

## Annex [#]. Social and Environmental Screening Template

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) and [Toolkit](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.

### Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	REDD+ results-based payments for results achieved by Brazil in the Amazon biome in 2014 and 2015
2. Project Number	XXX
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Brazil, Amazon Biome

### 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?
<b>Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach</b>
<p>In Brazil, there are substantial legal and policy frameworks that strive to protect, promote and respect human rights constitutionally that will underpin the design and implementation of the Floresta+ activities, as well as Brazil's overall national REDD+ strategy (ENREDD+). In addition to the numerous international agreements and instruments that have been ratified, Brazil has made significant efforts in the last decades towards reforming and creating national laws relevant to resource management, conservation, sustainable economic development, and the enjoyment of rights and freedoms, including that of self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities. These are fundamental to the realization, inclusivity and permanence of REDD+ efforts, particularly with respect to IPs and traditional communities (quilombolas) who are stewards of forest ecosystems, and are key stakeholders in the maintenance of forest cover and the ecosystem services with which this is associated. In addition to conserving and restoring forest cover across the Brazilian Amazon, the project also seeks to improve the well-being of those whose livelihoods and cultures are tightly linked to natural resources, supporting the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to health, the right to water and the right of IPs to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.</p> <p>At the heart of the Floresta+ program and ENREDD+, are efforts to address land tenure issues first and foremost, so that resource-dependent communities can secure their rights and access. Integrating stakeholders from the private, public, and non-profit sectors into the project as equal partners or as leaders is recognized as pivotal to the success of REDD+ in Brazil. In particular, measures are taken to support the participation of indigenous peoples and traditional communities, as well as marginalized groups such as poor rural farmers and women, in the design, implementation, and monitoring/evaluation of project activities in ways that value their knowledge and respond to their needs. The meaningful, effective, inclusive and <i>voluntary</i> participation of these stakeholders (and where required, the free prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous and traditional communities), will strengthen ownership and build local support of REDD+ related activities. The voluntary nature of the RBP Project activities, broadly through adherence to the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) and more specifically to the Floresta+ program, the multi-stakeholder participation in the project design, the project's applicable legal and policy framework, and the mitigation measures already in place and those to be added in accordance with SISREDD+/ and the ESMF – all will work together to ensure not only</p>

that risks of human rights impacts are minimal, but also capitalize on those opportunities that exist nationally to advance the enjoyment of these rights.

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

Brazil will take proactive and explicit measures to ensure a gender perspective is fully integrated into the revised ENREDD+ implementation, as well as the design of the Floresta+ pilot program, as supported by a revised and updated Gender Assessment and Action plan. The RBP Project recognizes that ENREDD+ goals are best achieved when the gendered contributions and perspectives of women, men, girls and boys are incorporated in the project design, implementation and evaluation, while the success of the project's objectives hinge upon the vested interest of both men and women through the enjoyment of equitable project benefits. As illustrated in REDD+ planning activities (CONAREDD+ and CCT-Safeguards advisory board), Brazil is committed to gender equitable participation is an important consideration, and activities planned for the use of proceeds seek to empower women in economic and political decision-making, increasing their control over assets, and safeguard their rights. Recognizing that affirmative and special measures should be taken, a Gender Assessment was varied out and a Gender Action Plan was developed which examined the proposed RSP activities in the context of the GCF's policy on Gender, Principle 2 of UNDP's SES (Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment), presenting findings and recommendations of several studies.

The design of Floresta+ will be focused on mainstreaming gender and, following other payment for environmental services programs previously implemented in Brazil, women will be defined as preferred beneficiaries when applicable. Gender-sensitive and gender-responsive approaches will also be applied to enable meaningful and full participation of women stakeholders in the design of project activities, and to ensure the collection of gender-disaggregated data, and the equitable representation of women in the management and evaluation of REDD+ related activities. Following the full ESIA and updated Gender Assessment and Action Plan to understand real and perceived gender differences and anticipate risks, mitigation measures will be taken to address gendered risks and barriers to participation, including discrimination and lack of experience, confidence and skills and power relations that may limit women's voice in the implementation of ENREDD+ and the Floresta+ pilot program. The RBP Project will implement the action plan's recommendations aimed at increasing women's participation in, equitable access to, and monitoring of training, capacity building, technical assistance and resources, and social and economic benefits and opportunities comparable to men.

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

Environmental sustainability is mainstreamed into the project, through both the main outputs, including 1) The development of a pilot of an Environmental Services Incentive Program for Conservation and Recovery of Native Vegetation (Floresta+) and 2) The strengthening of the implementation of Brazil's ENREDD+ through improvements in its governance structure and systems. ENREDD+ has as its overall objective to contribute to climate change mitigation by eliminating illegal deforestation, promoting conservation and restoration of forest ecosystems and fostering a low-carbon and sustainable forest economy, while delivering environmental, social and economic benefits. Through its specific objectives of: i) improving the monitoring and impact assessment of public policies for REDD+, ii) integrating governance structures for climate change, forests and biodiversity at all levels and iii) contributing to the mobilization of resources at the scale compatible with Brazil's commitments to mitigate climate change in accordance with Brazil's NAMAs by 2020, the project will advance goals of environmental sustainability not only nationally, but globally.

