Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

Annex D: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

An indicative program-wide overview of potential environmental and social risks, based on GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) Minimum Standards (MS) is summarized below, with estimated ratings provided for each. General guidance on potential assessment and mitigation measures to be considered during project development and implementation is provided – noting that assessment and mitigation approaches will vary considerably based on individual project contexts and interventions, and that the recommendations made here will be superseded by GEF Agency assessments for projects carried out during PPG and beyond.

- The estimated overall risk rating at programme level, based on currently available information and considering the programme outcomes and interventions to be supported by the country projects, is **Moderate**.
- The nine national child projects under the FARM+ program entail a diverse set of potential social and environmental risks which could have adverse impacts in the absence of appropriate avoidance, assessment or management/mitigation measures. These include risks associated with: *accountability to stakeholders* and *grievance resolution and social inclusion* (incorporating *gender equality and empowerment*, and provisions for other *vulnerable or marginalized groups*); *biodiversity conservation*; *indigenous peoples*; *cultural heritage*; *resource use efficiency and pollution*; *labour and working conditions*; c*ommunity health, safety and security*; and *climate change and disaster management*. Risk ratings have not been assigned to child projects at the concept stage, but early, indicative information has been used to flag likely sources of ESS risk, as described below.
- During project development, each child project will be expected to carry out a comprehensive assessment of environmental and social safeguards risks, applying the safeguards' policy of the applicable GEF Agency, and to identify a set of measures to avoid, minimize, manage or mitigate potential risks and their impacts either through integration of SES considerations into project design or through development of specific management plans, in line with the relevant Agency policy and applicable national requirements. Some projects may present a more complex set of ESS risks, with higher risk ratings and more complex mitigation requirements than others, but this is not expected to translate into high cumulative ESS risks or extensive impacts at programmatic level – robust assessment and management at project level should effectively mitigate against this.
- In all cases, comprehensive gender-sensitive and socially inclusive stakeholder analysis and consultation will be fundamental to ensuring social viability and sustainability of the programmatic outcomes. M&E Frameworks should include measurable indicators for monitoring social and environmental risks and impacts, and their effective management.

- The Global Coordination Project (GCP), which will be executed by UNDP, will focus on programme management, partnership coordination, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management and provision of technical support. An international safeguards expert will be hired as part of the project management unit (PMU) to support and enhance ESS-related knowledge management, sharing and learning for effective upscaling and replication of successful solutions being generated through the child projects, and assist with monitoring and evaluation of safeguards performance across the programme (while respecting the autonomy of individual Agency policies). The ESS risk rating is estimated to be Low due to the nature of these activities.

GEF Minimum Standards for safeguards	**Key drivers of risk, indicative rating and guidance to child projects**
MS 1: Environmental and Social Assessment,	**Risk context and drivers**

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

Management and Monitoring	The child projects under the FARM+ program are supported by five agencies including: AfDB, FAO, UNEP, UNIDO, and UNDP. The Agencies are required, as per GEF policy, to apply their respective policies, procedures, systems and capabilities for ESS risk screening, categorization (considering probability and impact of identified risks), management and mitigation, including for gender mainstreaming and stakeholder engagement. **Programme risk rating**: **LOW**. All the GEF Agencies have ESS policies and systems in place that meet the GEF accreditation standards for ESS, and established track records in their application in GEF-financed interventions. **Recommendations for assessment, mitigation and management**: Child projects under the FARM+ program have not been required to conduct formal ESS risk screening yet, so it will be essential for this process to be initiated early in the PPG process and then iteratively to contribute to shaping the project's Theory of Change, identifying important agents of change, informing project design, ensuring gender-sensitive and socially inclusive consultation, and developing a robust ESS architecture for the projects. Each GEF Agency will apply its own policy and ESS standards to risk screening, assessment and management. Under this minimum standard, **gender-related impacts** and **inclusive stakeholder engagement** (with special consideration given to disadvantaged and vulnerable groups) are given special attention. Given the multisectoral nature of programmatic outcomes, FARM+ will have a diverse set of stakeholders (international organizations, multiple Ministries and departments in national governments, industry associations, multinational companies, SMEs, banks, insurance companies, communities – including indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities in some cases); who will be the agencies of change through which the transformation to sustainable and climate resilient agricultural practices will be achieved. In some countries under this programme, systemic gender disparities are known to exist (despite Government commitment to gender equality and women's empowerment) and gender equalities remain a significant barrier to women's participation in important political, economic, social and environmental domains. This, along with high variability in other social vulnerability parameters, means that child projects could face a diversity of challenges under this risk category. **Climate and disaster risks** are an important sub-category under this minimum standard, with countries, especially, the LDC/SIDS increasingly exposed to climate-related vulnerabilities. This means that programme outcomes will be vulnerable to climate change, with implications for the vulnerability and coping mechanisms adopted by project-affected communities. Mitigation and adaption to these climate-related risks and their impacts lies at the core of the FARM+ Program. The vulnerability of programme and project-level outcomes to the impacts of climate change, and, therefore, the delivery of the intended social and environmental outcomes, will be greatest in LDCs/ SIDS with highest vulnerability to climatic hazards and weakest capacity to address them, areas that are especially sensitive to climate risk, or where interventions may inadvertently increase the vulnerability of communities to climate induced risks and disasters. At the project level climate risks are likely to be Substantial in many cases. It will be essential for each child project to conduct a thorough climate risk analysis (e.g. following the GEF STAP Climate Risk Analysis approach, or methods recommended by the GEF Agency or implementing partners) during the project development phase to identify likely

