

UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador
2. Project Number	6255
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Ecuador

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 SGP/GEF Ecuador strategy recognizes the key actors for the implementation of the bio-enterprise methodology, considering their own development objectives (at the local, territorial and national level) built upon the multistakeholder approach rather than delivering individual funding. Community level organizations are the key actors for design and implementation of bio-enterprise projects within an overall strategic landscape management framework they participate in developing. This process is monitored, accompanied and evaluated periodically to comply with the proposed objectives and implementation-quality. The project is designed to take into considerations their needs, rights, obligations and knowledge, whereas they systematize this process with the M&E system and communication strategy.

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

Gender has been considered throughout this project's design and will be during so implementation. The project will prioritize work with women's groups and youth for the development of bio-enterprise projects as well as cross initiatives, such as the scholarship funds and GreenCrowds. By empowering women in the bio-enterprise projects, women become leaders with a power of decision on community agreements. Their involvement contributes meaningfully to the family's economy as they represent a key role in agricultural activities. Therefore, the integration of gender in the new methodology for bio-enterprise products will be a cross cutting approach in community projects. Women have increased their incomes, they have been involved in the activities for the Bio-corridor conservation, and they have involved other women in economic and ecological efforts.

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

The premise of the GEF Small Grants Program is that communities will adopt environmentally sustainable practices that lower their additional costs by mitigating possible risks to their current production and livelihood systems. The SGP finances community organizations to design and implement sustainable development bio-enterprise projects under a multistakeholder approach that also produce global environmental benefits.

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).</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 Significance</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</p>
Risk Description	Impact and Probability (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments	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>The communities’ efforts to conserve biodiversity and manage land sustainably may decline due to prolonged drought and/or severe storms (floods). Extreme weather/climate events can lower their interest in the project’s environmental priorities as their top priority is income generation and family care.</p>	<p>I = 4 P = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>		<p>SGP’s overall objective is to increase socio-ecological resilience in the target land/seascapes, therefore, several activities are designed to improve the health of ecosystems and the adaptive capacity of communities. The risk of severe weather events, in particular long periods of drought, is ever present and SGP will ensure that community project initiatives take into consideration such climate risk-informed and identify the means to mitigate them at the project design stage.</p> <p>Criteria for the formulation of projects will be defined and clearly communicated to prospective proponents to address any latent environmental threat. The SGP will ensure that this commitment is fulfilled during project execution.</p>
<p>Low initial capacity and awareness of local NGOs and CBOs may negatively influence the growth in capacities and sustainability of community organizations.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>		<p>Risk mitigation systems in place will be strengthened to maintain or improve CBO and NGO capacities. The Ecuador SGP Country Programme works with all grantees to help build capacities by identifying appropriate rates of disbursement, linking grantee partners to learn from each other (peer-to-peer), and working in a flexible manner that responds to the strengths and comparative advantages of grantees. The SGP Country Programme also reduces risk by supporting replication of good practices that have proven to deliver on GEF strategic priorities at the community level. The National Steering</p>

				<p>Committee (NSC), with representation from civil society leaders, government institutions, and donors, further provides support to community organizations for effective design and implementation of SGP-financed projects. Please see Annex D for the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.</p> <p>SGP conducted a screening process with the principal stakeholders and had access to all the necessary information to determine the focus area of intervention and actor-mapping prior to project design. Working with programs in the field that support communities with incentives and technical assistance to identify the design of the project and monitor progress. SGP will work in this area with communities in a coordination strategy with a multi-stakeholder methodology.</p>
Community-led projects in environmentally sensitive areas could lead to biodiversity loss and/or land degradation; these include harvesting of non-timber forest products, reforestation, or harvesting of fish or other aquatic species.	I = 4 P = 1	Low	Note that all community projects are vetted by the SGP National Coordinator and NSC, as well as ad hoc technical experts, as needed	All the appropriate stakeholders with technical support and consultation were taken into consideration during project design, but new actors will be called for specific activities such as core areas for conservation and sustainable market research.
Indigenous peoples could feel that they have been insufficiently consulted or engaged in development of their projects	I = 5 P = 1	Low	No proposals are accepted or approved without thorough review by the NC and NSC of consultations and participation of proponent organizations and communities. Please see the Stakeholder Engagement	