Furthermore, The Floresta+ pilot program, that aims to provide incentives for environmental services (IES) in the Amazon Biome region, has the following specific objectives: i) Provide monetary compensation to incentivize native vegetation conservation and recovery and improvement of ecosystems that generate environmental services (including but not limited to carbon), ii) Prevent the occurrence of deforestation, forest degradation and forest fires through financial incentives iii) Incentivize the conservation and recovery of native vegetation of rural properties, conservation areas, indigenous lands, land settlements and traditional people and community lands, iii) Promote compliance with the environmental legislation, especially that related to the protection and recovery of native vegetation (Forest Code) iv) Offer a financial mechanism to foster the development and implementation of public policies aimed at conservation and recovery of native vegetation. These aforementioned goals and commitments, that not only address the conservation and recovery of forest cover and carbon stocks, but also prioritize measures that address ecosystem services more broadly, put environmental sustainability at the very core of the program.

The project will generate a number of co-benefits for the environment and people/communities who depend upon it, taking specific measures to protect biodiversity and critical habitats through targeted, modality-specific management plans, and when applicable, modality-specific plans that will support the preservation and restoration of water and soil resources, while avoiding any adverse impacts related to changing livelihood practices, the use of non-native/invasive species in reforestation efforts, and chemical inputs for production and pest-management. These objectives will be achieved with the support of real-time, transparent and participatory monitoring of diverse and relevant social and environmental indicators, which are outlined in the ESMF and will be updated/revised following the full ESIA. To mitigate risk of reversals and displacement of emissions, while

benefitting both the environment and livelihoods and well-being of people in the Amazon, initiatives that are central to the program, and the strengthening and operationalization of SISREDD+, include strengthening land tenure security, the enhancement of monitoring and regulatory processes, enhancing the capacities of the stakeholders involved to pursue low-deforestation livelihoods, and encouraging participatory governance, integrating traditional knowledge, for the sustainable management of resources and promotion of sustainable production practices.

## Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

<b>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</b> <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>	<b>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</b> <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			<b>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)?</b>
<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Impact and Probability (1-5)</b>	<b>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>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.</b>
<b>Risk 1:</b> Adverse impacts on the enjoyment of <b>human rights</b> of affected populations through unfair or discriminatory impacts and exclusion, particularly of marginalized groups or people living in poverty because duty-bearers might not have the capacity to meet their obligations or because rights-holders might not have the capacity to claim their rights.	I = 3 P = 3	Moderate	There is a risk that indigenous and traditional communities may not have full understanding of their rights, may not be given sufficient notice and information, or may not have the capacity to claim their rights. While significant progress has been made in Brazil in terms of respect and promotion of human rights, particularly those in regards to indigenous lands and self-determination, the government may not have the capacity to effectively comply with these obligations, given the extremely high cultural, linguistic, and livelihood diversity of	There are substantial legal and policy frameworks in place to protect human rights, as well as the rights of IPs to their territories of traditional use (See PLR analysis, conducted as part of the ESA). To identify marginal, potentially at-risk populations, and in particular, potential human rights impacts, a full ESIA is planned as part of the launch of the project and design of Floresta+. Moreover, the project will be implemented using a phased approach to ensure that technical assistance and capacity building is provided to duty-bearers, both in terms of supporting ongoing land titling processes, responding to land conflicts in a fair and equitable manner. In particular, attention will be given to leveling out differences among states in terms of ability to carry out their human rights obligations, and support the land regularization of IPs and traditional