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

	climate change trends and scenarios, assess risk exposure of project components and outcomes, identify and evaluate project impacts on community exposure and vulnerability; and identify measures that can be taken to avoid, adapt to or reduce the projected impacts and risks (e.g. through siting of activities in least vulnerable areas; use of low-carbon technologies in operations; risk-proofing design of structural and non-structural project interventions; and building risk-preparedness plans and measures into the design of project outputs).
MS 2: Accountability and Grievance Resolution	**Risk context and drivers** Accountability to stakeholders means enabling active local community engagement and participation in decision-making/project activity, particularly targeted at those at risk of being left behind; transparency through provision of timely, accessible and functional information on supported activities, including on potential environmental and social risks and impacts and management measures; ensuring effective results monitoring—and, where appropriate, participatory monitoring with stakeholders —and reporting on implementation of social and environmental safeguard risk management measures (through the M&E system, including through annual PIR, and MTR and TE); and ensuring stakeholders have access to a rights-compatible complaints-redress process**.** While any activity under the child projects might carry accountability and grievance redress risks, these might be highest in complex environments; in projects where stakeholders or beneficiaries are not effectively consulted with or engaged (taking into account stakeholder diversity, including indigenous peoples and other vulnerable and marginalized groups), **Programme risk rating: Low**. In line with GEF policy, all Agencies supporting child projects under the programme will be required to demonstrate that they have appropriate grievance and conflict resolution systems in place. The global Coordination programme will play a role in monitoring that these are established. **Recommendations for assessment, mitigation and management**: Wherever possible, and especially where project-level accountability risks are rated Moderate or above (especially in complex stakeholder environments and where projects carry Substantial or High ESS risks, especially those that might impact on IPLCs), projects should strive to ensure that GRMs are fully elaborated during PPG – after due consultation and endorsement by stakeholders - so that they can be operationalized at project start. The project's stakeholder engagement strategy, policy planning processes, and information disclosure strategy will also be central to minimizing accountability and grievance resolution risks. FARM+ will build a network of stakeholders in the participating countries, ensuring gender inclusive participation. Stakeholder participation will include government ministries, local counterparts, civil society, CSOs, the private sector, multilateral banks, development agencies, partner agencies and organizations, amongst others. These stakeholders will be engaged at both the country project level and through collective and coordinated mechanisms through the Global Coordinating Project Under Component 1, policy and financing reforms/innovations should involve multiple stakeholders to build coherent government policies, regulations, and enforcement measures that support sustainable and climate resilient agriculture. Rigorous stakeholder analysis and engagement plans will be required, throughout the project development and implementation phases. Policy development processes could include Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) approaches to ensure that the policy reforms/innovations have taken the inputs of all relevant stakeholders into account and that they have broad-based support; that environmental and social issues have been

