ESMS Screening & Clearance Report

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:			
Project proponent (e.g. IUCN programme):			
Project ID:		Funding agency:	
Name of staff leading project development:		Executing entity:	
Expected start date and/or duration:		Contract value (in CHF):	
Country:		Geography/landscape:	

Establishing the need for ESMS Screening (ESMS applicability)

*The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the purpose is to classify the type of the project in order to decide whether an ESMS screening is needed. Please note that this information also needs to be entered in the PAAS workflow in the **Project Portal**. However, as the portal only accepts one option to be selected, please see the portal entry guidance provided in italic in some of the boxes below about which option supersedes others.*

Type of project	Definition	Next steps
☐ **Area-based project**	An **area-based project** is a project where resources are provided in form of technical assistance, physical investments (infrastructure, technology or equipment) or financing to bring about changes in skills, knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and/or practices of institutions or individuals **within a defined geographical area**.	Screening needed -> continue with **Step 1a**
☐ Non-area-based project	A **non-area-based project** does not provide resources for activities on the ground, it does not deploy inputs such as technical assistance, physical investment or financing in a defined geographical area. The following types of projects are considered non-area based projects: a. Global/regional/national projects that contribute to policy, strategy development or planning, advances global knowledge - provided the project does not involve any actions on the ground; b. Projects analysing biophysical or spatial data, assessing or monitoring status of ecosystems, biodiversity or species including presentation of data in form of a database, maps or through web-based platforms (e.g. Red List of Species, Red List of Ecosystems, IBAT etc.) - provided the project does not involve any actions on the ground; c. Preparation and dissemination of position papers, scientific paper, reports, documents and communication materials; d. Organization of events, workshops, stakeholder meetings, conferences or trainings; e. Partnership coordination and management of networks; f. Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences; g. Projects related directly to roles where IUCN provides statutory advisory services to intergovernmental processes with their own oversight policies and procedures in relation to the types of issues covered by ESMS; h. Projects that supports the internal development of the IUCN	Screening not needed -> complete the 2 rows at the bottom of this table and upload the document on the Project Portal
☐ **Law Enforcement**	Projects that include law enforcement activities must undergo ESMS Screening due to the possibility of human rights risks. The requirement is valid irrespective of whether the project is classified as area-based or non-area-based.	Screening needed -> continue with **Step 1a**

	Project Portal PAAS workflow: Non-area-based projects which include law enforcement should always be classified as "Law Enforcement" and not "non-area-based project" in order to trigger the Screening process in the workflow. For area-based projects with law enforcement activities, however, tick "Area-Based Project" and not "Law Enforcement".	
☐ **Project with Grant-Making**	Projects that include a scheme for awarding grants to external entities. A grant award scheme is an instrument that allocates funding to projects which have been selected based on a call for proposals. Projects funded by the grant scheme may result in negative environmental or social impacts, but because the grant proposals will only be known during project implementation, a separate procedure for screening and other ESMS steps is needed that will be integrated into the grant award procedure. These ESMS procedures will be documented in form of a grant-level ESMS which needs to be reviewed and approved prior to the approval of the project. In some cases putting a grant award scheme in place and administering it is the project's only aim, in other cases the grant award mechanism is only one component alongside other project components. Because these scenarios require different handling, the ESMS Coordinator / Focal Point should be contacted to discuss the appropriate ESMS procedure for the project.	Screening needed -> complete **Step 1a** but <u>not</u> the ESMS Questionnaire; contact ESMS Coordinator/ Focal Point
☐ Service Agreement Projects	Service Agreement Projects are projects set up to deliver a service to meet the objectives of a client in exchange for consideration (payment). The client has defined the scope of work and outcomes. IUCN clients might use service agreements for routine services provided in a competitive environment. Service Agreement Projects are outside the scope of the ESMS.	Screening not needed -> complete the 2 rows at the bottom of this table and upload the document on the Project Portal
☐ IUCN not Lead Agency	Projects where IUCN is not the Lead Agency of the project and therefore not the prime recipient receiving funding from an originating donor but only the sub-recipient (also referred to as **sub-awards** or **sub-grants**). In this position IUCN has responsibility for programmatic decision making over the sub-award, but does not have the primary authority of the award. Examples are **consortium partner arrangements** where IUCN is only responsible for selected work packages and does not have the role of a consortium coordinator responsible for quality assurance. Another example are **GEF** projects where IUCN is not the Implementing Agency but only the Executing Entity and therefore not responsible for safeguard screening. The Project Manager **should verify** that the Lead Agency has a robust environmental and social management **system in place** that is at least equivalent to IUCN's ESMS and review the respective screening report. Enter the conclusions in the **second last row** at the bottom of this table. The IUCN ESMS Coordinator or regional ESMS Focal Point should be consulted if the Project Manager believes that the prime recipient's environmental and social risk management seems inadequate or ESMS risks were overlooked. *Project Portal PAAS workflow: Projects where IUCN is not the Lead Agency, need to be indicated as such in the portal, irrespective whether any of the other classifications apply as well.*	If the safeguard system of the Lead Agency is considered <u>adequate</u>, Screening not needed -> complete the 2 rows at the bottom of this table and upload the document on the Project Portal
☐ Previous Safeguard Screening	Projects that (i) were already screened on safeguard risks or (ii) where an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) or any other type of impact assessment (partial ESIA, targeted assessment of environmental and/or social risks etc.) has been done before. If the screening or ESIA is considered <u>adequate</u>, confirm this by entering the following details in the **second last row** at the bottom of this table: for (i) details about the screening results; for (ii) describe the content of the assessment, whether data is still current enough and whether the relevance and quality of data has been judged adequate. If the screening or ESIA is considered not adequate, a different classification should be chosen (any of the applicable classifications above). The IUCN ESMS Coordinator or regional ESMS Focal Point should be consulted if the Project Manager has any doubts about the adequacy of the previous safeguard actions. *Project Portal PAAS workflow: Projects where <u>adequate</u> safeguard tools are in place, should be classified as "Previous Safeguard Screening", irrespective whether any of the other classifications above apply.*	If the screening or ESIA is considered <u>adequate</u>, Screening is not needed -> complete the 2 rows at the bottom of this table and upload screening document or ESIA on the Project Portal
For all projects where the ESMS Screening is being waived as a consequence of the classification, please provide additional explanations in the field below (e.g. describing the safeguard actions of the lead agency, previous screening results, quality of ESIA etc.):		
Name and function of staff who completed the above fields:		Date