<p>There are potential risks of excluding marginalized groups associated to the proposed beneficiary selection mechanism, which uses the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR ) as the main program entry point.</p> <p>There is a risk of unfair benefit-distribution when payments and compensation amounts are tailored to and target deforestation “hotspots” over large expanses of intact forest.</p>			<p>traditional and indigenous communities, as well as the extensive geographic reach of the project, which will be implemented throughout the Amazon. In particular, this risk will vary considerably from state to state, given their different capacities to consult with stakeholders and their history with Indigenous People, which may generate distrust, conflict and delays that may undermine project objectives.</p> <p>To be eligible for payments, beneficiaries must have land registered through the CAR, which could create a biased beneficiary selection process and unfairly benefit those who are already registered, as well as those for whom registration is accessible (not spatially isolated, able to hire someone to demarcate land, access to computer/internet). Currently, wealthy, individual owners of large land areas are disproportionately represented in the land registry. There is a risk of excluding those who have not yet registered their land or those who are facing institutional or practical challenges in registering. For small producers, and in particular those with farms in <i>assentamentos</i>, land regularization is overseen by INCRA, an institution with limited capacity and resources to effectively carry out legal land titling in these areas.</p> <p>Additionally, Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities whose collective land rights are not secure, are more likely to have legal disputes about land demarcation or about overlapping and contradictory land claims (through ‘<i>grilagem verde</i>’, for example). Although the granting of Indigenous Land titles is an ongoing process, and in some areas local development plans</p>	<p>communities.</p> <p>Considering the different modalities of Floresta + and diverse groups of beneficiaries, modality-specific plans will be developed so that management and mitigation measures account for the needs and interests of marginalized groups, with particular attention to: (1) the status of their land and the resource rights of different beneficiaries in the project areas; (2) the benefit sharing structure for different beneficiary groups and payment mechanisms of different project modalities; (3) the engagement of women and other minority groups in decision-making and participation processes around activities, including the project design, implementation and management.</p> <p>The ESMP will be updated to detail which sites will require specific plans and overall avoidance and management measures to be put in place across the project.</p> <p>In particular, comprehensive stakeholder engagement plans, indigenous (and traditional) peoples plans, and gender action plans will outline key management measures to prevent potential human rights impacts for vulnerable and marginalized groups. They will define procedures for establishing a relationship of trust and dialogue through principles of accountability and rule of law, and ensuring participation and inclusion, and non-discrimination. Marginalized and vulnerable groups will be engaged throughout project implementation, as well as all impact assessment and management planning activities, including defining how they want to be engaged. Monitoring and evaluation of engagement processes will be conducted by a third party or external body, involving a variety of stakeholders, including NGOs, CSOs, and/or community representatives.</p> <p>With specific reference to indigenous people and traditional communities, project activities occurring on their lands will be implemented on a voluntary basis, after adequate information is provided on the implications of adhesion to the program. The elaboration of the local development plans in indigenous territories (PGTA) and of management plans for sustainable use reserves (RESEX, FLONA) will serve as an entry point to the program. In cases where these plans do not yet exist, measures will be taken to design and implement these plans in a participatory manner, with self-selected representatives of indigenous and traditional communities</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>for these territories (e.g., PGTAs) exist and can be used as the entry point for voluntary program participation, huge tracts of land targeted by the program have yet to be titled, and the resources for the process of creating PGTAs is very limited. For the first years of the rollout of the pilot program, there remains a risk of exclusion, given that the majority of these groups still do not have their territories regularized, or do not have development plans in place – although this varies from state to state.</p> <p>There is also a risk of unfair benefit-distribution when payments and compensation amounts are tailored to and target deforestation “hotspots” over large expanses of intact forest. In general, wealthy landowners reside in priority areas, many of which have already contributed to deforestation in the past, and have been granted amnesty under the revision of Brazil’s Forest Code in 2012. A majority of Indigenous people and Traditional communities reside in remote regions that may not currently be threatened by deforestation, so there is a risk of disproportionately benefiting one group over the other.</p>	<p>leading the process.</p> <p>An Indigenous and Traditional Peoples working group will be created that will help inform the design of Floresta+ modalities targeting IPs and traditional communities, as well as to inform the design of the stakeholder consultation process. FPIC procedures, focused on providing information and training on the Floresta+ will guide stakeholder engagement when there are potential impacts on their livelihoods and cultural heritage. Likewise, broadened participation of representatives of indigenous groups and traditional populations in the local, regional and national REDD-related platforms will continue to be promoted in the design, implementation and monitoring of project activities and indicators for the SISREDD+. Lessons learned from engagement with stakeholders in previous REDD-related platforms, at the national and state-level, will be taken into account to continue to strengthen the capacities of the government at all levels to comply with its obligations (e.g., SISA in Acre). The <a href="#">National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI)</a> and The <a href="#">National Council of Traditional Peoples and Communities – CNPCT</a>, are the main guiding policies for addressing and respecting the knowledge and rights of indigenous and traditional peoples and communities’ territories.</p> <p>Finally, appropriate grievance redress mechanisms (GRM) that provide channels for concerned stakeholders will be set at the program level to ensure accessibility for marginalized populations. There is currently a national system in place to register and resolve land disputes related to the CAR, as well as ombudsman offices (<i>ouvidoria</i>) for different government bodies at the federal and state level, including the ministries of environment. Additionally, the work of Brazil’s Pastoral Land Commission (CPT) covers the entire national territory and is performed independently, offering support to small farmers and the landless, addressing problems of unjust land distribution and violence. These processes/administrative bodies will be supported throughout the rollout of the Floresta+ pilot program.</p> <p>For project-level complaints, conflict management and mitigation measures are addressed through the GRM, which will be adapted to specific sites, considering (1) language and literacy of stakeholders; (2) logistical feasibility of reporting structure; (3) power relations between stakeholders and grievance officers along gender and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>ethno-cultural lines. This alignment with the sub-national and national level mechanisms already in place and/or with a new system for REDD-related grievances. Appropriate capacity building and technical training will be provided to coordinate and tailor these mechanisms at all levels, with particular attention to the state-level where the preparedness for REDD+ varies considerably (e.g., Acre and Mato Grosso are considerably advanced, and hence a phased approach will be adopted). Advisory committees that include stakeholders and representatives of IP and TC, following Acre's SISA example, will monitor complaints and response mechanisms. Finally, the UNDP Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM), provides an additional, formal avenue for stakeholders to engage with UNDP when they believe that a UNDP project may have adverse social or environmental impacts on them; they have raised their concerns with Implementing Partners (including applicable project, national or other GRMs) and/or with UNDP through standard channels for stakeholder consultation and engagement; and they have not been satisfied with the response.</p>
<p><b>Risk 2:</b> Adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls. The Project could potentially reproduce discrimination against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in the design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits. The Project could potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing benefits.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Payments and other benefits (e.g., extension services, credit, productive input etc.) may favor head of households (men), especially if they are more highly represented among landowners officially registered to CAR.</p> <p>Similarly, in community-based payment schemes where a leader or representative of the group receives payment on behalf of others, there is a risk of inequitable benefit sharing among community members, including women.</p>	<p>A gender-responsive ESIA will further examine these risks, supported by a comprehensive gender analysis to assess relevant gender dynamics and inequalities with attention to the differences across the highly diverse groups of beneficiaries. It will also focus on the collection of additional baseline data on gender (e.g. on land tenure, women's involvement in decision-making at local/community levels, etc.). Additionally, the stakeholder consultation and engagement plans will ensure that efforts are designed and undertaken using a gender approach and equitably include representatives from more marginalized groups, including women, youth, single-family households.</p> <p>The gender action plan (Annex 6) will be reviewed and updated according to the ESIA recommendations (and gender-specific consultations) to mitigate risks of reproducing or exacerbating gender inequalities. This includes ensuring that project entry points for beneficiaries and corresponding incentives for environmental services (e.g., compensation schemes to individual, community representative, or other) are adequately assessed and designed.</p>