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

	identified and are addressed through the policy/planning reforms; and that any institutional capacity gaps for implementation and monitoring are effectively addressed.
MS 3: Biodiversity Conservation and Management of Living Resources	**Risk context and drivers** There is a risk that key interventions through which the programme will deliver its intended outcomes may have adverse impacts on habitats, biodiversity, ecosystems or ecosystem services (through habitat loss, conversion, fragmentation, encroachment or other ecological disturbances). **Programme risk rating: Moderate.** Risks associated with biodiversity and sustainable management of living resources, are expected to arise in most projects with significant on-the-ground activities. Biodiversity is mainly affected through the accidental release of POPs pesticides and HHPs into the environment due to improper handling, storage, transport and treatment/disposal containers during the pilot demonstrations. **Recommendations for assessment, mitigation and management**: During the PPG phase, each project will identify and assess potential adverse impacts on biodiversity, in accordance with the policies and templates of the supporting GEF Agency, and any relevant national requirements (e.g. Environmental Impact Assessment regulations). A targeted assessment leading to an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) that includes a Pollution Prevention and Management Plan and Waste Management Plan will likely need to be prepared to protect these natural resources. Pollution risks or damage to sites of biodiversity importance from financed activities will need to be managed during the screening process and additional assessments/management plans may be identified once each activity is defined. Technical support will also be available under the Global Coordination Project (through the international safeguards expert that is recruited) to help ensure that technical design of interventions maximises risk avoidance and builds on best practices.
MS 5: Indigenous Peoples	**Risk context and drivers** There is no universally accepted definition of indigenous peoples. Concepts of indigeneity differ among the peoples of the nine countries included in this programme, and in the ESS policies of the Agencies and Governments implementing the FARM+ child projects. The decision on whether or not this Minimum Standard is triggered in each project will be determined through application of the relevant Agency policy and consultations with relevant national authorities, community organizations, human rights groups, sociologists and other relevant stakeholders. Under the GEF Minimum Standard in Indigenous Peoples, Agencies are expected to assess and avoid, wherever possible, potential risks or adverse impacts (economic, social, cultural or environmental) on the identified peoples, and to have in place the necessary policies, procedures, systems and capabilities to ensure that the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of affected Indigenous Peoples is obtained when a project or program may cause impacts on their rights, lands, resources, territories, cultural heritage or other practices.

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

	Programme level rating: Moderate. Based on currently available information, it is estimated that this standard may be triggered in maybe 3[1] of the child projects, depending on the particular definition and policy applied. The probability of risks being triggered will be lowest when stakeholder engagement processes are fully socially inclusive (including indigenous and tribal peoples where these are present, ethnic minorities or other social or land-user collectives with special needs or interests and any other vulnerable or marginalized groups or individuals. Without this, there is a risk that programmatic outcomes will not be achieved due to inequitable or discriminatory impacts on IPs, particularly those living in poverty or otherwise marginalized or excluded. Risks will be higher where stakeholder communities are more heterogenous, with a greater proportion of marginalized or vulnerable groups (including ethnic/cultural minorities) or where there are greater numbers of underlying socio-economic disparities. **Risk assessment, management and mitigation** Under the PPG, all projects should carry out comprehensive stakeholder analyses or baseline social assessments, in line with the policy requirements of the supporting GEF Agency, national requirements and international best practices to identify which Indigenous Peoples (including self-identifying Indigenous Peoples) are present in the project domain. Where the applicable GEF Agency Standards on indigenous peoples are triggered, Free, Prior and Informed Consent should be implemented (starting early in the PPG phase). Throughout the project cycle, FPIC and other community consultations should be comprehensively documented and reported in an accessible format to participants. Indigenous Peoples should also be appropriately included in the stakeholder engagement plan and gender action plan, and as relevant, any other plans needed for the project such as Indigenous People's Plans (or locally appropriate equivalents). The FARM+ program will actively engage with these groups, and emphasis will be placed on meeting the specific needs of women, youth, and IP farmers.
MS 6: Cultural Heritage	**Risk context and drivers** There is a risk that program interventions could have impacts on sites, structures or objects that have cultural heritage values or impacts on intangible forms of cultural heritage (such as traditional knowledge, language, traditional rites and land use practices). Adverse impacts could also arise due to changes to food production practices (some of which may be traditional). **Programme level risk: Moderate**. It is expected that programme interventions may trigger risks associated with cultural heritage and that individual project risk ratings in this category will mostly be moderate. Risks are likely to be higher in countries with greater cultural heterogeneity and more strongly preserved traditional systems and where complete avoidance of impacts on tangible cultural heritage is not possible. **Risk assessment, mitigation and management**: Where project-level risk assessments identify low or moderate risks and impacts associated with cultural heritage, and where these are limited in scale and well-understood, mitigation could be effectively achieved through design – for example through selection of sites

