DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

Annex 5: Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP)

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Safeguarding Solomon Islands endemic and globally threatened biodiversity and ecosystem services from key threats, particularly invasive alien species and unsustainable land use practices (SAFE project)
2. Project Number (i.e., Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	PIMS 6566
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Solomon Islands
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Design
5. Date	

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
Human rights depend on a healthy environment, as degraded natural resources often mean the more marginalized and vulnerable communities are most affected. Resource and land-related degradation and conflicts already exist in Solomon Islands, and through its implementation activities the project aims to reduce these vulnerabilities and improve rather than impinge on local rights. The project objective is *Solomon Islands indigenous (threatened and endemic) species, natural ecosystems and land/seascapes are safeguarded from invasive alien species, land degradation, unsustainable resource use and climate-induced risks through effective government capacity, community participation and governance and green livelihoods in support of the blue/green economy.* During the project preparatory and design stage (i.e., PPG), analysis and assessment of environmental and social risks/impacts has been undertaken (as part of the project's ESMF). This initial assessment included examining human rights conditions within the scope of the project. The detailed design of this project has thus included the incorporation of a human-rights based approach following national and international guidelines such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Equality Act and Aarhus Convention principles. The human rights-based approach of the project will be achieved by encouraging equality, inclusion and participation in biodiversity conservation, invasive alien species (IAS) management and sustainable land management consultations, management planning and implementation. Through implementing a human-rights mainstreaming approach, a wide range of stakeholders will be engaged, consulted, and participate in project planning and implementation activities (i.e., including representatives from different levels of government, Non-Governmental Organizations as well as local communities). Given the presence of communities of indigenous people in all project land/seascapes, mechanisms will be identified and implemented to guarantee their meaningful, effective, and informed participation throughout all elements of the project cycle. Initial consultations have occurred at the PIF stage with NGOs, CBOs, and provincial governments relevant to the selected land/seascapes. This early concept/PIF consultation has been further built-off with detailed culturally appropriate consultations with communities at each of the project's potential demonstration sites. These detailed consultations were carried out in the PPG phase of the project with the objective of achieving agreement (and where necessary FPIC) on any matters that may affect their rights and interests, lands, resources, territories (whether titled or untitled to the people in question) and traditional livelihoods. Local indigenous peoples in each of the four project sites (These five sites include, Reef Islands and Utupua Seascape/landscape, Western Solomons Biosphere, Solomon Tubi Forest Reserve and Lau and North Malaita Integrated

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

Sustainable Management Area have been consulted and informed of the objectives, activities and potential impacts of the project. Any activities that may adversely affect the existence, value, use or enjoyment of indigenous lands, resources or territories shall not be conducted unless agreement has been achieved through an FPIC process. Potentially affected indigenous peoples have been informed of their right to withdraw consent at any time during project implementation and have been informed of the various channels they may take to formally lodge a grievance with the relevant authority.

Within the detailed design of the project, focus has been given towards empowering marginalized groups, including youth and women. During the design/PPG phase, a detailed stakeholder analysis and engagement plan has been prepared together with a comprehensive list of all those stakeholders who have been consulted. Meeting minutes of each consultation with local communities have been documented, as has the process for establishing FPIC. This analysis has sought to capture the existing systems, languages, cultures and traditions of Solomon Islands and the demonstration land/seascapes. Building off of this stakeholder analysis, the project design has sought to ensure that relevant (i.e., for the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable land management, and their customary use of biological resources) practices of indigenous and local communities are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations. A monitoring and evaluation process has been incorporated into the project design with strong local participation, enabling human-rights abuses or grievances within project activities to be addressed efficiently and transparently

To ensure the effective integration of a human-rights based approach, measures have been incorporated into the project document to support the project Board, staff team, consultants and duty bearers to follow this rights-based approach. Human rights standards and considerations have been embedded within the capacity building and awareness raising of the team and local community. Equal opportunities are required to be upheld within all employment that arises as a result of the project.

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

Gender equality is a key Outcome for the United Nations Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022: Outcome 2 "Gender Equality: By 2022, gender equality is advanced in the Pacific, where more women and girls are empowered and enjoy equal opportunities and rights in social, economic, and political spheres, contribute to and benefit from national development, and live a life free from violence and discrimination[1]". This project aims to contribute to women's empowerment through involvement in decision-making and support for green livelihoods and sustainable land management. Women's rights and participation will be monitored against defined indicators and targets throughout the project; a target of the project will be to score at least 2 as per the UN's Gender Marker system, meaning that the project will promote gender equality significantly[2].

Gender Equality is also a stated priority of the Government of Solomon Islands, and all ministries and sectors share the responsibility for achieving gender equality. Traditional norms influence gender relations in different Solomon Islands cultures in terms of division of labor, property rights, and decision making. Key societal gender concerns include access to legal and judicial support, health, education, economic empowerment, decision-making and leadership, violence against women[3].

