

Annex 3: UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)**Project Information**

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Promoting sustainable livestock management and ecosystem conservation in Northern Ukraine
2. Project Number	PIMS 6395
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Ukraine

Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability**QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?*****Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human-rights based approach***

The project works in the Northern Ukraine Landscape. In order to ensure that the project targets appropriate beneficiaries, during the PPG stage, the team facilitated dialogue with target communities, identified areas where their rights might be threatened, and complied with existing legislation related to socio-cultural rights. A full range of stakeholders participated in the project document validation workshop, including CSOs, and local communities. During full project implementation, under Component I, when assessing land use patterns and identifying the most appropriate land use scenario for the agricultural and ecological lands in question, the project will conduct targeted consultations with all relevant stakeholders to obtain inputs from them, including local and customary communities. This is to ensure that the proposed land use scenario development does not violate the rights of the communities in the target areas. The selection of farmers will be based on their willingness to participate in the project on a fully voluntary basis. Furthermore, when conducting project activities and mapping of farmer targeted under Component II, the project will utilize Free, Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) guidelines.

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

The project will be fully compliant with gender mainstreaming requirements of both the GEF and UNDP.

A detailed gender analysis was conducted during the project development phase. It was based on the methods such as: i) desk study of available surveys and materials on gender implications within the agricultural sector of Ukraine; ii) analysis of sex-disaggregated data on agriculture (ownership of lands, livestock, equipment and machinery, amount of sales of agricultural products, etc.) available from the State Statistics Service; iii) consultations with stakeholders – including farmers, experts and other project partners; as well as iv) a questionnaire on gender implications of value chain mapping, with a total of 25 response forms collected.

Findings and recommendations from the gender analysis were presented at the project validation workshop, and subsequently informed the project Gender Strategy and Action Plan. While further information gathering and analysis is planned to streamline gender mainstreaming in the project, it has been already identified that the project scores as GEN2 per the ATLAS Gender Marker, meaning that the project has gender equality as a significant objective.

The most critical findings that are relevant to the project design and that have informed the project Gender Strategy and Action Plan are: 1) women are under-represented in the regional and local authorities and among owners and managers of agricultural companies (decision-making); 2) men farmers have more resources than women – average land area of the household headed by men is 1.49 ha, by women, 0.98 ha; 3) men-headed households also dominate among households keeping various kinds of agricultural animals, but the

difference is not that big (66.2% vs. 64.7%); 4) men employed in agriculture earn 8% more than women; 5) while women and men invest comparable time into productive agricultural activities (women, 3-4 hours per day on average, while men, 4-5 hours), women spend some 50% more time than men doing domestic work, including house chores, taking care of children and elderly, etc.; 6) when it comes to access to finance and credit of farmers, there is no coherent vision on whether there is any gender discrepancy – while there is anecdotal evidence that women have more problems with access to finance due to gender stereotypes, there is also a widespread understanding that Ukrainian farmers have poor access to credit irrespective of their sex; 7) women tend to make more decisions as final consumers of agriculture products.

Gender considerations have been assessed for all project activities under each output. In addition, the following activities are recommended to mainstream gender into the project:

- 1) Regularly collect all the relevant data on project participants, beneficiaries, etc. with breakdown by sex;
- 2) Ensure that project activities, including trainings and local decision-making mechanisms, have appropriate and adequate gender representation. Specifically, to suggest using 30/70 quota if other modalities are not functional;
- 3) Make sure that women and men are equally involved during the consultations with local communities in project target regions;
- 4) Strengthen focus on the management of protected areas, as well as on reducing risks of exposure of women (and children) to agricultural inputs potentially harmful to human health;
- 5) Engage men and women equally in decision-making over the project activities, including through involvement of female agriculture experts and inviting women to project decision-making bodies, coordinating and networking mechanisms; and
- 6) Facilitate creation of income opportunities, including through employment, for male and female agriculture professionals.

The project will maintain regular close consultations with local communities in the target geographies to further identify gender mainstreaming opportunities in the project implementation phase.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams environmental sustainability

The project's interventions, backed by government commitments and regulations, will ~~prevent~~ mitigate the loss of biodiversity and organic soil carbon in an area of over 200,000 ha. This will be done through on-the ground interventions under Component II, and partnership with local and international partners seeking to support sustainable supply chains in the Northern Ukraine Landscape. Peatland restoration technologies will be tested for the benefit of environmental sustainability, the protected area system in peatlands strengthened (Component III). These interventions will be backed by improved overall policies on environmental sustainability of peatlands in the Northern Ukraine Landscape (as per activities under Component I), aiming to ensure health for over 3 million ha of land in the Northern Ukraine Landscape in the long run. The project will also contribute to generation of knowledge on the value of ecosystem services in the Northern Ukraine Landscape, working with the general public, and key stakeholders to raise their level of understanding and capacities for environmentally sustainable management of lands across the Northern Ukraine Landscape (under Component III).