[1] This list of countries has been preliminarily determined by the country's inclusion into the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs: https://www.iwgia.org/en/.

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

	that do not impact on cultural heritage sites or restrict access to them, and application of other established best practices. Where the risks or impacts are more complex or carry higher risk ratings, more comprehensive assessments and management plans may be required, in line with the relevant Agency policy.
MS 7: Resource Use Efficiency and Pollution	**Risk context and drivers** Pollution risks resulting from child projects have been identified for the handling, storage, transport and treatment/disposal containers during the pilot demonstrations, which may lead to the accidental release of POPs pesticides and HHPs into the environment. It is expected that all 9 child projects will meet all applicable national environmental laws and standards, and applicable international agreements and follow best practices used by the international organizations working in the region, for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating environmental and related public health risks associated with the potential release of pollutants, wastes, and hazardous materials due to routine or non-routine circumstances, require operators to conduct orientation training addressing relevant environmental and operation health and safety issues prior commencement of the relevant operations, and conduct regular surveillance is conducted to avoid leaks, spills, incidents or accidents occurring during the use of equipment and during storage. **Program risk rating: Moderate**. Although risk ratings under this standard for individual projects may be Substantial, it is expected that impacts can be avoided or mitigated through technical design, or targeted assessments and management plans (for example, Pollution Prevention and Management Plan and Waste Management Plans). **Risk assessment, management and mitigation:** During the PPG phase, projects will need to assess risks related to resource efficiency and pollution prevention, adjusting project design as needed to ensure effective management of risks, with careful attention paid to scale, selection of project sites and cumulative impacts across the project's broader area of influence. The targeted assessments and ESMPs (including the Pollution Prevention and Management Plan and Waste Management Plan) will most likely address this risk.
MS 8: Labour and Working Conditions	**Risk context and drivers** There is a risk that work opportunities may not be equally accessible to all sectors of society (for example, rural communities, unskilled workers, women, the disabled, youth), working conditions may not meet national standards or international commitments, and that workers may face occupational health and safety risks. Labour conditions are likely to be highly variable depending on the country context. **Program risk rating: Moderate**. **Risk assessment, management and mitigation:** During the PPG phase, projects will need to assess potential risks related to labour and working conditions. Some risks may be addressed through project design and appropriate workforce development, capacity building programmes, investment in suitable safety equipment and systems, with provision of specialized training for personnel working in higher-risk situations. Development of SOPs and competency standards should align to international best practices, and relevant national legislation, and procurement plans should factor risk mitigation into account.

Docusign Envelope ID: E645988F-1F14-4EC0-9377-35BFD35C9C57

MS 9: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	**Risk Context** The main risks to Community Health, Safety and Security under this programme will be associated with agricultural interventions where communities may face exposure to accidental or natural hazards, occupational health and safety risks. The child projects shall put in place processes and measures that address the safety and health of project workers, during project design, planning and implementation. These processes and measures may be encompassed and implemented through the applicable party's occupational safety and health management system or processes. **Programme risk rating: Moderate.** **Risk assessment, management and mitigation** Where risk assessment under PPG identifies community health, safety and security risks, appropriate measures should be designed, implemented and monitored, in keeping with the applicable GEF Agency policy and relevant international or national standards, to prevent or avoid adverse impacts, or reduce or mitigate impacts where avoidance is not possible. In addition to standard safety procedures, training and awareness raising, mitigation measures could include emergency preparedness plans, and programmes to minimize the risk of community exposure to disease or other health risks, taking into account differentiated levels of exposure and the needs of disadvantaged, vulnerable or marginalized groups.