A comprehensive gender analysis specific to Solomon Islands and the project's demonstration land/seascapes has been undertaken during the project design/PPG phase. This analysis has sought to determine the roles of women, identify inequalities or vulnerabilities, cultural, social, religious, and other constraints on women's potential participation. This Gender Analysis also reviewed best practices achieved by previous local initiatives, such as in the Arnavon Community Marine Conservation Area[4] where TNC has facilitated a Women's network (KAWAKI) to unite women around conservation, culture, and community to create a better future for their children[5], and in projects in the Western Province which have helped women establishing savings clubs. Gender related issues will also be assessed and examined in the project's ESMF.

The key recommendations from this analysis have been captured in a Gender Action Plan, and further mainstreamed within the project framework. This includes the incorporation of age and sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics with applicable measurable indicators related to gender equality and women's empowerment.

---

[1] United Nations Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022. https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/Final_UNPS_2018-2022_Pacific.pdf

[2] UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2018-2021 https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/gender/UNDP%20Gender%20Equality%20Strategy%202018-2021.pdf

[3] Asian Development Bank. Solomon Islands country gender assessment. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2015. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/176812/sol-country-gender-assessment.pdf

[4] https://www.sprep.org/attachments/VirLib/Regional/community-based-action-sids.pdf

[5] https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/where-we-work/asia-pacific/asia-and-the-pacific-women-in-conservation/kawaki-women-s-group/

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

During project implementation, activities will be undertaken that aim to reduce gender inequalities and support rights for women in the demonstration land/seascapes , through capacity development and female participation in consultations, awareness raising and knowledge sharing. Both women and men will be provided with equal access to advice and job opportunities within the auspices of the project. The project will adopt and adhere to relevant guidelines such as those of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as well as UNDP and GEF gender policies.

During project design/PPG, consultation and outreach has sought to engage with women's groups within the project demonstration sites. During implementation Women's groups will be empowered to advise different aspects of the project, and female representatives and leadership positions will be enabled within the architecture of the project. Opportunities and choices will be given to women that should strengthen women's rights in the wider community, households and family networks. The economic status of women, and particularly vulnerable women, will be specifically targeted through the project's work to support green livelihoods.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience

Solomon Islands has been identified as part of the East Melanesian Biodiversity Hotspot[6] due to the wide range of ecosystems and biodiversity it harbors, including 37 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). The country and the proposed demonstration land/seascapes host large numbers of IUCN Red List and endemic species. Unsustainable land use practices (deforestation, unsustainable farming, mining), invasive alien species, over-exploitation, pollution and climate change are all impacting the local environment, threatening the sustainability of natural resources, globally significant biodiversity as well as the wellbeing of local people, including diverse indigenous communities.

During the PPG, a detailed assessment has been conducted of the status of, and threats to, biodiversity and the wider environment in the demonstration land/seascapes. This initial assessment provides the basis for identifying the measures to be included in the detailed project design for mainstreaming biodiversity into ecosystem management, conservation of species and managing the threats from IAS and sustainable land management. The assessment covers both the status of globally threatened and endemic biodiversity and IAS, as well as a review of opportunities to reduce threats from IAS and land degradation to enhance biodiversity conservation.

The project has a strong focus on the mainstreaming of sustainability and resilience through mainstreaming biodiversity. Specifically, the project aims to contribute to mainstreaming biodiversity by: a) supporting national and provincial government to establish inter-sectoral governance mechanisms for biodiversity conservation, IAS and sustainable land management and to enhance capacity, regulations, tools and guidelines; b) developing and implementing a National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) and ensuring better biosecurity at ports and airports to stop IAS incursions; c) demonstrating in priority land/seascapes improved biodiversity conservation and IAS and sustainable land management through community based natural resource management and green livelihoods; d) raising public awareness and improving knowledge management and sharing of best practices.

The project addresses key priorities identified in Solomon Islands National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (2016-2020); the Aichi targets under the UN Convention on Biological Diversity; targets under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, the UN Pacific Strategy 2018 – 2022, as well as international SDGs (particularly SDG 14: Life Below Water and SDG 15: Life on Land).

Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders

[6] https://www.cepf.net/sites/default/files/emi_ecosystem_profile.pdf

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

The project has worked closely with local community members/islanders, including women groups, representation of all the ethnic groups (i.e. through contact with Tribal Chiefs and Elders), differently abled, and extremely poor in rural areas that depend heavily on the islands' terrestrial and the surrounding areas' marine ecosystems to meet the basic necessities (food, clean drinking water, shelter, and livelihoods) through a participatory approach during the project design, development, phase. This continued engagement will also be a crucial element of project implementation. During the design phase (i.e., PPG), such consultation and engagement with local peoples was crucial in setting priorities and inputs for the development of the project activities. This in turn ensured that positive impacts reach these communities during the implementation phase.