Justification and approval of deferral of ESMS Screening

In exceptional cases the ESMS Screening can be deferred (e.g. RfP with low probability of funding) – to be discussed with the ESMS Coordinator(Focal Point. A key requirement is that the project budget is sufficiently flexible to allow that potential risk management measure can be added at a later stage after completing the Screening. In such case the below fields are completed.

Rational for not completing the ESMS Screening during project preparation phase; please confirm budget flexibility to ensure ability to add risk measures at later stage):		
Deferral conditions (e.g. establishment of timing of ESMS Screening):		
Name and function of staff approving deferral (ESMS Coordinator or regional ESMS Focal Point):	Date	Signature
Name and function of staff leading project development acknowledging deferral conditions:	Date	Signature

Step 1a: Decision on the need of a formal ESMS Screening versus Self-Assessment

The fields below are completed by the project proponent - tick one of the three options

1. ☐	Project budget is ≥ CHF 1,000,000 - Formal ESMS Screening is required **-> continue with Step 1b and then Step 2**
2. ☐	Project budget is < CHF 1,000,000 - Formal ESMS Screening is not required as environmental or social risks are appraised through completion of ESMS Questionnaire (referred to as **Self-Assessment**[1]**) -> continue with Step 1b**
	If the Self-Assessment does not identify any environmental or social risks or only low risks that are fully addressed by the project activities, no further steps are required and the project is considered cleared on ESMS. The low risk category is confirmed below by providing a brief rationale why the project is considered a low risk project and naming the staff who conducted the Self-Assessment. This document must then be uploaded on the Project Portal and serves as ESMS Screening & Clearance Report[2].
	If risks have been identified during the Self-Assessment, tick option 3 below.
	<table><tr><td>☐ **low risk**</td><td>Rationale why project is considered low risk:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Name and function of staff who conducted **Self-Assessment:**</td><td></td></tr></table>
3. ☐	Despite being a small project (< CHF 1,000,000), risk issues were identified during the **Self-Assessment** - Formal ESMS Screening process is required **-> continue with Step 2**

Step 1b: Completing the ESMS Questionnaire (enclosed as Annex)

The fields below are completed by the project proponent. Area-based projects require completing the ESMS Questionnaire attached as Annex 1. For non-area-based projects with law enforcement activities only the Security and Human Rights Risk Questionnaire is needed (available at www.iucn.org/esms), but not the ESMS Questionnaire.

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:		

---

[1] ESMS Self-Assessment means that the Project Proponent completes the ESMS Questionnaire provided in this template as an Annex and makes the final judgement about the environmental and social risks. This includes filling out the cells marked with **Project Proponent** as well as the final row in each section row where it says **conclusion of IUCN ESMS Reviewer**.

[2] Please save the document with the following file name: "esms screening and clearance_ID_NAME PROJECT_self-assessment_low risk".

Step 2: Formal ESMS Screening

To be completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer(s); only needed when the options 1 or 2 above (marked in red) are ticked

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:			
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:			

The below Screening Report is completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer(s) after having gone through the ESMS Questionnaire. It summarizes the main findings of the ESMS Screening and represents a consensus between ESMS reviewers.

ESMS Screening Report	Required assessment topics or management measures/plans	Rating of environmental and social risks[3]		
Environmental and Social Risks (potential negative impacts) *(see section B of the questionnaire for details)*		Likelihood (1-5)	Impact (1-5)	Significance (L, M, S, H)
Adverse gender-related impacts (including gender-based violence)				
Risks of affecting vulnerable groups				
Risk of undermining human rights				
Community health, safety and security risks				
Labour and working conditions				
Resource efficiency, pollution, wastes, chemicals and GHG emissions				
Risk of project design failing to take climate change into account				
Other environmental or social risks *(add new rows below for each risk)*:				
ESMS Standards	**Trigger[4]**	**Required management measures/plans**	Likelihood (1-5)	Impact (1-5)	Significance (L, M, S, H)
Involuntary Resettlement & Access Restrictions *(see section C1 of the questionnaire for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Resettlement Action Plan ☐ Resettlement Policy Framework ☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts Access Restriction ☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework ☐ Other:			

---

[3] The entries for likelihood and impact are taken from the ratings established at the end of each section in the questionnaire. Guidance for rating the likelihood, impact and significance is provided below (see heading in purple). For more information on these ratings, please see the Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks available at www.iucn.org/esms.

[4] The decision of triggering a standard does not mean that safeguard instruments or plans have to be prepared right away. The ESMS Reviewer will specify the consequences of triggering the standard in the respective ESMS reviewer section of the questionnaire in C1-C4. Often plans might be required immediately (prior to project approval), in other cases only at a certain point in time (e.g. plans might need to be complete and accepted before the relevant activity can begin). In cases where the risk issues are less substantive, a plan might not be needed at all and mitigation measures are incorporated into the ESMP.