			Plan in Annex D.	
Multi-stakeholder platforms require a significant investment of time and commitment of all its members to function effectively, prevent elite capture and build social cohesion	I = 3 P = 2	Moderate		The benefits of an effective multi-stakeholder platform will be defined and conveyed to all participants at the programme inception phase, to ensure that they are willing to invest time with programme activities.
Communities may not benefit from CSO-private sector partnerships for upscaling initiatives due to failure to produce equitable benefits for both parties.	I = 2 P = 2	Moderate		SGP will enable continued dialogue between CSOs and the private sector/enterprise and will share positive examples of successful partnerships where both parties benefit. SGP has a mandate that all projects have a counterpart in cash or in-kind for the same delivered amount. SGP is also looking for new kinds of joint programs to adhere to this intervention in Ecuador, such as: PROAMAZONIA, Heifer, CIESPAL and private enterprise with GreenCrowds.
Political instability may have a negative impact on communities, thereby affecting their resource mobilization, the implementation of community activities, and the sustainability of project objectives.	I = 3 P = 2	Moderate		SGP plans to mitigate these risks through the continuous efforts of the NC, NSC members and SGP team to encourage more civil society organizations to be engaged with the Programme due to its significant role in the national development process – in partnership with the state and the private sector – as a result of their experience in welfare and social development programs.
The project could reproduce gender-based discrimination against women assuming leadership or other important roles during project design and implementation	I = 3 P = 1	Low	No proposals are accepted or approved without thorough review by the NC and NSC of the quality of consultations and participation of proponent organizations	

			and communities. Please see Annex E for the Gender Analysis and Action Plan.	
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?			
	Select one (see SESP for guidance)		Comments	
	<i>Low Risk</i>			
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>		X	The project builds on more than 25 years of SGP experience in Ecuador and the established programming, governance and operational mechanisms of the Country Program. UNDP sits on the National Steering Committee of the Country Program which reviews the country strategy, project eligibility criteria and proposals for approval. Other NSC members include the Ministry of Environment, academy, civil society organizations, including representatives of indigenous peoples, women and other rural actors.
	<i>High Risk</i>			
	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?			
	Check all that apply		Comments	
	<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>		X	SGP conducted a screening process with the principal stakeholders and had access to all the necessary information to determine the focus area of intervention and actor-mapping prior to project design.
	<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>		X	A specific strategy ensures equitable development and sustainability. The project has a strong gender and generational strategy in place to ensure participation and strengthening of women and youth groups.
	<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>		X	The SGP expressly finances projects to conserve and use biodiversity sustainably. The bio-enterprise projects sign a MOA document where they specifically show that they will not contravene any national or

			international obligation. At the same time, SGP and the Ministry of Environment will ensure that these communities fulfill these commitments through their own M&E systems called "SIMONAA" that is the monitoring system that procures the examination and evaluation of the process. This system along with the georeferenced monitoring in place will ensure that special conservation and mitigation measures are in place where necessary.
	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Priority is given to vulnerable areas with indigenous people. The staff of Socio Bosque has helped with this identification, and it was one of the selection criteria for landscapes in the project. At the same time, ICCA methodology ensures indigenous participation as one of its key principles to mitigate possible risks.
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor – Diana Salvemini		UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP staff member. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is ad
QA Approver – Stephen Gold		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. Final signature confirms that the SESP was completed, approved, and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental <u>Risks</u>	
Principles 1: Human Rights	Answer (Yes/No)
1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ¹	No
3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5. Are there measures or mechanisms in place to respond to local community grievances?	Yes
6. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
7. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
8. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
9. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	
1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No

¹ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, 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 people and transsexuals.

2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3. Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
3. Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, considering different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>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</i>	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable <u>Natural</u> Resource Management	
1.1 Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including 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 Does the Project involve 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)	No
1.4 Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	Yes
1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	Yes

1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ² greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	No
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		

² Regarding CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.1 Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2 Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3 Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4 Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6 Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7 Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8 Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9 Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage	
4.1 Will the proposed Project result in interventions 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)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement	

5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in 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)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ³	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the rights, lands and territories of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether Indigenous Peoples possess the legal titles to such areas)?	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.4	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.5	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.6	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No

³ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

6.7	Would the Project potentially affect the traditional livelihoods, physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in 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 ?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	<p>Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?</p> <p><i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i></p>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No