Key stakeholders listed above were engaged at an early stage in the development of this project via a robust round of consultations, where the project team and representatives visited the five potential demonstration sites and undertook detailed consultations. This provided an ideal setting to share ideas, aims and global goals to be achieved through this project, as well as overviews of social and environmental standards, including UNDP's grievance and redress mechanism.

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 introduction of new natural resource management practices, enforcement controls and/or strengthened biosecurity protocols/clearances in the demonstration land/seascapes (and via associated national-level policy and strategy developments under Component 1 and 2) could affect traditional rights and/or access to some land and resources, potentially increasing conflict between communities and likely affecting more marginalized or vulnerable groups including indigenous peoples.* Principle (Human Rights): P.5, P.6, P.7 Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4	I = 4 L = 3	**Substantial**	Solomon Islands has a wide diversity of tribes with distinct customs and norms including customary land ownership, cultural practices, languages and traditions meeting the broad UNDP definition of Indigenous Peoples. In all four proposed demonstration land/seascapes, local communities, including indigenous people, living within or near these areas may use them for livelihoods (subsistence/small scale farming, fisheries or forestry) or have traditional rights for harvesting natural resources. There have been conflicts	Assessment The process of consulting with communities in the demonstration land/seascapes began at PIF stage through discussions with relevant NGOs, CSOs and provincial authorities working in the areas, and was further strengthened through meaningful consultation at the project's demonstration sites during the design/PPG phase. During the PPG phase a stakeholder analysis and extensive consultation has been undertaken by project staff and external experts to discuss project activities with local and indigenous communities in all four of the proposed demonstration land/seascapes. These four sites include, Reef Islands and Utupua Seascape/landscape, Western Solomons Biosphere, Solomon Tubi Forest Reserve and Lau and North Malaita Integrated Sustainable Management Area. All

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 66.6, 6.9			between indigenous communities over natural resource use and land tenure in Solomon Islands, and these could be exacerbated if project activities build on existing impacts or if they are not managed properly. The COVID-19 pandemic may increase the chance of such conflicts due to impacts on the local economy and movements of people from towns back to rural areas. Resistance is more likely from older generations. Local people are likely to be aware of threats to natural resources in their area. Although this risk has been categorized as Moderate at the design stage it may be found to be lower following further assessment.	four sites are owned by indigenous local tribal groups and are mostly on customary land. Preliminary consultations with indigenous peoples were conducted during the PPG phase by experts hired specifically to ensure culturally sensitive approaches. As part of this process, willingness by tribal communities to engage/participate in the project was documented through a series of Consent Letters (see Annex 1 of the IPPF). However, these letters do not replace the need for a FPIC that will need to be established/achieved with all communities participating in the project once the exact demonstration sites are finalized and before implementation begins. A **FPIC** protocol will be obtained before the implementation of Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4. The ESMF assesses the need for further impact assessment during project implementation. It is tentatively foreseen that targeted/scoped ESIAs, ESMP (which will be incorporated into the proposed ILSMS under Output 3.1) will be required to be produced during implementation with the potential for further targeted assessments being planned as needed. The scoped ESIAs will include a **livelihoods assessment** describing the current socio-economic conditions within the demonstration land/seascapes 'Upstream' risks to indigenous peoples (and/or their rights, resources, territories, or cultural heritage) will also be assessed as part of the **SESA** conducted for the project's policy interventions, including Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1. <u>Management</u> **ESMPs** (which will be incorporated into the proposed ILSMS under Output 3.1) will be produced as part of the scoped ESIAs conducted for each of the four demonstration sites. To ensure effective management of any livelihood-related issues that may eventuate during the implementation of the project, a **Livelihood Action Plan** will be developed in. Year 1 of the project's

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

				implementation. It shall seek to determine management measures /actions as well as monitoring indicators for any livelihood-related activities/mitigation measures. The LAP will be informed by other associated project initiatives s such as the ESIAs and ILSMS that will be undertaken at each of the project's demonstration land/seascapes associated with Component 3. Additionally, a full **Indigenous Peoples Plan** (see outline for IPP in Annex 6 of the ESMF) should be developed for each of the four demonstration sites under Component 3. The IPPS will build on the IPPF. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan prepared during the PPG further defines measures to ensure that the project is well informed by nominated community representatives throughout all planning and implementation phases. A comprehensive grievance redress mechanism has been co-designed with the communities during the PPG and incorporated into the ESMF together with a monitoring and evaluation process. Capacity building, raising environmental awareness and empowering community voice has also been built into the project design.
Risk 2 *Women and other marginalized groups could face discrimination or lack voice within decisions, benefits and resources surrounding project design and implementation.* Principle (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment): P.8, P.9, P.10, P.11 Principle (Accountability): P.13	I = 4 L = 2	**Moderate**	Due to existing local hierarchies, cultural practices and traditional governance, gender imbalances exist in governance, community and household positions within the demonstration land/seascapes. In three of the provinces hosting demonstration land/seascapes (Western Province, Temotu Province, Isabel Province) households are governed through matrilineal systems where ownership of land/resources is handed down through women. However, when it comes to decisions on land and natural resources use, decisions are usually done by male family members and not	<u>Assessment</u> A detailed assessment of specific local challenges and inequalities for women and other marginalized groups has been undertaken as part of the project preparatory work (and has been captured in the project's **Gender Analysis**/Gender Action Plan). The scope of the gender analysis/assessment sought to determine the roles of women, identify inequalities or vulnerabilities, cultural, social, religious, and other constraints on women's potential participation and any rights issues within the spatial boundaries of the project's demonstration sites and sphere of influence. <u>Management</u> The key recommendations from the gender analysis have been captured in a **Gender Action Plan** and mainstreamed within the project framework. This includes the incorporation of age and sex-disaggregated data/gender statistics and specific measurable indicators related to gender equality and women's empowerment.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