				<p>The plan will include relevant baselines and indicators to be monitored, disaggregated by gender and by group of beneficiaries. Finally, prioritizing payments to women, particularly female-headed households drawing on the lessons of 'Bolsa Familia', by enhancing their access to credit and productive resources, capacity building and training, or other such measures to mitigate this risk will be included in the project design and operations manual. The design will be validated by stakeholders, including women, and a gender specialist will support mainstreaming within the project.</p> <p>Community-based payment schemes will build on traditional and customary governance structures, while integrating measures to ensure that benefits are shared among community members, especially women, youth and elders. Consultations and participatory design of project activities will identify appropriate benefit sharing mechanisms that will mitigate risks of inequalities.</p> <p>Finally, appropriate grievance procedures/mechanisms to provide channels for concerned stakeholders will be set to ensure accessibility for marginalized populations, including women (See Risk 1 for further details). Should any complaints or disputes arise regarding project operations and benefit sharing that unfairly impact women, this mechanism will ensure timely responses and appropriate resolution.</p>
<p><b>Risk 3:</b> Loss of access to natural resources, especially land and non-timber forest products.</p> <p>Project activities could create tensions or exacerbate conflicts among communities and individuals regarding land use and property rights claims. In some cases, the program could engender land speculation and drive land grabbing.</p> <p>The Project could potentially restrict availability, quality of and</p>	<p>I = 4 P = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Project activities that restrict access to productive resources (especially land and forests) could have potentially negative impacts on individuals and communities that are highly dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods. This applies to all beneficiaries but in particular, Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Communities, who rely on forests for food, medicine, construction materials, cultural services, etc. (See also Risk 6, economic displacement). This risk could also potentially affect men and women differently, given their differentiated responsibilities and relationships to forests and land use (See</p>	<p>The project will carry out upgrades to the SICAR for registering and monitoring processes that will strengthen land tenure security in the Amazon, measures will be taken to ensure that environmental registration is accessible to marginalized groups, including women, poor family farmers, indigenous people and traditional communities.</p> <p>Potential risks associated to land rights issues and beneficiary selection through the CAR will be further assessed in the full ESIA in line with UNDP's SES. The assessment will take into account land issues associate to the different Floresta+ modalities, as well as the varied land tenure security concerns of different beneficiary groups, with special attention to the diversity <i>within</i> groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, etc)</p>

access to resources, in particular to marginalized groups, regarding farming, grazing, hunting or collecting of forest products.			<p>also Risk 2).</p> <p>There is also a risk that activities related to environmental regularization through the CAR program could bring about conflicts between land users and disputed claims to land. This could adversely impact marginalized populations who may face social and cultural barriers in claiming their rights through CAR, or who are vulnerable to land grabbing (such as is occurring through 'grilagem verde') (See Risk 1 for further details).</p>	<p>To address the potential for exacerbated conflicts, a dispute resolution mechanism is integrated as part of the CAR and the project-level and federal-level GRM will be tailored to address land rights issues (See Risk 1 for further details)</p> <p>Regarding restricted access to resources, the Brazilian approach to Cancun safeguards clear states against any kind of restriction to the sustainable use of their own territory. A full ESIA will be carried out to determine if and where access restriction is a risk and, when it is unavoidable, the project will ensure affected stakeholders fully participate in the design, implementation, M&amp;E of management plans. If livelihoods are natural resource based and access restrictions apply, the project will allow continued access or provide access to alternative resources with equivalent livelihood-earning potential and accessibility. Where common property is affected, benefits and compensation may be collective, as determined through the FPIC process.</p> <p>Floresta+ activities will be designed and implemented in coordination with existing policies and instruments (e.g., management plans), while supporting the operationalization of SISREDD+ to avoid any potentially negative impacts on livelihoods, especially of forest dependent individuals and communities. Attention will be given to clearly defining restricted activities related to natural resources and ecosystem services, to be decided in a participatory manner with beneficiaries. Where sustainable production and extraction practices are included in the design, both biodiversity and culturally significant livelihoods will be considered following UNDP SES. These activities will be tailored to the needs of different beneficiary groups, and their rights will be fully and effectively communicated, while also providing adequate training and support for alternative livelihood activities that are compatible with forest conservation and the maintenance of ecosystem services.</p> <p>See also mitigation measures outlined for Risk 6 on economic displacement.</p>
<b>Risk 4:</b> Project activities could have indirect negative impact on natural habitats or Protected Areas. Risk	I = 3 P = 2	Moderate	Project activities involving the restoration of forest cover on degraded land or sustainable production practices could affect	The ESIA will further assess this risk in each of the four Floresta+ modalities and to determine how UNDP's social and environmental standards apply to all these activities. Any risks identified will be



