valorization or hazardous waste treatment  Related to:   * Accountability; P.13 | I = 4  L = 2 | Moderate | Some communities living near contaminated sites, existing disposal/treatment sites and industries treating hazardous waste may have concerns about the project. | | As mentioned in the ESMF, the remediation activity for PCB contaminated site (Activity 4.2.1) and waste valorization pilots (Activity 5.1.1) will undergo an ESIA each to assess the various potential impacts on stakeholders surrounding communities who will be closely involved and engaged through implementation of the ESMP. The plan will ensure effective engagement between various stakeholders by creating and disseminating information, fostering cooperation, and enhancing capacities. Stakeholders identified include representatives from central and local government, private sector, NGOs and civil society, academia and research institutions, vulnerable population groups and the general public. This will be done in line with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan that has been prepared for the Project.  The project will also put in place a project-level and/or site-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) to provide meaningful means for local communities and affected populations to raise concerns and/or grievances when activities may adversely impact them. | | | |
| **Risk 5**: The project could reproduce existing discriminations against women through excluding them from decision-making on project activities, benefiting from project outputs and capacity building initiatives.  Related to:   * Gender Equality and Women Empowerment; P.10 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | The Gender Analysis conducted found that there is an access gap in investments and entrepreneurship skills between men and women for medical waste disposal and incineration business. It also found that even though formalization of waste management increased community safety and stopped informal waste pickers, formal waste collection efforts excluded women from benefits that include wages and financial gain from the reuse of plastic containers and textiles. | | A *Gender Action Plan* (Annex 9 of the ProDoc) has been prepared to mitigate the identified risk and propose measures that ensure that women are represented in decision-making on project activities and are included in capacity building activities. Proposed strategies to mainstream gender in hazardous waste management include an enabling policy environment, awareness raising and education, gender equity in the access to opportunities, and data collection and research. This will be further assessed in the SESAs and ESIAs/ESMPs that will be undertaken during project implementation as described in the ESMF. | | | |
| **Risk 6**: Accidental release of PCBs, POPs pesticides, HHPs or mercury into the environment due to improper handling, storage, transport and treatment/disposal of these chemicals and exposing the workers as well as the local communities living nearby.  Related to:   * Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management; 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.14 * Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security; 3.2, 3.5, 3.6 * Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions; 7.6 * Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency; 8.1, 8.2 | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | Accidental releases of chemicals into the environment would have a severe impact but are unlikely to occur in high amounts. | | In line with the ESMF that has been prepared for the project, an ESIA will be conducted for identified pilot demonstrations and disposal activities (handling and disposal of Hg-containing products (Activity 3.1.2), PBDE-containing plastics (Activity 3.1.3) and PCB-containing equipment and oil (Activity 4.1.1), remediation of the PCB-contaminated site (Activity 4.2.1) and handling and disposal of stockpiled obsolete POPs and non-POPs pesticides (Activity 4.3.1)) and will identify environmentally sensitive receptors that may be affected by accidental releases such that mitigation measures will be developed and included in the ESMP through a Spill Prevention and Management Plan. This plan will describe how the project will handle, transport and store hazardous material in accordance with IFC Health and Safety Guidelines. | | | |
| **Risk 7:** Contamination or damage to sites of cultural heritage, biodiversity or socioeconomic value to the local community from pilot demonstrations  Related to:   * Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management; 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.7, 1.14 * Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security; 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 * Standard 4: Cultural Heritage; 4.1, 4.2 * Standard 5: Resettlement and Displacement; 5.1, 5.2 * Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples; 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.6 * Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resources Efficiency; 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.6 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | The impact and likelihood of this risk can be better determined once the pilot sites and activities have been selected. | | Pilot demonstrations that have not yet been selected (pilot interventions to avoid/reduce the generation of (hazardous) waste and releases through the introduction of cleaner production and safer alternatives (Activity 3.1.1), waste valorization pilots (Activity 5.1.1) and demonstration pilots to enhance national hazardous waste treatment capacity, environmental performance (Activity 5.2.1) and upgrade/expansion of existing interim storage facility infrastructure (Activity 5.3.1)) will incorporate SES criteria during the selection process including assessment of sites of these activities. A list of exclusion criteria will be prepared to eliminate high risk sites. These will include sites with high cultural heritage value, inhabited sites, sites with high biodiversity values (such as protected areas) or sites used by indigenous peoples. Once defined, the pilots will undergo a SESP to determine the level of assessment/management needed. | | | |