Indigenous Peoples *(see section C2 of the questionnaire for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Indigenous Peoples Plan ☐ Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework ☐ Other:				
Cultural Heritage *(see section C3 of the questionnaire for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Chance Find Procedures ☐ Other:				
Biodiversity & Sustainable Use Natural Resources *(see section C4 of the questionnaire for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Pest Management Plan ☐ Other:				
Quality of stakeholder consultation during project design so far *(see section D4 for details)*	☐ good ☐ adequate ☐ not sufficient	Required action:				
Project Risk Category:	*The project risk category rates the overall project; it is based on the significance rating established for each E&S risk area and for the ESMS Standards. The overall rating is usually that of the highest risk.*	☐ **Low Risk**	☐ **Moderate Risk**	☐ **Substantial Risk[5]**	☐ **High Risk**	
Required assessments and management measures/plans:	☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) ☐ Partial ESIA ☐ Targeted assessment (social assessment, targeted environmental studies etc.)	☐ Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) ☐ Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) ☐ Abbreviated ESMF ☐ Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) ☐ Other:				
Brief summary of the main findings: main risk issues, their significance and justification of the overall project risk categorization; assessments and measures / plans to address risks and to meet provisions of the ESMS Standards and timing of each						

Guidance for rating environmental and social risks

The rating of risks is based on the assumptions that the management measures and plans specified in the respective column are implemented and effective in mitigating the risk. It is good practice that the plans are available before ESMS Clearance. Risk rating is based on the two elements: likelihood and the expected impacts (consequence).

Likelihood represents the possibility that a given risk event is expected to occur. The likelihood should be established using the following five ratings:

- *Very unlikely to occur (1)*
- *Not expected to occur (2)*
- *Likely – could occur (3)*
- *Known to occur - almost certain (4)*
- *Common occurrence (5)*

---

[5] Note that the introduction "substantial risk" as a fourth risk category is currently being tested. Until the validity has been confirmed, all GEF and GCF projects will continue to be classified only with three categories of risk (low, moderate, high).

Impact (or consequence) refers to the extent to which a risk event might negatively affect environmental or social receptors – see below criteria distinguishing five levels of impacts:

Table 1: Rating impact of a risk area

Severe (5)	Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of **very high magnitude**, including **very large scale** and/or spatial extent (large geographic area, large number of people, transboundary impacts), cumulative, **long-term (permanent and irreversible)**; **receptors** are considered **highly sensitive**; examples are severe adverse impacts on areas with high biodiversity value[6]; severe adverse impacts to lands, resources and territories of indigenous peoples; significant levels of displacement or resettlement with long-term consequences on peoples' livelihood; impacts give rise to severe and cumulative social conflicts with long-term consequences.
Major (4)	Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of **high magnitude**, including **large scale** and/or spatial extent (large geographic area, large number of people, transboundary impacts), of certain duration **but still reversible** if sufficient effort is provided for mitigation; receptors are considered sensitive; examples are adverse impacts on areas with high biodiversity value; adverse impacts to lands, resources and territories of indigenous peoples; significant levels of displacement or resettlement with temporary consequences on peoples' livelihood; impacts give rise to social conflicts which are expected to be of limited duration.
Medium (3)	Adverse impacts of **medium magnitude**, **limited in scale** (small area and low number of people affected), **limited in duration** (temporary), impacts are relatively predictable and can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated with known solutions and straight forward measures.
Minor (2)	Adverse impacts of **minor magnitude, very small scale** (e.g. very small affected area, very low number of people affected) and only short duration, may be easily avoided, managed, mitigated.
Negligible (1)	Negligible or no adverse impacts on communities, individuals, and/or on the environment.

Significance of a risk area is established by combining likelihood and expected impact (consequence) of a risk event as demonstrated in the table 2. The significance rating signals how much attention the risk area will require during project development and implementation and the extent of control actions to be put in place. See the Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks for further details on the rating (including factors influencing the likelihood and impact).

Table 2: Rating significance of a risk area

		Likelihood of occurrence				
		Very unlikely to occur (1)	*Not expected to occur (2)*	*Likely – could occur (3)*	*Known to occur - almost certain (4)*	*Common occurrence (5)*
Impact	*Severe (5)*	Moderate	Substantial	High	High	High
	Major (4)	Low	Moderate	Substantial	Substantial	High
	Medium (3)	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Substantial
	Minor (2)	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
	Negligible (1)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

---

[6] For the definition see IUCN ESMS Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources.

Step 3: ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

*The purpose of the ESMS Clearance stage is to confirm the risk classification that has been established by the formal ESMS Screening and to review and approve the risk assessments and safeguard tools developed. It is completed at the **end of project development** prior to approval of the project. The fields below are completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer.*

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:			

	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:			

Have findings from the risk assessment or other final steps of project development triggered any **changes to the risk classification** of the project? If yes, explain and indicate the risk areas where modifications were made.	
Have the **ESMS actions** requested by the ESMS Screening been completed (assessments or management measures/plans)? Has this been done in a satisfactory manner? Has the implementation of the tools been budgeted for?	
Are there **ESMS actions** requested by the ESMS Screening that still need to be completed during the project? If yes, specify the actions and respective deadlines?	
Has the quality of **stakeholder consultation** during project design been adequate? Have results of the consultations been documented (disaggregated by gender, where relevant)? Does this demonstrate how the consultations were used to inform project design?	
Has a **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** (SEP) been developed that describes how the identified stakeholder will be further engaged during project implementation?	
Is the SEP inclusive and provides for active participation of a wide range of stakeholders – particularly women, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples, representatives of the local communities and local groups?	
Are provisions made for monitoring the SEP during project implementation?	
Has a **project-level grievance redress mechanism** (GRM) been established that explains the processes for submitting, resolving and escalating grievances? Is the GRM culturally appropriate, readily accessible for local stakeholders and provide appropriate confidentiality protection?	
Have stakeholders been informed about the GRM?	