<p>of introducing invasive species, or posing a risk to endangered species.</p> <p>The project activities will take place within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas and indigenous people's lands. While there is a risk that beneficiaries displace illegal activities to protected areas or unclaimed/non-regularized land.</p>			<p>biodiversity, water and soil quality, and other ecosystem services if invasive/non-native species are introduced, or monocropping tree plantations are implemented.</p> <p>Likewise, displacement of livelihood activities through restricted land use could lead the intensification of harvesting NTFP and hunting activities, or illegal logging and agriculture and in adjacent protected areas, adversely impacting biodiversity or endangered species (See also Risk 6 on economic displacement and Risk 8 on emissions displacement).</p>	<p>specified in the updated version of the ESMP and mitigation measures identified.</p> <p>Biodiversity aspects will be emphasized in risk assessments and translated into the corresponding biodiversity action plans. Floresta+ is designed to provide incentives for the protection and restoration of environmental services in a holistic manner, while management measures will be taken to avoid adverse impacts these services, including biodiversity, carbon sequestration, as well as those of relevance to affected communities. If avoidance is not possible, the project will aim to maintain value and functionality of priority ecosystem services. Planning and implementation will prioritize the protection of ecologically sensitive areas using practices that mitigate risks to biodiversity, especially endangered and culturally important species. Each site will have documented baseline conditions that need to be understood and monitored. These plans will be aligned with <a href="#">UNDP SES requirements on Biodiversity</a> and following recommendations from the <a href="#">UNDP Guidance Note on SES 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</a>. They will also support the strengthen the processes for monitoring of biodiversity indicators, as decided through the participatory process of SISREDD+ indicators, as guided by the meetings of the CCT-Safeguards advisory board.</p> <p>Furthermore, rigorous and well-validated national monitoring systems are in place to track illegal activities in protected areas to be included as part of Brazil's SISREDD+. Bottom-up, participatory monitoring of biodiversity will also be implemented as a key mitigation measure, particularly in the case on indigenous and traditional peoples, which will encourage ownership and valuation of traditional knowledge.</p> <p>See also mitigation measures for Risk 8 on displacement.</p> <p>To avoid the displacement of activities (hunting, NTFP extraction) in adjacent protected areas, the design of Floresta+ projects and modality-specific management plans will be coordinated with existing territorial land use and development plans and with the full participation of stakeholders. This will ensure that beneficiaries have adequate and appropriate livelihood opportunities to compensate for any displacement due to forest conservation.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

				<p>Beneficiaries will also be fully informed of restricted activities, which will be clearly defined before project implementation in consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>See also mitigation measures outlined for Risk 6 and 7 that will stimulate sustainable local livelihoods, while enhancing and protecting ecosystem services, including biodiversity and cultural services.</p> <p>In the design of project activities, measures will be taken to avoid the introduction or utilization of invasive and non-native species, whether accidental or intentional, unless carried out per existing regulatory framework and subject to risk assessment. The choice of species for any plantation establishment, with avoidance/prohibition of any monoculture plantations, will be carefully considered. Areas that have begun to significantly regenerate will need to be assessed against high carbon and high conservation value thresholds before these areas are earmarked for plantations establishment. The Safeguards officer and project eligibility criteria will ensure that areas targeted for tree plantations were not degraded or deforested in anticipation of payments and other benefits, by tying eligibility to prerequisite requirements, such as time since forest clearing. The ESIA will assess this national [guidelines/PLR] against UNDP SES to ensure consistency and gap-filling measures are included in its application as needed.</p>
<p><b>Risk 5:</b> Project activities could trigger Natural habitat conversion or ecosystem degradation.</p> <p>Project activities could directly or indirectly lead to the (increased) use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers, with potentially adverse effects on biodiversity, soil and water quality and other non-carbon related ecosystem services.</p>	I=3 P= 2	Low	The project may drive or introduce the use of pesticides and fertilizers, especially if forest conservation leads to intensification of agricultural practices on already cleared land or if tree plantations require inputs that could potentially adversely impact the ecosystem and the services it provides.	The ESIA will further assess this risk in each of the four Floresta+ modalities to determine how UNDP's social and environmental standards apply to all proposed activities, and possible shifts in agricultural or livelihood practices. Any risks identified will be specified in updated versions of the ESMP and mitigation measures identified. Management measures will be included in updated and revised versions of the ESMP, in which baseline conditions will be established and procedures for monitoring will be outlined. Modality-specific plans and, when applicable, modality-specific plans will be developed following UNDP guidelines to mitigate degradation of critical natural habitats and ensure no net loss of biodiversity or ecosystem services.
<b>Risk 6:</b> Risk of economic	I=4	Moderate	There is a risk of economic displacement	A full ESIA will be carried out to determine if and where access