| **Risk 8**: Adopted legislation, guidelines, strategies and plans may lead to practices that could result in accidental release of PCBs, POPs pesticides, HHPs or mercury into the environment due to improper handling, storage, transport and treatment/disposal of these chemicals and exposing the workers as well as the local communities living nearby.  Related to:   * Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management; 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.7, 1.14 * Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security; 3.2, 3.5 * Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions; 7.6 * Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency; 8.1, 8.2 | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | This risk is not a direct result of project activities but may result from legal and policy instruments proposed by the project. | | In line with the ESMF, a SESA will be prepared during review of the PCB Law (Activity 1.1.1), drafting of regulatory texts and guidelines for new POPs and Hg and their hazardous waste streams (Activities 1.2.1 and 1.3.1), developing the EPR framework (Activity 1.5.1) and the national strategies for Hg (Activity 3.1.2). The SESA will consider the risk of accidental release of chemicals and worker exposure that may result from implementing the legislation and strategies at the national level and incorporate measures to mitigation them. | | | |
| **Risk 9:** Disruption to wetland where PCB-contaminated site will be remediated  Related to:   * Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management; 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.11 | I = 4  L = 3 | Substantial | Remediation of PCB-contaminated site will test bioremediation measures that may introduce alien invasive species to the wetland if the species is not properly selected. | | Activity 4.2.1 will undergo a site-specific ESIA and an ESMP will be developed to ensure that this risk is avoided or mitigated. | | | |
| **Risk 10:** Flooding of interim storage and waste treatment/disposal facilities for hazardous waste used during the demonstration activities  Related to:   * Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks; 2.1, 2.2 * Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security; 3.3 | I = 3  L = 2 | Moderate | Sensitivity and sustainability of the project may be affected by the occurrence of natural disasters due to landslides, erosion, floods or extreme weather conditions or greater vulnerability thereto. | | As part of the selection process for the demonstration pilots, considerations will be made that waste treatment (Activity 5.2.1) and interim storage facilities (Activity 5.3.1) to be used are not located in areas classified as high risk due to landslides, erosion, floods or extreme weather conditions. Once pilot demonstrations are selected, a SESP will be undertaken to determine the extent of the assessment/management needed. | | | |
| **Risk 11:** The project's demonstrative interventions for the elimination of PCBs may result in the increase of (or no reduction of) CO2 emissions or other air emissions due to current technologies for incineration treatment/destruction of PCBs.  Related to:   * Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks; 2.4 * Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security; 3.2 | I = 3  L = 3 | Moderate | It is estimated that 122 tons of PCB oil will need to be disposed of as part of the project activities. The disposal method will be through co-incineration (of PCB under 1,000 ppm) at a local private enterprise (cement kiln) as has been done in the past under a previous GEF project. Otherwise, it will be exported. | | As part of the ESIA that will be prepared for the project, technologies that be used for PCB treatment/elimination (Activity 4.1.1) will be evaluated in terms of their CO2 emissions and potential chemical release, options compared and measures proposed to minimize CO2 emissions and chemicals produced such that the alternative technologies must ensure compliance with "Best Available Techniques" (BAT) and "Best Environmental Practices" (BEP) practices as per the Stockholm and Basel Conventions. This will build on the burning test of PCB contaminated oil undertaken at CIMERWA in 2017 as part of the GEF-4 PCB project. | | | |
| **Risk 12**: As the project will lead to employment opportunities in hazardous conditions, risk exists of child labor, which is prevalent in the target country, as well as other practices in contravention to principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions.  Related to:   * Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions; 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5 | I=4  L=2 | Moderate | Given the fact that the project will work with licensed, legitimate and reputable international and national hazardous waste operators, and activities will take place at specific sites with the control of Rwandan authorities, there is very little chance that children could be exposed to the Project’s activities and/or that child labor will be used for project activities, especially in regard to handling of chemicals. | | During selection of the enterprises to be engaged in the demonstrations and disposal activities, and as part of the private sector risk assessment that will be undertaken, the project will ensure that an Occupational Health and Safety Plan; Labour Assessment and Management Plan; and/or any other plan required for SES compliance is in place prior to commencement of the works.  The interim storage (Activity 5.3.1) and waste treatment facilities (Activity 5.2.1) that will be used by the project will be subject to a visit to ensure compliance with international best practice. | | | |