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

<p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</p> <p><i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</p> <p><i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p>			<p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p>
<p>Risk Description</p>	<p>Impact and Probability (1-5)</p>	<p>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</p>
<p>Risk 1: Vulnerable or marginalized groups might not fully support project activities.</p> <p>(Principle 1: q4, q6)</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>As explained in the project document, the majority of lands in the Northern Ukraine landscape are in smallholder private ownership, often owned by the most disadvantaged groups and individuals, and a lack of engagement of some individuals within communities results in environmental problems.</p>	<p>By law, it is impossible to have any activities on private lands without engagement/agreement of smallholders who own them. By Ukrainian law it is impossible to force a smallholder into an activity on his land that he would not support or benefit from. During the PPG phase extensive stakeholder consultations were held across the full project territory, including during the project validation workshop. To further strengthen stakeholder engagement the project plans to organize land-user cooperatives, that will jointly discuss, plan and implement best model (economically and environmentally) at the land they own. The project will also organize Water User Associations in key areas where project-supported water management and restoration activities will take place. Engagement of communities has been fully planned in the project activities, and as outlined in the Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan, and Gender Action Plan, in line with current UNDP guidance.</p>
<p>Risk 2: Local governments (sub-national level) and community associations might not have the capacity to implement project activities successfully and not fully engage in the training activities provided. (Principle 1: q5)</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 3</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The low agricultural technical knowledge and capacity of smallholders to achieve good harvests on their land while preserving soil qualities and ecosystem characteristics, and</p>	<p>Addressing the low capacity levels is a key component of the project, and measures to address the cooperation and coordination risk are included in the detailed description of activities in the full project document, including in the Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Specifically, the project will invest substantially in training</p>

			<p>a lack of cooperation with water engineers, are the reasons why this project is proposed. This will be addressed through Component II.</p> <p>There are also limited multi-stakeholder platforms to address cross-sectoral issues (addressed through Component I).</p>	<p>stakeholders on sustainable land management techniques for peatlands, using the best national and international (e.g. from Belarus) expertise that has proven successful.</p> <p>The cooperative model adopted for Component II will address the potential for a lack of cooperation and participation in the training activities among the water engineers and land users.</p> <p>Local governments and communication associations were represented during the project validation workshop and provided inputs to the project development process and it is therefore expected that they will continue to participate in the implementation of the project.</p>
<p>Risk 3: New approaches to land management could change current access to resources, potentially leading to economic displacement and / or changes to property rights.</p> <p>(Principle 1: q3; Standard 1: 1.3; Standard 5: 5.2, 5.4)</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Under Component III the project will seek to establish sustainable land management regimes within the Northern Ukraine Landscape that prioritize the conservation of ecological resources for the maintenance of ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The project supports the “Regional Landscape Park” approach, which does not withdraw land from land-holders, but consults and seeks their permission for conservation activities that might be appropriate on their land. Withdrawal of land from land users in Ukraine is not possible, as all land is in private ownership and no activity can be conducted on it without the consent of the land owner. This issue was not raised by any stakeholders during the project validation workshop, and the planned project activities were received positively by stakeholders.</p>
<p>Risk 4: Field- and policy-level activities related to the restoration of peatlands and implementing paludiculture could inadvertently support child labor and other violations of international labor standards.</p> <p>(Principle 1: q1; Standard 3: 3.8)</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The project will involve cooperation with agricultural smallholders, and will also include land restoration work. In the context of these activities, especially in terms of agricultural activities, it is theoretically possible that project activities could occur within a realm where there is child labor or violations of international labor standards.</p>	<p>The project promotes replacement of traditional crop “farming” (not suitable for peatlands) by paludiculture, that is sustainable livestock management. As per standard paludiculture approaches (as in: Wichtmann, W., Schröder, C. & Joosten, H. (eds.) (2016): Paludiculture - productive use of wet peatlands - Climate protection - biodiversity - regional economic benefits. 272 p. ISBN 978-3-510-65283-9).</p> <p>The types of activities implemented under the project will minimize physical labor, and will apply a strict standard for the exclusion of child labor, or other labor violations. These standards will be further fully explained and disseminated to stakeholders as part of the project inception phase. This approach has proven effective through similar projects in Belarus, and Ukraine in the course of the past 12 years. During the PPG phase the project assessed any notable risks related to child labor or other violations, and did not find any probable</p>