CLEARANCE DECISION	
☐ **Cleared**	The conclusions are positive and the project proposal meets all requirements with regards to avoiding or reducing environmental and social risks: the proposal is accepted.
☐ **Conditionally cleared**	The conclusions above call for improving one or more ESMS action (e.g. assessments) and/or for important re-formulation of management measures/plans. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.
☐ **Clearance rejected**	Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, ESMS actions (assessments or management measures/plans) have not been completed, critical management measures have not been incorporated into the project and/or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.
Rationale – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or clearance rejected):	
Clearance conditions (when conditionally cleared) - Explain tasks to be completed during the project:	

Approval ESMS Clearance (M level or above)			
Name	IUCN Unit and Function	Date	Signature

Annex 1: ESMS Questionnaire – *to be completed as a preparation for the Formal ESMS Screening or the ESMS Self-Assessment*

A. Project summary

To be completed by project proponent
*Please summarise the project briefly using no more than one page. The summary can be in form of bullet points. Include goal/objectives, expected results/outcomes, outputs (project deliverables) and in particular the project's main **activities**. Please also describe the **project sites** and the **project area of influence**[7].*

---

[7] The project area of influence is the area likely to be affected 1) by direct impacts from project activities, 2) by project partner's activities and facilities that are directly owned, operated or managed by the partner and that are a component of the project, 3) by indirect project impacts (unplanned but predictable activities enabled by the project) or 4) cumulative impacts (incremental impacts added to impacts from other developments).

Guidance on completing the questionnaire

- Answer the questions in the 'Project proponent' column by selecting 'Yes, no, potentially (maybe) or not applicable (n/a)'; in the second column provide additional information - describing the risk, whether it will need to be further **assessed**, and/or how the risks will be **avoided or managed** (minimized or mitigated).
- If you don't have the required information, describe how you would gather the data during the project preparation phase or during project implementation. Please note that additional activities identified and specified in this exercise will either need to be integrated into the ToR for the risk assessment or into the project design as project activity. E.g. if you describe that land rights of local communities will be assessed, this either needs to be included in the ToR of a social assessment or specified as project activity.
- If the information requested can be found in the project proposal, please also reference the specific section of the proposal where this stated.

B. Assessment of social or environmental impacts

Please consider not only direct environmental and social impacts but also potential indirect impacts such as induced[8], cumulative[9] impacts as well as impacts of associated facilities[10]			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, maybe, n/a	*Answer question and describe how the project will* **assess***,* **avoid or manage the identified risks**	*Comments, additional considerations*
B1: Adverse gender-related impacts (including gender-based violence)[11]			
1. Is there a risk that the project may **discriminate** against women or other groups **based on gender** with regards to access to resources, services, or benefits provided by the project? *Note that equality in the process of designing the project is discussed in section D.*			
2. Is there a risk that project activities inadvertently **create, exacerbate or perpetuate gender-related inequalities** or have **adverse impacts** on the situation of women and girls?			
3. Is there a risk that project activities have **adverse impacts** on the situation of women and girls (e.g., livelihood or rights), including **restrictions** on women's ability to use, develop or protect **natural resources**, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?			
4. Is there a risk that the project might aggravate risks of **gender-based violence** (including sexual harassment, sexual exploitation or sexual abuse)? Is there a risk that persons employed or engaged by the project executing agency or through third parties to perform work related to core functions of the project might engage gender-based violence? Have any such incidents been reported in the past?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on[12]		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):

---

[8] **Induced impacts** refer to impacts on areas and communities from unplanned but predictable activities or developments induced/enabled by the project (incl. impacts that might occur later or in different locations). Example: Equipment intended for species monitoring (camera traps) could be used for law enforcement actions.

[9] **Cumulative impact** means the collective impact of a project's impact added to the impacts of other relevant past, present and reasonably foreseeable future developments. Example: Investments in tourism development by the Government leads to substantial increase in number of tourists that frequent a site and turns a project-funded PA access road into a major cause for disturbance for wildlife.

[10] **Associated facility or activities** means a facility or activity not funded as part of the project but which is necessary for the financial and/or operational viability of the project, and would not have been constructed or expanded if the project did not exist. Example: a visitor centre built by the project might require an access road as associated facility – the construction of which might trigger environmental impacts.

[11] IUCN defines Gender-Based Violence (GBV) as any harm or potential of harm perpetrated against an individual or group on the basis of gender. GBV has many expressions, including physical, sexual, psychological and economic, which can be underpinned by legal, social and institutional norms and systems. Examples include but are not limited to: physical assault; sexual violence including sexual exploitation / abuse, forced prostitution and rape; domestic violence; trafficking; early/ forced marriage; female genital mutilation; honour killings; property grabbing; and widow disinheritance.

[12] Please see guidance given above for estimating the **likelihood** of the event to occur and its **impact** (consequence) on the receptor. It is understood that there might still be a considerable degree of uncertainty at this stage of project preparation.

B2: Risk of affecting vulnerable groups[13]			
5. Has the project site been assessed on the **presence** of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups or individuals (including persons with disabilities)? Are their livelihood conditions and needs are sufficiently understood? Please name the groups; ensure that those referred to in the footnote were considered in the analysis.			
6. Is there a likelihood that project **risks** and negative impacts fall disproportionately on disadvantaged or **vulnerable individuals** or groups? Consider impacts on material and on non-material livelihood conditions. Also consider changes in **land use** and/or **tenure arrangements** with a risk of disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups, including people coming from outside the project area such as internally displaced people.			
7. Is there a risk that the project might **discriminate** against vulnerable groups with regards to access to resources, services, or benefits provided by the project? *Note that inclusiveness and non-discrimination in the process of designing the project is discussed only in section D.*			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B3: Risks of undermining human rights			
8. Could the project lead to **adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights** (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of individuals or groups including through measures that reduce the level or effectiveness of the protection of rights by governments and agencies or that weaken the respect of the rights by other stakeholders (e.g replacement of customary authorities and institutions by protected area officials, affecting the traditional systems of political representation, authority and decision-making and therefore the political rights of communities etc.)?		.	
9. Is there a risk that project activities affect individuals or groups in their ability to **fulfill economic and social rights**, i.e. the rights that guarantee the ability of people to meet their basic needs (e.g. health or education, drinking water, productive resources, sources of income, subsistence); consider restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to services or resources essential to meet the basic needs, in particular for vulnerable groups or individuals, including persons with disabilities?			
10. Is there a risk that project activities lead to a deterioration of **procedural rights**; consider project activities that lead to exclusion of individuals or groups from **participating in decisions** that may affect them (e.g. on natural resource management, land use etc.) or that affect their ability to **access information** that is important for their informed participation?			