displacement and inadequate compensation	P=2		<p>when project activities restrict access to and the use of productive resources such as land and forests (See also Risk 3). Impacts may be especially acute for individuals and communities that are highly dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods. This applies to all beneficiaries but in particular, men and women may be affected differently, given their differentiated responsibilities and relationships to forests and land use (See Risk 2). Likewise, indigenous and traditional communities relate to and depend on the forest in ways that are practically and culturally distinct from family farmers and other land users in the Amazon. As such, restricted access to these resources could potentially have adverse effects on their livelihoods and cultural heritage (See Risk 7).</p> <p>For activities that involve the promotion of sustainable rural livelihoods to address issues of economic displacement, there is a risk that beneficiaries will not receive adequate training or other resources that enable transitions and support alternative income generation that are needed to help beneficiaries maintain forest cover.</p> <p>Additionally, there is a risk of incentivizing rural out-migration or land abandonment if payments are tied to a bank-based distribution system that are inaccessible to remote communities or individuals without bank accounts. Drawing on experiences with Bolsa Familia implementation in Brazil, rural households may move to urban areas to secure payments.</p> <p>Finally, there is a risk of dependence of REDD payments rather than traditional livelihood practices and food systems, depending on the compensation amount, that could</p>	<p>restriction is a risk and, when it is unavoidable, the project will ensure affected stakeholders fully participate in the design, implementation, M&amp;E of management plans. If livelihoods are natural resource based and access restrictions apply, the project will allow continued access or provide access to alternative resources with equivalent livelihood-earning potential and accessibility. Where common property is affected, benefits and compensation may be collective.</p> <p>To mitigate any negative impacts associated to economic displacement, the project will include mechanisms that support rural, sustainable production practices and alternative livelihood opportunities for family farmers, IPs, and TCs. During the design phase, consultations will take with different groups of beneficiaries in order to inform the appropriate level of incentives/ payments to mitigate this risk.</p> <p>Modality-specific management plans and livelihood action plans, that are tailored to the different Floresta+ modalities and different groups of beneficiaries will be developed, when applicable. These will be aligned with existing territorial plans that have been elaborated through stakeholder consultations or self-determined, community-led initiatives (e.g., PGTAs). The ESMP and specific plans will pay particular attention to the heterogeneity within these groups, including the different linguistic, cultural and land use practices of indigenous and traditional peoples and family farmers that vary considerably across the Amazon.</p> <p>Measures to support sustainable livelihood options will be integrated into these plans, outlining targets for capacity building, credit, and other productive resources for beneficiaries as additional financial incentives.</p> <p>The amount of payment per hectare will be defined in norms to be published by the Floresta+ Program Management Committee. Direct payments will be calculated based on the area of native vegetation remnants and environmental liabilities to be recovered, in hectares, according to the data in the National Rural Environmental Registry System (CAR).</p> <p>The project will uphold the definition of sustainable extraction levels of a living natural resource, ensuring sustainable management that enables people and communities, including</p>
--	-----	--	---	---