			necessarily women. For systems where inheritance of rights, land, resources is passed down through male (patrilineal), especially in Choiseul and Malaita Provinces, decision making is done by men. Women could therefore be marginalized within project stakeholder participation, governance arrangements, capacity building, livelihoods development, and knowledge sharing. Enabling women to have leadership positions within community decisions and increasing their financial independence could also cause tension through alterations to traditional social and decision-making structures.	During the project design phase, considerations have been made and embedded in the project's framework that aim to reduce gender inequalities within the project's sphere of influence and support rights for women in the demonstration land/seascapes through capacity development and female participation, with the support of community leaders and local governments. Both women and men will be provided with equal access to advice and opportunities, including in project governance mechanisms and through any project-related benefits. The goal for gender-rights development within the project will be Gen 2, following the UN Markers meaning that the project will promote gender equality significantly.
Risk 3: *The introduction of incentives, project related employment and support for sustainable land management or green livelihoods could cause conflict if not implemented carefully and managed equitably or may support employment that fails to comply with national and international labor standards.* Principle (Human Rights): P.7 Standard 7: 7.1, 7.5	I= 3 L= 2	**Moderate**	Financial incentive mechanisms such as small grants or the establishment of savings clubs have the ability to engage community support and assist the more marginalized groups; however, they also have the potential to cause conflict if they are mismanaged or change the current economic systems. Recruitment for project-related employment could also cause conflict. Although there have been no cases of community transmission of Covid-19 in Solomon Islands, the	<u>Assessment</u> In the full project design document, financial incentive mechanisms and diversification of livelihoods have been planned so as not to negatively affect existing economic systems. Instead, they have been designed to ensure additional benefits to the community, with emphasis on empowering and including marginalized groups and individuals. The **scoped/targeted ESIAs** will assess potential issues related to labor and working conditions. <u>Management</u> Based on the outcomes of the ESIAs, a set of management and monitoring measures will be included in the **ESMP** (ILSMS developed under Component 3) to ensure that any employment developed through the project will follow national and international equal opportunity employment laws. These measures might be articulated through a **Labor Management Procedure.**

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

			pandemic has greatly impacted the economy and livelihoods of Solomon Islanders impacting sectors such as forestry, tourism and transport. At the local level, it is impacting food security and livelihoods as small-scale informal sectors including street and market vendors are ordered to temporarily close down by the government, leading to reduction in cash flow and mass movement of people to rural areas[7]. Microeconomic impacts felt by local beneficiaries may be exacerbated further if the introduction of incentives is not carefully and equitably managed.	
Risk 4: *The project may not effectively engage and ensure participation of all stakeholders, including women, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, during the project design and the implementation phases. Due to existing inequalities, rights holders may not have the capacity to claim their rights.* Principle (Human Rights): P.3, P.5 Principle (Accountability): P.13 Standard 6: 6.4	I = 4 L = 2	**Moderate**	Due to marginalization, or a lack of literacy and education some marginalized groups in the demonstration land/seascapes of the relevant regions in Solomon Islands may not be equally represented within the project. In initial project design/PPG consultations at the project demonstration sites, women were distinctly not as vocal as men. Traditional patriarchal biases and hieratical structures in the given project sites (particularly in Isabel, Western and Temotu Province) may hinder their capacity to claim their rights or be able to have equal participation in the project.	<u>Assessment</u> During the PPG phase, the project has undertaken comprehensive engagement with key stakeholders, particularly the communities of indigenous people in each of the demonstration land/seascapes to assess existing inequalities and will define measures to ensure they are addressed within the full project design documentation. Marginalized or vulnerable groups, such as youth and women have been specifically targeted for consultation and engagement due to traditional hierarchies. The consultations undertaken during the PPG phase included awareness raising with local indigenous communities in the relevant sea/landscapes where project activities will be implemented. Indigenous peoples were informed of their rights and their ability to withhold consent on certain activities of the project during implementation. Consent letters (Annex 1 of IPPF) were obtained from tribal chiefs as part of this initial consultation.