				risks. This issue was not raised or identified by any stakeholders at any point in the project development process and including the project validation workshop.
Risk 5: Existing differences in perceptions regarding land use could be exacerbated or reignited by project activities. (Principle 1: q8)	I = 3 P = 3	Moderate	There are no conflicts as such among small holders and water engineers on targeted peatlands, rather there are differences of perception on how best to manage land they own. The presence of this “difference of perception” often unfounded from both economic and environmental sides, is one of the key systemic solutions targeted by the project.	The project will address this through bringing the cooperative model, whereby stakeholders come together to jointly agree on the best model for peatland restoration and subsequent use. Openness and transparency by UNDP to receive any grievances was presented to stakeholders during the PPG stage validation workshop to facilitate addressing and resolving any possible complaints that may arise during project implementation. This information will be presented again at the project inception workshop, once implementation starts.
Risk 6: Project activities and approaches might not adequately incorporate or reflect views of women and girls and ensure equitable opportunities for their involvement and benefit. (Principle 2: q2, q4)	I = 2 P = 1	Low	Ukraine has strong focus on the promotion of women. For land based activities, it is important to note that women constitute a substantial part of small-holders, therefore optimized use of peatlands (as e.g. per Component II) would not be effective without engagement of women.	This risk is assessed fully in the gender analysis completed during the PPG and managed through the Gender Action Plan.
Risk 7: Poorly designed or executed project activities could damage critical or sensitive habitats. (Principle 1: q5; Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6; Standard 7: 7.5)	I = 2 P = 2	Low	The project targets the restoration of degraded peatland, and aims to put these restored lands under optimized management. Despite extensive and ecologically sensitive planning during the project development phase, it is still possible that the design of restoration or land use planning activities could take place without adequate account of biodiversity requirements (e.g. bird breeding season).	This risk is managed through the design of the project activities, outputs, budget. During the PPG phase all project activities were carefully designed and assessed by technical experts to ensure the most optimal ecological outcomes. The PPG team included multiple biodiversity experts, and a land restoration expert. In addition, project activities foresee that all project-supported restoration activities will undergo Environmental Impact Assessments prior to implementation, in accordance with Ukrainian national standards and requirements.
Risk 8: Policy changes could have unintended negative social and / or environmental	I = 2 P = 2	Low	Although the project focuses significantly on the strengthened	Under Component I, the SESA approach will be integrated into the design of the Northern Ukraine integrated landscape

<p>impacts if poorly designed or executed (upstream impacts).</p> <p>(Standard 1: 1.11)</p>			<p>implementation of existing policy, there are a few policy changes that will be initiated through focusing on integrated landscape planning (Component I). The existence of models from neighboring Belarus and Ukraine's previous own experience under the ClimaEast program point to a low likelihood of this risk.</p>	<p>management plan as appropriate. The extensive stakeholder consultation process during the PPG phase, including the project validation workshop, has deepened the analysis of the potential policy implications, reinforcing the preliminary SESP finding related to this risk. The stakeholder engagement plan and participatory approach of the project provide risk mitigation measures for any potential upstream impacts during the implementation of the project.</p>
<p>Risk 9: Project activities and outcomes will be vulnerable to the potential impacts of climate change.</p> <p>(Standard 2: 2.2; Standard 3: 3.5)</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>A moderate degree of vulnerability of paludiculture to warming climate is expected.</p>	<p>The potential future influence of climate change will be carefully considered through the policy component (I) and on-the-ground planning (Component II). The project strategy and expected results are anticipated to combat and mitigate future climate impacts, through increasing resilience of ecosystems and the economic practices carried out in the Northern Ukraine Landscape. The project team will work with all partners and stakeholders to apply the best available climate change forecasts data for the Northern Ukraine Landscape, and will ensure that all project activities are implemented taking future climate impacts into consideration. For example, the project's support for the restoration of peatlands will review climate data and climate change projections as part of the development and implementation of restoration and water management measures. The project activities include a focus on measuring and monitoring carbon emissions from peatlands, and the information derived from these processes will be fed back into improved climate resilient land management practices. The project will also identify potential gaps in the existing system of PAs in order to effectively conserve biodiversity, considering the potential for ecosystem change and ecological shifts due to climate change impacts. The project's work to establish sustainable livestock agriculture and land use practices will also be grounded in the best available and most recent climate science relevant for this region of Ukraine. As part of the project's work on strengthening the management effectiveness of PAs it will also strengthen environmental monitoring capacities in order to better track the future effects of climate change within PAs, and the targeted KBAs more broadly.</p>

<p>Risk 10: The release of non-hazardous and potentially hazardous pollutants; and the generation of both types of waste as well as potentially unsustainable fish resource use.</p> <p>(Standard 1, q.1.7, 1.8, Standard 7: 7.1, 7.2, 7.4)</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The release of pollutants in paludiculture is limited and primarily connected with milk processing facilities and intensive farming, and local air pollution issues from machinery use during field work. Fish ponds (if promoted by the project) could lead to cross-contamination with wild fish populations, and release of contaminated water.</p>	<p>This risk will be managed through the design of the project through careful design and monitoring of activities to ensure full compliance with environmental standards.</p>
Select one (see SESP for guidance)			Comments	
Low Risk		<input type="checkbox"/>		
Moderate Risk		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project is assessed as moderate risk overall, based on the fact that two risks are rated as moderate, out of the identified ten potential risks.</p>	
High Risk		<input type="checkbox"/>		
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the Social and Environmental Standards are relevant?			Comments	
Check all that apply				
Principle 1: Human Rights		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>All UNDP Social and Environmental Standards requirements will be implemented according to the identified risks, as specified in: UNDP, 2014. "<i>Social and Environmental Standards</i>," as accessed at http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-standards.html, as of January 31, 2020.</p>	
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>See above.</p>	
1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>See above.</p>	
2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>See above.</p>	

	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	X	See above.
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	X	See above.
	6. Indigenous Peoples	NA	There are no indigenous peoples in the project area.
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	X	See above.

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor <i>Alla Tynkerych</i>	15-Oct-2020	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 <i>Manal Fouan</i>	15-Oct-2020	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.