			<p>incentivize out-migration to urban areas or loss of cultural heritage (See also Risk 7).</p>	<p>indigenous peoples, to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being while also sustaining the potential for those resources to meet the needs of future generations.</p> <p>Special measures to address inequalities for women and other minorities will be included in the gender action and the indigenous people's plans (See Mitigation Measures in Risks 2 and 7). Financial mechanisms will be set up through the project to support the required for adapting land uses and short and medium term mechanisms to compensate opportunity costs during the transition. These mechanisms will be adapted different groups of stakeholders inclusive of small-scale farmers and indigenous/traditional communities. The project will determine any actions to avoid adverse economic displacement, and a set of parameters will be defined to monitor and report.</p> <p>Furthermore, procedures will be put in place to ensure that there is participatory design and implementation of land use planning with communities, to avoid restricting or economically displacing livelihood activities of IPs, TCs and family farmers. The stakeholder engagement plan will include specific actions to engage with marginalized groups, so that issues of food insecurity and access to clean water that disproportionately impact women or indigenous peoples are considered.</p> <p>Regarding restricted access to resources, Floresta+ activities will be designed and implemented in coordination with existing management plans to avoid any potentially negative impacts on livelihoods. For IPs and TCs, these plans will be developed or be revised/updated with the full participation of communities. For family farmers, Floresta+ activities will be coordinated with existing regional land use and development plans (e.g. ZEE) that address strategies for alternative and sustainable rural employment and income.</p> <p>The ESIA will further assess risks associated to compensation mechanisms for different beneficiary groups, and will be evaluated in consultation with targeted beneficiaries to identify barriers and risks specific to their geographic location and cultural and social needs, priorities, and concerns. The compensation mechanism and distribution systems will be modified accordingly to ensure accessibility to remote and marginalized groups, while procedures</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				will be implemented to monitor the impacts of payments on livelihoods, as a community-led or participatory procedure when applicable.
<p><b>Risk 7:</b> The project could potentially adversely affect the cultural heritage of traditional and indigenous peoples, in its intangible form, including the knowledge, practices, technologies, innovations, and institutions related to traditional ways of life.</p>	I=3 P=3	Moderate	<p>There is a risk that payments made directly to indigenous and traditional communities will trigger a shift from a subsistence economy to a cash-based, market-integrated economy, which could lead to the loss of traditional livelihood practices (especially those related to the sustainable extraction of forest products, fishing, hunting, etc) and degradation of traditional social structures and knowledge systems that support the health and well-being of these communities.</p>	<p>Currently, some consideration of traditional knowledge and practices in the monitoring and management of various safeguards is incorporated in the participatory process for creating socio-environmental indicators for the SISREDD+. Cultural heritage is also explicitly considered in the creation of PGTA's, the voluntary process of creating development plans based on IP priorities, epistemology and worldviews.</p> <p>The ESIA will further identify these potential risks on traditional forms of knowledge and practices, further taking into consideration the diversity of Indigenous and traditional cultures in the Amazon that give rise to unique knowledge, practices and social structures among Brazil's varied IPs.</p> <p>Culturally-sensitive consultations will be carried out for the participatory design and management planning of project activities, to ensure that the needs, concerns, and priorities of these diverse groups are accounted for and integrated to avoid any adverse impacts on their cultural heritage.</p> <p>In modality-specific indigenous peoples plans, procedures to monitor and report the impacts of compensation and benefits (monetary and non-monetary) on traditional knowledge, practices, and social structures will be defined and carried out with the full participation of affected communities. This will include community-led, local reporting and monitoring of illegal activities (poaching, logging), where applicable and appropriate, as decided through community consultations. These IP plans will link to the PGTA's, where these plans exist, and further support the elaboration of such plans where they have yet to be completed.</p> <p>Finally, a GRM will be developed, ensuring that this is accessible and transparent (See further details in mitigation measures for Risk 1).</p>
<p><b>Risk 8:</b> Displacement of emissions to other sectors, biomes or countries.</p>	I=4 P=3	Moderate	<p>There is a risk that actions to reduce emissions for deforestation and forest degradation provoke displacement of</p>	<p>Brazil has demonstrated a strong commitment to continuous improvement of its FREL estimates and monitoring programs. While the scope of the FREL and monitoring has focused on critical areas</p>

			<p>activities to other critical biomes in Brazil, such as the <i>Cerrado</i> or <i>Caatinga</i>. Likewise, transnational leakage is a risk, particularly in areas that border countries with significantly lower capacities to monitor and enforce deforestation, such as Peru or Bolivia. Finally, payments for restricting activities in designated forested areas could be re-invested to promote land-intensive commodity sectors (See risk 5) or support non-forestry sector activities (e.g., artisanal mining, industrial production) within and outside of the Brazilian Amazon that generate GHG emissions and could offset progress made by REDD+ activities</p>	<p>in the Amazon, scaling up of the implementation of REDD+ from the biome to the national level, in a stepwise manner is underway, to help track and manage any potential for displaced emissions within Brazil's borders. This includes consistent, reliable, credible, accurate, transparent and verifiable monitoring of deforestation and degradation, such as PRODES, which is integrated into the SISREDD+. In 2015, to improve environmental monitoring at the national level, <a href="#">the Brazilian Biomes Environmental Monitoring Program</a> was established and is aligned with the objectives of the ENREDD+ to deliver the enhancement and improvement of systems and monitoring protocols – particularly for the extra-Amazonian biomes – necessary for achieving the desired national scale. Additional actions include the implementation of the PPCerrado and the engagement of stakeholders beyond the Amazon in the ENREDD+, the establishment of the <a href="#">Rural Environmental Registry (CAR)</a> and the creation of a national forest monitoring system (NFMS). These initiatives will also provide important information to improve, at the national level, policies to combat deforestation and forest degradation and to foster forest recovery. Regarding the inclusion of other REDD-plus activities, Brazil will include reducing emissions from forest degradation in the biomes where this activity is considered by the Working Group of Technical Experts on REDD+ as a significant source of emissions. The same applies for pools and non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases.</p> <p>To mitigate displacement of emissions to other sectors, the innovations modality of Floresta+ will support private sector actors in created green innovative technologies and production practices. These measures will also be buttressed by PLRs related to climate change and resource management that provide legal and regulatory frameworks that will mitigate cross-sectoral displacement of emissions.</p>
<p><b>Risk 9:</b> Reversals (non-permeance of carbon stocks). Risk of reversals is assumed in all REDD+ projects including conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of C stocks. These risks are related to factors that could result in participant's</p>		Moderate	<p>There is risk of incentive structures, compensation, and other program benefits not adequately covering opportunity costs and participants needs over long time horizons, given that drivers and dynamics of deforestation and degradation can rapidly change or shift to new locations overtime. This risk is equally relevant to cases where</p>	<p>Brazil has several actions to monitor, analyze and improve the coordinated actions for maintaining reduced deforestation rates. As described in the FP, each phase of PPCDAM is an opportunity to analyze both the main causes of deforestation and the risks of reversals, which leads to improvements in the action plan. To ensure permanence, the underlying factors of deforestation and forest degradation will be reassessed and re-evaluated to reflect an understanding of the likely effect of climate on forests, including</p>