[7] https://digitalarchive.worldfishcenter.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12348/4195/Program%20Report_2020-22_Covid19%20Report.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

			While Tribal chiefs, in each of the project's demonstration sites, represent the key decision-makers, based on traditional societal norms, women's views have been sought through discussion amongst the women of the community, who then rely on their perception to the relevant traditional leaders/tribal chiefs. .	On-going consultation with affected stakeholders will also be undertaken during the conduct of the **SESA** conducted for Outputs 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1 for policy-level/strategy development initiatives. Management Formal **FPIC** will need to be obtained (especially for Component 3: Activities 3.1.6, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3) before any activity that might impact indigenous peoples starts. Given the triggering of Standard 6 (Indigenous Peoples), FPIC procedures have been developed and embedded in the project's ESMF, IPPF, SEP and future required management plans/assessments (such as the IPP). On-going consultation (according to FPIC protocol) with affected stakeholders will also be undertaken as part of the **IPPs** that will need to be developed for each demonstration site. The IPP (that will be developed during implementation, following the requirements outlined in the project's IPPF) will also ensure that indigenous peoples are able to share/access benefits from the project in a culturally appropriate manner. As a result of the detailed consultations that have been conducted during the PPG phase, a comprehensive **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** has been prepared as (ProDoc Annex 8). As some project sites and activities have not been finalized in fine-level detail at the time of project design, A **Grievance Redress Mechanism** (GRM) has been designed and incorporated within the project's ESMF and IPPF. Monitoring and evaluation processes have been designed to record any complaints or grievances that arise within the project and wider community, with attention being brought to the Project Board. The GRM has been designed to be culturally sensitive and accessible to all stakeholders. Due to the COVID-19 context, related restrictions in the Solomon Islands, and to avoid the risk of transmissions, consultations have needed to be done by local specialists, remotely trained and supported by an international specialist.
Risk 5: *Project board members, and project staff may not have the necessary capacity to uphold their duties regarding rights and the requirements of UNDP's*	I = 4 L = 1	**Low**	Capacity may also be reduced because of conflicting demands for project board members and	Assessment During the PPG phase, a capacity assessment of national and provincial stakeholders has been undertaken to better understand the capacity to uphold

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

SES. In the absence of national requirements on FPIC, project duty bearers may not have the knowledge and understanding of UNDP's requirements of FPIC when undertaking activities (most notably in Component 1&2 for Policy-level decisions, and Component 3 for demonstration site-level impacts) that will require strict compliance and adherence to the UNDP SES. Principle (Human Rights): P.2 Standard 6: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5			staff arising because of the COVID-19 pandemic.	duties, rights, and safeguards, within the delivery of the project's implementation. Management Based on the findings of the capacity assessment, **SES-related training and capacity building** has been integrated into project design to support duty bearers (particularly members of the Project Board, project staff and consultants and government officials) so that they can better understand their responsibilities for human rights. Budgetary considerations to address gender/ safeguards issues have been costed and allocated as necessary in the final project design document, such that technical support and training on gender and safeguards will be provided to the PMU/Board at the start of the project. A monitoring and evaluation process will monitor the development of capacity within the project team and stakeholder groups.
Risk 6: *The effects of climate change such as flooding, droughts and storms could impact project areas and activities (most specifically under Component 3, i.e., Output 3.1, 3.3 and Activity 3.4.4) and vulnerable communities. Climate variability and change will increase frequency and intensity of natural disasters and this can potentially delay or destroy project interventions.* Standard 2: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	I = 3 L = 4	**Moderate**	Climate change is a severe threat to low-lying coasts and atoll ecosystems throughout Solomon Islands due to sea level rise, storms and temperature changes. Storms can also lead to flooding and landslides from the mountains increasing the threats from land degradation. Disaster risks such as tropical cyclones are increasing in intensity and may impact on project implementation. Climate change and land degradation also intersect with threats from IAS, increasing opportunities for new incursions or spread. Planned project activities have been designed to contribute towards the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change impacts on the vulnerability of communities through	Assessment The initial environmental and social assessment that has been undertaken as part of the project's ESMF, has included the consideration of climate vulnerability by adopting local and expert advice over areas most at risk as well as species, habitats or communities that could be affected. Climate vulnerability has been included throughout project design, given the intersection with threats from land degradation and IAS). A separate **pre-screening climate change assessment** was undertaken for the PIF, which has informed the design of the full project. Climate risks will be further screened at each site as part of the scoped ESIAs. Management Potential climate risks/impacts that have been identified in preliminary screening have been factored into the full project design. With associated mitigation and management measures planned and budgeted. Climate change mitigation and adaptation measures have been embedded in the project design through improved natural resources management, green livelihoods, capacity building and awareness. Demonstrations on the ground have been designed to illustrate how integrated natural resources management can be a key tool in addressing climate change.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