| **Risk 13**: The project may pose risks to occupational health and safety due to exposure to harmful chemicals during site remediation, transport and interim storage of chemicals and their treatment/final disposal. Workers may also be exposed to risk of accidents and physical injuries on the job.  Related to:   * Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions; 7.6 | I = 4  L = 2 | Moderate | Workers could be exposed to chemicals and accident risks during implementation of the pilot projects and disposal activities but the probability that this exposure will be long term is unlikely. | | As mentioned earlier, the ESIAs that will be undertaken for each selected pilot, will take into consideration occupational health and safety measures to ensure they are in line with best practices such that adequate measures are included in the pursuant ESMPs. Pilots that have not been selected will undergo a SESP to determine the level of assessment/management  During selection of the enterprises to be engaged in the demonstrations and disposal activities, and as part of the private sector risk assessment that will be undertaken, the project will ensure that an Occupational Health and Safety Plan; Labour Assessment and Management Plan; and/or any other plan required for SES compliance is in place prior to commencement of the works. This includes a visit to interim storage (Activity 5.3.1) and waste treatment (Activity 5.2.1) facilities that will be used by the project. | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | **X** | | **Thirteen potential risks have been identified for this project, nine of which are assessed as MODERATE and four as SUBSTANTIAL. As a result, this project is rated overall as a SUBSTANTIAL Risk project. During the PPG, an ESMF, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan have been prepared to meet SES requirements. During project implementation, several SESAs addressing potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts of upstream activities will be performed, and ESIAs along with ESMPs that will include Occupational Health and Safety Plans, Spill Prevention Plans, and any other plans required for SES compliance including potentially a Livelihoods Restoration Plan, will be developed and put in place prior to commencement of the pilot demonstrations and disposal activities. Pilots that have not yet been identified will undergo selection criteria that include SES and once selected, a SESP to determine the level of assessment/management needed. In addition, all private enterprises that will be engaged in the project will undergo a private sector risk assessment in line with UNDP SES requirements.** | | |
| ***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 during PPG: gender analysis, stakeholder analysis |
|  | | **X** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) | Planned (for during implementation) |
|  | | **X** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Planned (for during implementation) |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | **X** | |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | |  | | **X** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) | Completed during PPG: Gender Action Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan |
|  | | **X** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) | Planned (for during implementation) |
|  | | **X** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) | Completed during PPG |
| ***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/Pages/Homepage.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| P.1 Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? | *No* |
| P.2 Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project? | *Yes* |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | *No* |
| *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? | No |
| P.5 inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? [[1]](#footnote-2) | Yes |
| P.6 restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? | No |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | No |
| **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| P.8 Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? | No |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | Yes |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | 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* | No |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  *For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc*. | No |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.13 exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? | Yes |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | Yes |
| P.15 risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project? | No |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | Yes |
| 1.2 activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | 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? | No |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | No |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | Yes |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-4) | No |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | Yes |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | Yes |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | Yes |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | No |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | Yes |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 3.1 construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams) | Yes |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | Yes |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | Yes |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | No |
| 3.5 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | Yes |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | Yes |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | Yes |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | No |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | Yes |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | Yes |
| 4.3 adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | No |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | No |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | No |
| **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?[[4]](#footnote-5) | No |
| 5.4 impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | No |
| **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? | No |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.6 forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above* | Yes |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | No |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | No |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | No |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)* |  |
| 7.1 working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments? | Yes |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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/) | Yes |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | Yes |

1. Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender and transsexual people. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)