<p>withdrawal from the voluntary program.</p>			<p>beneficiaries may feel locked-in to lands use obligations over time with out the capacity and resources to adapt their livelihoods and land use practices (See Risk 6 on economic displacement)</p> <p>Similarly, there is a risk that delayed or inadequate payments after program rollout could also lead to dissatisfaction and conflict, resulting in withdrawal from the program and subsequent deforestation/ degradation of areas targeted for protection or restoration. This risk is associated to myriad factors, including the consultation process, potential financial and operations risks (such as corruption in the government or fund distribution parties) or significant shifts in political agendas following elections.</p> <p>Finally, non-human factors can also contribute to the risk of reversals, notably those linked to climate change pressures (such as natural disasters, extreme flooding, fires, etc.), which could off-set REDD+ efforts.</p>	<p>both anthropogenic and natural drivers. It should be highlighted that the implementation if the Floresta+ program which incentivizes familiar farmers, IPs, TCs and other relevant stakeholders to maintain forests and associated environmental services are pivotal to these efforts.</p> <p>Further mitigation measures to address the risk of reversals will be taken at the project-level, and involve the further support of monitoring processes, as well as the updating and revision of management plans and stakeholder engagement plans – in accordance with new phases of PPCDAm – so that the procedures outlined for engagements with natural resource users over time will continue to benefit livelihoods and well-beings while incentivizing commitments to conservation, restoration, and reduced deforestation (See mitigation measures for Risks 6, economic displacement, Risk 7, cultural heritage, and Risk 1, human rights). Careful coordination of PLRs with other relevant sectors and Ministries (including, but not limited to those involved in the implementation of PPCDAm) will also be prioritized in order to achieve optimal results.</p>
	<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?</b>			
	<b>Select one (see <a href="#">SESP</a> for guidance)</b>			<b>Comments</b>
	<i>Low Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The proposed program includes activities with potential adverse social and environmental risks and impacts, that are limited in scale, can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, and can be addressed through application of standard best practice, mitigation measures and stakeholder engagement during Project implementation.</p>	
	<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?</b>			

	Check all that apply		Comments
	<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	X	
	<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	X	
	<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	X	
	<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	X	
	<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	X	
	<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>	X	
	<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>	X	
	<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>	X	
	<i>7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	X	

#### Final Sign Off

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor		UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.



## SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks	
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?	Yes
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? <sup>1</sup>	Yes
3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	Yes
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?	Yes
5. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	Yes
6. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	Yes
7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	
8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	Yes
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?	Yes
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?	Yes
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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

4.	<p>Would the Project potentially limit 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?</p> <p><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></p>	Yes
<b>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:</b> Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
<b>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</b>		
1.1	<p>Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?</p> <p><i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i></p>	Yes
1.2	<p>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?</p>	Yes
1.3	<p>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)</p>	Yes
1.4	<p>Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?</p>	No
1.5	<p>Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?</p>	Yes
1.6	<p>Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?</p>	Yes
1.7	<p>Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?</p>	No
1.8	<p>Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?</p> <p><i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i></p>	No
1.9	<p>Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)</p>	Yes
1.10	<p>Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?</p>	Yes
1.11	<p>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?</p> <p><i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g.</i></p>	Yes

	<i>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>	
<b>Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant <sup>2</sup> 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?	Yes
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
<b>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</b>		
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	No

<sup>2</sup> In regards to CO<sub>2</sub>, '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.]

	decommissioning?	
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)?	Yes
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
<b>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</b>		
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)	Yes
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
<b>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</b>		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	Yes
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)?	Yes
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? <sup>3</sup>	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?	Yes
<b>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</b>		
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 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	Yes

<sup>3</sup> 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.

	country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	
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?	Yes
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	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?	Yes
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	Yes
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	Yes
<b>Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>		
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?	Yes
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	Yes
7.3	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?  <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>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	Yes
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

While it's considered that Cancun safeguards (f) and (g) are implicitly captured in the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards and Policies (See [Demonstrating Consistency: UNDP Social and Environmental Standards and Policies and UNFCCC Cancun Safeguards](#), 1 June 2016), it is important to consider

these Cancun safeguards separately in the SESP and ESMP because they: 1) are not explicitly referenced in the UNDP standards; 2) are unique, assumed risks for forest and land use; and 3) should be reflected separately in the national reporting of the SIS/SOI.

<b>Cancun safeguard (f) – Address the risk of reversals</b>	
• Does the scope of the project include conservation, sustainable management of forests, and/or enhancement activities?	Yes
• Are C stocks conserved, enhanced, managed through the project activities likely to be vulnerable to: climate change (e.g., more frequent drought, flooding, Wildfire? Institutional failure?	Yes
<b>Cancun safeguard (g) – Reduce displacement of emissions</b>	
• Is the scale of the project subnational?	Yes
• Does the scope of the project include less than all 5 REDD+ activities?	No
• Are any project activities likely to result in displacement of land-use change at the local level? Within national borders?	Yes