			improved natural resources management and avoid the potential for maladaptive practices.	Based on the results of the ESIAs, necessary climate adaptation measures will be incorporated into each site ESMP.
Risk 7: *The project could have unintended impacts on valuable natural habitats, globally threatened or endemic species, or production systems if activities are improperly executed, e.g. potential overharvesting of native species, improperly executed IAS control could lead to increased spread/invasion of IAS if biosecurity/ decontamination protocols are not followed, broadscale weed removal could result in bare land and increased erosion risk, poor habitat management could lead to risks to threatened species if habitat needs/requirements not met.* *In addition, measures to control IAS including physical removal or the use of chemicals (pesticides or herbicides) may create hazardous waste or cause environmental pollution.* Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 Standard 8: 8.1, 8.2, 8.4, 8.5	I = 4 L = 3	**Substantial**	The project aims to strengthen biodiversity conservation, reduce impacts of IAS and land degradation. Therefore, environmental impacts are expected to be positive. However, there is a possibility that integrated management and sustainable management of agricultural lands may negatively impact important biodiversity, or that damaging IAS may be intentionally introduced for control of other IAS, or that livelihood development may overharvest native species. After physical removal, some IAS may create hazardous waste because of their ability to invade new areas from rhizomes or eggs etc. Chemicals used to treat IAS may cause environmental pollution by seeping into water courses. Institutions may fail to comply with national and international environmental safety standards.	<u>Assessment</u> The project design has sought to ensure that existing threats to biodiversity or land degradation are addressed and that no new threats are caused by project activities. Under demonstration activities in Component 3, the project document specifically states that no non-native species will be used for SLM, reforestation or for livelihood development. To assess potential impacts, and to inform the development of the management plans themselves, ESIAs will be conducted as part of Output 3.1 for each of the target sites. The **scoped ESIAs** for each site will inform the development of each of the ILSMS (which in turn will include/incomplete the elements of a site specific ESMP) and will include an assessment of potential impacts to habitats and other biodiversity values at each demonstration site. <u>Management</u> If the zone of influence of activities under Component 3 include a critical habitat (such as protected area), a **Biodiversity Action Plan** (see outline in Annex 5 of the ESMF) will be required. Any proposed IAS control/removal efforts (including under co-financing) will take place under clear SOPs and management plans, with consideration of potential environmental and social impacts. The project will ensure that appropriate protocols are developed and deployed for those working in locations that require biosecurity, with subsequent site-specific OHS plans being required where a risk to worker safety exists. If the use of chemicals is required at any point for IAS control measures, all relevant activities involving pesticide application will require a site-specific **Pesticide Management Plan**, developed in accordance with good international practice. The project will avoid supporting the use, manufacture and trade of chemicals subject to international bans, restrictions or phase-outs The plans will be developed in accordance with good international practice, and will avoid supporting the manufacture, trade, and use of chemicals and hazardous materials

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

				subject to international bans, restrictions or phase-outs due to their high toxicity to living organisms, environmental persistence, or potential for bioaccumulation, unless for acceptable purposes as defined by the conventions or protocols (e.g. the Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention).
Risk 8: *The project could contribute to cumulative environmental or social impacts in the area through unintended negative consequences from policy or legislative changes, such as those proposed under Output 1.2 (i.e., improved land use policy, regulations, and multi-sector coordination) and the National strategy for IAS management (NISSAP) developed under Output 2.1.* Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.14	I = 3 L = 2	**Moderate**	As per the previous risk (i.e., Risk 7), environmental and social impacts are expected to be overwhelmingly positive. However, there is a possibility that upstream policy or legislative changes supported by the project may negatively impact important biodiversity, or bring additional threats from IAS or may negatively affect livelihoods	Assessment Mainstreaming of biodiversity into different sectors under project Output 1.1, and other policy initiatives under Output 1.2, and Output 2.1 (i.e., NISSAP) will follow the **Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment** (SESA) approach. The project document specifically states that SESA will be applied to all new policies and legislation/regulations/ordinances (most specifically those under Output 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1) prior to approval by the Government and this has been built into detailed project design. The project's ESMF also took into account the need to further assess potential issues relating to cumulative impacts (both direct and indirect).
Risk 9: *Measures to control invasive alien species may be hazardous for the project team, officials and pose potential risks to community health, could exacerbate risks of erosion and landslides (posing safety risks to communities), and may not comply with best practice health and safety standards.* Standard 3: 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 Standard 7: 7.6	I = 4 L = 2	**Moderate**	Some IAS may be poisonous or lead to skin irritations. Chemicals or physical methods used to manage IAS may be toxic or dangerous. Improperly designed control/removal of IAS (including via co-financing) could exacerbate potential risk of erosion or landslides which could result in safety impacts on communities. Institutions may fail to comply with national and international safety standards and community members participating in IAS control or government officials conducting biosecurity at ports of entry/exit may not be adequately trained or	Assessment During the PPG phase an IAS management expert has been hired to assess this risk in detail, identifying risk areas and vulnerable stakeholders. This analysis also considered existing safety guidelines and their application as well as knowledge of safety procedures (amongst project implementers) and capacity to follow them. Management During project design it has been determined that new **guidelines for IAS management** and control will be developed at the start of the project implementation. In addition, safety equipment will be provided (e.g., PPE) and staff and local communities will be trained around dangers of managing IAS and steps to manage the associated risks (as part of Activity 2.2.6). Regular safety checks will have been built into the project design, with responsible parties being specified for overseeing H&S aspects of the project's implementation.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