---

[13] Depending on the context **vulnerable groups** could be landless or elderly people, children, ethnic minorities, displaced people, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups, among others. Particular emphasis should be given to risks for persons with disabilities which are often overlooked.

Question		Likelihood	Impact
11. Is there a risk that activities lead to **unjustified preferential treatment** of individuals or groups in terms of access to resources or services provided by the project; also consider elite capture that might lead to discrimination of vulnerable people, or formal or de facto restriction or exclusion of groups from access to such resources or services[14]?			
12. Is there a risks that project activities contribute to the **discrimination** on the grounds of ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographic origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority?			
13. Is there any history of **human rights conflict or injustice** in the project area/s, including evictions and failure to compensate people for their land and/or assets when the protected area was established[15] and is there a risk that the project might perpetuate or aggravate such situations?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B4: Community health, safety and security			
14. Is there a risk of increasing exposure of communities to security and safety risks, in particular for vulnerable groups, through direct and indirect impacts when operating in **areas of conflict or post-conflict** (civil war, inter-ethnic conflict etc.) or areas affected by organized poaching, drug cultivation or trafficking, organized crime or trafficking in persons or illegal migration?			
15. Is there a potential risk that the project could inadvertently exacerbate **existing conflicts** or **generate conflicts** within or between communities including through weakening community institutions, disrupting social interactions or the risk of inadvertently escalating personal or communal conflicts and violence?			
16. Will the project support PA management and/or provide support for **law enforcement activities**? If yes, please briefly describe relevant project activities and answer questions a-d. Otherwise, skip to question 17			
a. Which agencies are responsible for law enforcement in the project area? Do they include any community organizations or private companies?			
b. Do park rangers or other law enforcement personnel carry firearms in the course of their duty?			
c. Has there been any conflict between the management of the protected area/s and local people in the last 5 years? If so, what were the causes of the conflict (e.g. poaching, logging, disputes over access rights, artisanal mining)?			

[14] Examples for *de facto* restriction or exclusion are: information is not made available in appropriate languages, individuals with no/low income or without tenure rights (or registered titles) can't access services (e.g. agricultural extension services, persons with disabilities are confronted with physical barriers that block their access; certain groups are stigmatised by society and thus have no access services.

[15] In cases of past resettlement processes in the project area/s, the proponent should seek evidence that demonstrate that international good practice was adhered to and appropriate compensation provided.

		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
d. Have there been any formal complaints, investigations or press reports relating to law enforcement activities in the project area? in addition to own knowledge of the site, please also conduct a web search and check sites of the OHCHR regional or national office.			
17. Is there a risk of injury or loss of life among people triggered by an increase of **human wildlife conflicts** that may be elicited directly or indirectly from project activities, with particular attention to vulnerable and/or forest-dependent groups? Also consider loss of assets (e.g. crops, livestock) which might escalate conflicts (e.g. retaliatory killing)?			
18. Is there a risk that activities inadvertently affect provisioning and regulating **ecosystem services** including risks of increasing communities' **exposure to natural hazards or disasters** (e.g. by exacerbating floods due to cleared vegetation for project construction or by changing flows into water infrastructure etc.) giving particular attention to current or projected impacts from climate change?			
19. Is there a likelihood that project activities lead to **accidents** and exposure of communities to **hazardous substances**, including accidents involving vehicles and equipment and risks related to infrastructure built by the project, in particular in areas subject to natural hazards (floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc.).			
20. Could the project cause or exacerbate community exposure to **health and safety** risks including by triggering **water-**born or -based **diseases** (e.g. through creation of stagnant water bodies, livestock affecting quality of portable water), increasing the spread of other vector-borne diseases or **communicable infections** (e.g. by failure to provide precautionary measures during epidemics or seasonal diseases) or through reduction in **local air quality** (e.g. through generation of dusts, burning of wastes, or burning fossil fuels and other materials in improperly ventilated areas)?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B5: Labor and working conditions affecting project workers – please see definition for project workers in footnote[16]			
21. Is there a risk that the project would potentially involve or lead to working conditions that do **not meet national labor laws** and regulations and/or are not consistent with International Labor Organization's (ILO) Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (e.g. discriminatory working conditions, lack of equal opportunity, lack of clear employment terms, failure to prevent harassment or exploitation, failure to ensure freedom of association etc.)?			
22. Will the project work with local **volunteer** (community patrols etc.) or engage individuals in public or **community work programs**? If so, for what kind of activities?			

---

[16] Project workers refer to (i) people employed or engaged **directly by the project executing entity** to work specifically in relation to the project, (ii) people employed or engaged through **third parties** to perform work related to core functions of the project, (iii) individuals engaged by the project in public or **community work programs or as volunteers**.