			equipped, e.g. in fumigation methods.	
Risk 10: *The proposed project may result in interventions in the demonstration land/seascapes (most specifically under component 3) that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional, or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g., knowledge, innovations, practices).* Standard 4: 4.1, 4.2, 4.5 Standard 6: 6.1, 6.5, 6.9	I = 4 L = 3	**Substantial**	The proposed integrated management plans, biodiversity conservation measures and IAS and land degradation management measures proposed under Component 3 might impact cultural sites and/or intangible forms of culture.	Assessment During the PPG phase, the project team undertook the development of an ESMF which included the preliminary assessment of risks to cultural heritage (both tangible and intangible). As the exact sites of project interventions are not finalized, further assessment/identification of risk areas and vulnerable cultural heritage in each demonstration land/seascape will need to be undertaken during project implementation. Such identification and assessment of potential impacts to cultural heritage (including the use of traditional knowledge) will be included as part of the **targeted/scoped ESIAs** undertaken as part of Output 3.1 during the development of the ILSMS. Management In addition, as specified in the ESMF, **Guidelines for safeguarding cultural heritage** may need to be developed at the start of the project and staff, consultants and government officers will be trained around risks to cultural heritage. Procedures and protocols for handling chance finds will be coordinated with the national cultural heritage authority, with the engagement of locally affected peoples.
Risk 11: *Project or UNDP staff/consultants travelling to Honiara and demonstration land/seascapes could increase risk of COVID-19 spread if pandemic is prolonged or if a different pandemic emerges during the project's lifetime.* Standard 3: 3.4	I = 4 L = 1	**Moderate**	There have been 20 confirmed cases of COVID 19 in Solomon Islands since the WHO declared a pandemic in early 2020, with no reported deaths. However, a surge in cases may emerge during the implementation phase, or a different pandemic may emerge during the project's lifetime. There would therefore be significant consequences if transmission occurred by project consultants or project or UNDP staff visiting the country or moving between islands.	<u>Assessment</u> Detailed assessment of this risk was undertaken by UNDP prior to the initiation of the PPG and full implementation stages of the project. Screening for the risk of spreading communicable diseases has been included within the auspices of the ProDoc and will continue to be monitored throughout the project's timeline. <u>Management</u> Given the current restrictions and pandemic-related travel requirements, PPG activities have been undertaken by national consultants, supported remotely by international specialists and external UNDP staff (no international staff have travelled to the Solomon Islands at the time of the PPG). The potential for inter-island transmission has been reduced by the project including a high degree of devolution of implementation responsibility to local level (i.e., working through provincial staff and local coordinators). Should there be

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

				a relaxation on travel restrictions in the future that might allow international specialists to participate in full implementation of the project, internationally recognized biosecurity standards will need to be followed.
Risk 12: *Due diligence has not yet been completed to ensure there are no enhanced safeguards risks from working with private sector companies / co-financers with whom the project may cooperate to support biodiversity and LDN activities (most notably under Output 3.4., Activity 3.4.4) .* Principle (Human Rights): P.2 Principle (Accountability): P.14	I = 3 L = 3	**Moderate**	The project aims to engage the private sector in line with GEF expectations. Potential partners identified at PIF stage include tourism sector (e.g., with SolTuna, Bilikiki Cruises, Dive Solomons, local eco-resorts); forestry sector (e.g., Guadalcanal Plains Palm Oil Ltd (GPPOL). Due diligence has not yet been completed with these private sector partners to confirm they adhere to UNDP expectations on exclusionary criteria, potential controversies and commitment to ESG, and that any potential risks can be managed through conditions.	Assessment Potential private sector partners and related activities (including co-financing) will be subject to completion of due diligence, including use of the UNDP Private Sector Risk Assessment Tool. <u>Management</u> Partnership agreements will be established with each private sector partner prior to the start of any partnership working. Such agreements will be fully aligned with UNDPs private sector partnerships policy and they will include a Social and Environmental Commitment Plan (SECP) summarizing key commitments they agree to implement and additional assessment or management measures that might need to be implemented to ensure compliance with SES. The above-mentioned required procedures are furthered outlined and specified in the project's ESMF.
Risk 13: Certain areas of the Solomon Islands are contaminated with UXO left-over from the Second World War. UXO could potentially harm or kill project workers and/or stakeholders within the project's demonstration sites. Standard 3: 3.5 Standard 7: 7.6	I= 4 L= 1	**Moderate**	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) from the Second World War still contaminates some areas in the Solomon Islands and can injure or kill people if they detonate. The Government, in cooperation with NGOs and the international community, has made significant efforts to document contaminated lands and introduce preventive measures, however injury and fatalities still occur,	<u>Assessment</u> The UXO-related safety risks to both communities, and the project's potential workforce have been preliminary assessed as part of the project's ESMF. While the full mapping and documentation of UXO within the Solomon Islands is not complete, injuries and fatalities remain relatively rare in the proposed demonstration sites of the project. Most recent injuries and fatalities relating to UXO in the Solomon Islands has been from the direct detonation, handling and/or storage of UXO and other remnants of war. Identification and assessment of potential risks relating to UXO at each of the proposed demonstration sites will be included as part of the **targeted/scoped ESIAs** undertaken as part of Output 3.1 during the development of the ILSMS. <u>Management</u> During project implementation, the project team shall inform the relevant national authorities and/or NGOs or any activities that are in likely contaminated areas. In