23. Are project workers (including **rangers** and community patrols) exposed to the **risk of violence** in the course of their duties (e.g. exposure to armed poachers or to criminal groups involved in drug trafficking)?			
24. Is there a risk that project workers might be exposed to **occupational health and safety** (OHS) risks including risks related to vehicles, equipment or heavy machinery, chemical or biological hazards, exposure to infectious and vector borne diseases? Including rangers or community patrols being exposed to human wildlife conflict or at higher risk to malaria due to long period of exposure. Also consider specific threats to women.			
25. Are there any circumstances in which the project may be involved or implicated in **forced labor** (e.g. any work or service which someone has not volunteered for and is forced to do) or **harmful child labor**[17]? Child labor would be considered harmful if it interferes with a child's education or could be detrimental to a child's health or mental, spiritual, moral, or social development. Please consider direct and indirect work relationships established by the project as well as work relationships of project stakeholders, including farmers and other enterprises that receive benefits or services from the project.			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B6: Resource efficiency, pollution, wastes, chemicals and GHG emissions			
26. Is there a risk that project activities might lead to releasing **pollutants** (chemicals and other hazardous materials) to the environment due to **routine** or **non-routine circumstances** (e.g. accidental releases) with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?			
27. Is there a probability that project activities cause significant amounts of **waste or waste water** or generate **hazardous waste**? Is there a risk of inappropriate disposal of waste?			
28. Might the project involve the use of **chemicals or other hazardous materials**? If yes, explain how risks are managed. Is there any probability that among them are substances, chemicals or hazardous materials subject to international bans, restrictions or phase-outs due to high toxicity to living organisms, environmental persistence, potential for bioaccumulation, or potential depletion of the ozone layer?[18] Please note that the use of pesticides are covered in the Biodiversity Standard (Section C4).		1.	
29. Will project activities involve or lead to a significant consumption of **energy, water or other resources**? If yes, explain how it will be ensured that resources are used efficiently.			

---

[17] IUCN follows ILO Convention 138 on Minimum Age that sets the general minimum age for admission to employment or work at 15 years (13 for light work) and the minimum age for hazardous work at 18 (16 under certain strict conditions). It provides for the possibility of initially setting the general minimum age at 14 (12 for light work) where the economy and educational facilities are insufficiently developed. For more information on the prevention of harmful Child Labour, please see the Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks available at www.iucn.org/esms.

[18] For instance, substances listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
30. Will the project lead to significant increases of **greenhouse gas** emissions or to a substantial reduction of carbon pools (e.g. through loss in vegetation cover or below and above ground carbon stocks)?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B7: Climate Change (risks of project design failing to take climate change into account)			
31. Have the historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including **climate sensitivity**[19] been analysed in the project area?			
32. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more **vulnerable** than others (e.g., women or marginalized/ vulnerable groups)?			
33. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the **effectiveness of project** activities or the sustainability of intended changes? If yes, explain how the project intends to lower such risk.			
34. Is there a risk that project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of **local communities** or the **local ecosystem** to climate variability, temperature increases or climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc)?			
35. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
B8: Other environmental or social risks			
36. Please list in the row(s) below any other identified direct, indirect (induced or cumulative), and transboundary environmental and social risks, and the risks and impacts of associated facilities:			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):
Overall conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on negative Social and/or Environmental Impacts			
Have negative environmental or social impacts been identified? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assessed? Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?			

C. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards

C1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions[20]

---

[19] Sensitivity is the degree to which a system can be affected, negatively or positively, by climate-related stimuli. IPCC, 2001

[20] The term "**involuntary resettlement**" refers to project-related land acquisition and restrictions on land use which have adverse impacts on communities and persons. Project-related land acquisition or restrictions on land use may cause physical displacement (relocation, loss of residential land or loss of shelter), economic displacement (loss of land, assets or access to assets, leading to loss of income sources or other means of livelihood), or both. Resettlement is considered involuntary when affected persons or communities do not have the right to refuse land acquisition or restrictions on land use that result in displacement (World Bank ESS5)

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes,no, maybe, n/a	*Answer question and describe how the project will* **assess, avoid or manage the identified risks**	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Will the project involve resettling people or communities involuntarily and/or acquiring their land (e.g. for the creation of a strict nature reserve or reducing the threat of wildlife related incidents for communities living in reserves)? **if yes, answer a-b below**		*Shaded cells do not need to be filled out*	*Shaded cells do not need to be filled out*
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement.			
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?			
2. Is there a risk that the project will involve forced eviction[21]?			
3. Does the project include activities that might cause economic displacement by **restricting peoples' access** to land or natural resources where they have recognized rights (legally or customarily defined)? Please consider the following activities: establishing new protected areas (PA) or extending the area of an existing PA, improving enforcement of PA regulations (e.g. training guards, providing monitoring and/or enforcement equipment, providing training/tools for improving management effectiveness), constructing physical barriers that prevent people accessing certain places; changing how specific natural resources are managed to a management system that is more restrictive[22]; **if yes, answer a-h below, if no justify your answer in this row**			
Answer only if you answered yes to item 3			
a. Indicate the project **activities** that (might) involve restrictions and the **respective land or resources** to be restricted including communal property and natural resources (e.g. marine and aquatic resources, timber and non-timber forest products, fresh water, medicinal plants, hunting and gathering grounds and grazing and cropping areas.			
b. Based on a thorough analysis of the legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resources, can it be confirmed that restrictions implemented by the project might affect **groups or individuals who have recognized rights** to the respective land or natural resources? Or would the restrictions potentially affect individuals who do **not have recognized** rights but who are highly dependent on the land/resource? **If both questions are answered with no, skip to question 4; otherwise continue answering c-h below**			

---

[21] It is important to understand that Involuntary resettlement is different from "**forced eviction"**; the latter being defined as the permanent or temporary removal **against the will** of individuals, families, and/or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal and other protection (WB ESS5). Forced evictions is an extreme form of involuntary resettlement and "constitutes a gross violation of human rights, in particular the right to adequate housing" (Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/77).

[22] Note that the Standard "does not apply to restrictions of access to natural resources under community-based natural resource management projects, i.e., where the community using the resources collectively decides to restrict access to these resources" (e.g. introduction of restrictions to ensure continued access to these resources) "provided that an assessment establishes that the community decision-making process is adequate and reflects voluntary, informed consensus, and that appropriate measures have been agreed and put in place to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community" (WB ESS5).

c. Is there a risk that project induced access restrictions will negatively affect people's livelihoods? Consider impacts due to • Loss of access to natural resources in a particular area, • Loss of access to social services such as schools, health care etc, • Change of quality/quantity of resources a household can access, • Change in seasonal access to a resource, • Change in types of assets needed to access resources; If yes, please elaborate on the different livelihood elements that are affected, explain who might be affected and describe impacts. Distinguish between social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples), men and women; also consider impacts of restrictions on people coming from outside of the project area. **If yes, answer d-h below; otherwise skip to question 4**			
d. Have strategies been considered to **avoid restrictions** by making changes to project design? If yes, explain.			
e. If it is not possible to avoid restrictions, will the project include **measures** to minimize or compensate for impacts from loss or restrictions of access? Please describe the measures.			
f. Are **eligibility criteria** established that define who is entitled to benefit from these measures? Are they transparent and fair (e.g. in proportion to their losses and to their needs if they are poor and vulnerable)?			
g. Are these measures culturally **appropriate** and gender inclusive? Does the geographical scale of the measures match the scale of the restrictions (e.g. will measures be **accessible to all groups affected** by the restrictions)?			
h. Has a process been implemented or started to obtain **consent** from groups that are likely to be negatively affected by restrictions? Please describe the process (who has been consulted and how).			
4. Will/might the project require the **acquisition of land** for purposes other than the conservation objectives described above? E.g. for building (communal) infrastructure (development of water tanks, irrigation canals, access roads etc.). If yes, describe the legal status/ownership of the land that might be subject to land acquisition. If voluntary donations are considered, explain how it will be ensured that no pressure or coercion is involved.			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

What are the main gaps with regards to the provisions of the Standard?	
What are the main risks and who are the main groups potentially affected?	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? What safeguard tools are to be prepared (e.g. Process Framework)?	
When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)? When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?	

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)	Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):

C2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples [23]

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes,no, maybe, n/a	*Answer question and describe how the project will* **assess**, **avoid or manage the identified risks**	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Does the project site[24] overlap with lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples? **If yes, answer questions a-i**			
2. Even if indigenous groups are not found at the project sites, is there still a risk that the project could affect the rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples? **If yes, answer questions a-i**			
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.			
a. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project's area of influence.			
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups? Do these groups identify themselves as indigenous? And how does the host country's Government refer to these groups?			
c. Explain whether communities have traditionally lived in the project site or whether there are groups or some households who have moved from their traditional area to the project site to be in or near a protected area for economic reasons.[25]			
d. Is there a risk that the project affects their livelihood through **physical or economic displacement**? While this is covered in section C2, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected. For projects promoting protected areas, distinguish between communities whose traditional resource use areas overlap with the PA, even before it was created, from those who have a recent history and presence there.			
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' **rights or livelihood** by using or commercially developing natural resources on lands and territories claimed by them, by affecting their			

---

[23]The coverage of indigenous peoples includes: (i) peoples who identify themselves as "indigenous" in strict sense; (ii) tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and (iii) traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services

[24] The project site is defined as the project's area of influence. This is often larger than the site where actual project activities are located as it considers the area impacted by the activities. For example, a project that intervenes in a PA through strengthening law enforcement will also impact groups that live just outside a PA but have historically hunted inside the PA, even before it was created.

[25] It is important to bear in mind that the Standard is seen to generally apply to the community and not to an individual that may have left the community.

		Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
traditional livelihood, their self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices, or their development priorities?			
f. Is there a risk of affecting the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples by using or contributing to the **commercialisation** of indigenous peoples' **traditional knowledge** (including ecological) or practices?			
g. Are any indigenous groups living in **voluntary isolation**? If yes, how does the project respect their rights (paying attention to national laws on the matter) and avoid any negative impacts?			
h. Explain whether and how legitimate representatives of indigenous groups have been **consulted** to discuss the project and better understand potential impacts upon them? Has a process been started or implemented to achieve their free, prior and informed consent (**FPIC**) to activities that might affect them (positively or negatively)?			
i. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide **benefits** for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a way agreed with them and is culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples

What are the main gaps with regards to the provisions of the Standard? *What are the main risks and who are the main groups potentially affected?* *Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?* *Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? What safeguard tools are to be prepared (e.g.Indigenous Peoples Plan)? When would the plans need to be available (complete and accepted)?*	

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):

C3: Standard on Cultural Heritage[26]

		Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes,no, maybe, n/a	*Answer question and describe how the project will* ***assess*, *avoid or manage the identified risks***	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection? **if yes, answer a-c below**			
2. Does the project site include important cultural resources such as burial sites, buildings or monuments of archaeological, historical,			

[26] Cultural heritage is defined as tangible or intangible, movable or immovable cultural resource or site with paleontological, archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community, or natural feature or resource with cultural, religious, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature.

artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value? **if yes, answer a-c below**			
3. Does the project area site include any natural features or resources that are of cultural, spiritual, or symbolic significance (such as sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas, or sacred species)? **if yes, answer a-c below**			
a. Will the project involve development of **infrastructure** (e.g. roads, building, dams) or construction of buildings (e.g. visitor centre, watch tower)?			
b. Will the project involve **excavation** or movement of earth (e.g. for slope restoration, landslides stabilisation), flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?			
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items a. and b. might affect known or unknown (buried) cultural resources?			
4. Will the project restrict local users' **access** to cultural resources or natural features/sites with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?			
5. Is there a risk that project activities might affect **in-tangible cultural resources** such as values, norms or practices of local communities?			
6. Will the project promote the use of or the development of economic **benefits from cultural heritage** resources or natural features/sites with cultural significance to which local communities have recognized rights (legally or customarily defined)?			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage	
What are the main gaps with regards to the provisions of the Standard? *What are the main risks and what are the main receptors (groups, resources) potentially affected?* *Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?* *Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? What are the safeguard tools to be prepared (e.g. Chance Find procedures)? When would these need to be available (complete and accepted)?*	

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):