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

				such instances, project staff shall be trained on the identification and safety measures for any activity within said areas.		
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?					
	Low Risk	☐				
	Moderate Risk	☐				
	Substantial Risk	☒		This screening exercise (SESP) has identified 13 risks, one which has been identified as low risk, 11 of which have been scored as Moderate, one which has been categorized as Substantial. As such, the project has an overall categorization of **Substantial risk.** All principles and standards of UNDP's SES are triggered by this project as outlined in its SESP. Along with additional targeted risk/impact assessments that may need to be undertaken during project implementation, the risks identified have been further assessed and outlined in the project's ESMF. The ESMF serves as a framework from which further procedures and requirements on environmental and social management/performance have been specified for the project.		
	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")	☒			***Status? (completed, planned)***	
	if yes, indicate overall type and status		☒	Targeted assessment(s)	Initial assessment included within project's ESMF and IPPF. Further future risk assessment procedures are also outlined in the project's ESMF.	
			☒	ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment)	Planned (Targeted ESIAs will be undertaken and shall inform the ISLMS at each of the project's demonstration	

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

					sea/landscapes as part of Output 3.1)
			☒	SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)	Planned
	Are management plans required? (check if "yes)	☒			
	If yes, indicate overall type		☒	Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others)	Completed: Gender Action Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan
			☒	ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans)	Planned (with Indigenous Peoples Plan) (The elements for a site-specific ESMP will be developed and included within the ILSMS for each project demonstration sea/landscape)
			☒	ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework)	Completed (with IPPF)
	Based on identified <u>risks</u>, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?		**Comments (not required)**		
	Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind				
	Human Rights	☒	Risk 1 Risk 2 Risk 3 Risk 4 Risk 5 Risk 12		
	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	☒	Risk 2		

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

	Accountability	☒	Risk 1 Risk 3 Risk 4 Risk 5
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	☒	Risk 7 Risk 8 Risk 12
	2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks	☒	Risk 6
	3. Community Health, Safety and Security	☒	Risk 7 Risk 9 Risk 12 Risk 13
	4. Cultural Heritage	☒	Risk 10
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	☒	Risk 1
	6. Indigenous Peoples	☒	Risk 1
	7. Labor and Working Conditions	☒	Risk 9 Risk 13
	8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	☒	Risk 7

Final Sign Off

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

Signature	*Date*	*Description*
QA Assessor	25/5/23	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	25/5/23	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 submission to the PAC.
PAC Chair	25/5/23	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.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

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 for further guidance on addressing screening questions.	
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind **Human Rights**	**Answer (Yes/No)**
P.1 Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g., during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	*No*
P.2 Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g., government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	*Yes*
P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g., project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	*Yes*
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:	
P.4 adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	Yes
P.5 inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?[8]	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?	*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*	Yes
P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? *For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.*	No
Sustainability and Resilience: Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below	

[8] 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.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

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 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?	Yes
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 groundwater? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction*	No
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[9]	No
1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g., collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[10]	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

[9] See the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

[10] See the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

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 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*	Yes
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
3.1	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g., roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams)	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
3.5	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?	No
3.8	engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
4.1	activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site?	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?	Yes
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
Would the project potentially involve or lead to:		
5.1	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	No

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

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?[11]	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?	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.*	Yes
Standard 7: Labor 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 labor laws and international commitments?	Yes
7.2	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	No
7.3	use of child labor?	No
7.4	use of forced labor?	No
7.5	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity?	Yes
7.6	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life cycle?	Yes
Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		

[11] 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.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 74AA0BE2-B7A2-46CD-9015-AA38EC0CACF5

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?	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, Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention*	Yes
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?	No