C4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

		Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
			Answer question and describe how the project will ***assess, avoid or manage the identified risks***	*Comments, additional considerations*
		Yes,no, maybe, n/a		
1. Is the project located in or near areas • legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands				

	• recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users • which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value[27]		
2.	If there are any project activities proposed within or adjacent to areas high of biodiversity value or critical habitats **described above**, is there a risk of causing **adverse impacts** to biodiversity and the integrity of the ecosystems? Consider activities such as infrastructure works (e.g. watch tower, facilities, access roads, small scale water infrastructure) or ecotourism activities and impacts from inadequate waste disposal, disturbance of nesting sites, slope erosion through hiking trails etc. Consider both construction and use phases.		
3.	Is there a risk of **significant adverse impacts** on biodiversity **outside areas of high biodiversity value**, through infrastructure development, plantation development (even small scale) or other activities e.g. through the removal of vegetation cover, creation of soil erosion and/or debris deposition downslope, or other disturbances? Consider both construction and use phases.		
4.	Is there a risk that the project affects areas of high biodiversity value **outside the project area**, e.g. by procuring natural resource commodities from other geographies (e.g. timber used for watch towers etc.)? If yes, explain whether appropriate industry-specific sustainability verification practices be used.		
5.	Will the project introduce or use **non-native species** (flora and fauna), whether accidental or intentional? Consider activities such as reforestation, erosion control or dune stabilisation or livelihood activities (e.g. aquaculture, farming, horticulture etc.). If yes, explain how the risk of the species developing invasive characteristics is managed?		
6.	Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading **invasive species** (e.g. through creation of corridors, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?		
7.	Is there a risk that the project negatively affects **water dynamics** or **water flows** through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or through other activities and as such affects the hydrological cycle, alters existing stream flow and/or reduces seasonal availability of water resources?		
8.	Is there a risk that the project affects **water quality** of surface or groundwater (e.g., contamination, increase of salinity) through		

---

[27] Areas important to threatened species according to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, important to endemic or restricted-range species or to migratory and congregatory species; areas representing key evolutionary processes, providing connectivity with other critical habitats or key ecosystem services; highly threatened and/or unique ecosystems (e.g. to be determined in future by the evolving IUCN Red List of Ecosystems); areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and subsets such as important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), important Plant Areas (IPAs), important Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity or Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites.

irrigation/ agricultural run-off, water extraction practices, influence of livestock or other activities?			
9. Will the project involve or promote the application of pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (**biocides**)? Also consider the use of integrated pest management.			
10. Will the project involve handling or utilization of **genetically modified organisms**/living modified organisms?			
11. Does the project promote the use of **genetic resources** from natural habitats (e.g. harvesting, market development)? If yes, explain how the project will avoid **unsustainable harvest rates**? Also explain what are the measures for **access and benefit-sharing** relating to these?			
12. Is there a risk that the project could give rise to an increase of incoming **migration** and population increase, which could put a strain on the existing natural resource base?			
13. Could the project result in **noise and vibration** from construction and maintenance equipment, traffic and activities, which may disturb sensitive fauna receptors, including underwater noise impacts on fish and marine mammals?			
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
What are the main gaps with regards to the provisions of the Standard? *What are the main risks and what are the main receptors (areas, species etc.) potentially affected?* *Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?* *Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? What are the safeguard tools to be prepared (e.g. Pest Management Plan, Protocol for Species Selection)? When would these tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?*			
Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)		Estimated likelihood of risks (1-5):	Estimated impact (1-5):

D. Adherence to ESMS Principles

		Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
The below table reviews the project and its design process on adherence to the ESMS Principles. The principles are described in the ESMS Manual. Please note that the Guidance Note on Stakeholder Engagement[28] represents a new policy provision and delineates further requirements for consultation and involvement of stakeholder during project design and implementation.				
	Yes,no, maybe, n/a	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*		*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Has a **Stakeholder Analysis** been done and documented identifying a project's key stakeholder; assessing their interest in the project; ways in which they may influence the project's outcomes and how				

---

[28] Available at www.iucn.org/esms

they might be impacted by project activities (positively and/or negatively)?			
2. Does the analysis differentiate by **gender**, and along other key axes of sociocultural differentiation, including consideration for **vulnerable groups** and individuals?			
3. Have **consultations** been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept and risks? Were consultations conducted in a meaningful and culturally appropriate way? Provide details about the form of consultations and the groups involved. Explain how this has influenced project design.			
4. Have disadvantaged or **vulnerable groups** or individuals been **consulted** or other peoples that might be negatively affected? Please provide details about the groups, the consultations and results of the consultations.			
5. Have **women and men** been provided **equal opportunities** in terms of participation and decision-making throughout the identification and design of the project? Have provisions been made to ensure the same for implementation (including staffing), monitoring and evaluation of the project? Please provide details.			
6. Has a **gender analysis**, socio-economic assessments or the equivalent been applied to inform gender-responsive design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?			
7. While gender risks have been covered in section B, briefly describe how the project is likely to **improve gender equality** and **women's empowerment.**			
8. While risks of discrimination and in-equality have been covered in section B, briefly explain how the project is likely to provide **opportunities** for **persons with disabilities** to participate in and benefit from projects and programs on an equal basis with others;			
9. While risks of affecting human rights have been covered in section B, briefly explain how the project is likely to **further the realization of human rights** e.g. by supporting governments to adhere to their human rights obligations or by supporting the 'rights-holders' to claim their rights (where relevant and feasible within the context of the project).			
10. Is the project in **compliance with laws and regulations** of the host country relevant for E&S matter e.g. provisions for impact assessment, disclosure and consultation) and with those regulations implementing obligations under international laws? In case licenses or environmental permits are required for project activities, explain how this will be ensured.			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer

Are ESMS requirements on stakeholder engagement, disclosure and grievance fulfilled to satisfactory level? What additional actions need to be carried out and by when? What actions to be implemented during the project should be included in the ESMP or the Stakeholder Engagement Plan?	