



CUVKUN

Enhanced Water Security and Community Resilience in the Adjacent
Cuvetlali and Kunene Transboundary River Basins Project



CUVKUN Project Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP)



Supported By



Led By



In Partnership With



Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP)

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Enhanced water security and community resilience in the adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene transboundary river basins
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	PIMS 4736; GEF ID 10565
3. GEF Agency	UNDP
4. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Regional (Angola and Namibia)
5. GEF Focal Area	International Waters
6. PPG financing	USD 300,000
7. GEF Project Grant	USD 12,173,000
8. Co-financing	USD 165,450,801
9. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Implementation
10. Date updated	09 March 2026

Part A. Integrating Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach

Human-rights based approach (HRBA) seeks to promote and protect human rights by strengthening and building capacities in rights-holders in order to empower them to claim their rights and valid entitlements, and in duty-bearers in order to enable them to meet their obligations to respect, protect and fulfil all human rights. The project will respect and support Human Rights in the project target areas (Cuvelai and Kunene river basins) through the development and implementation of the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Plans. IWRM, from the perspective of HRBA, can be seen as a planning and implementation tool to realize the HRBA. IWRM Plan development and implementation helps identify tangible indicators and targets for the duty-bearers to meet gradually in time, which measures clearly how much they meet their obligations, and it helps strengthening capacities in rights-holders so that they will be made aware of and empowered to claim their rights and valid entitlements during the development and the implementation of the IWRM Plans.

The project will strengthen water governance in and for the two basins, through the maintenance and reinforcement of the national and regional stakeholder working groups (these exist already for the Cuvelai basin), which will function in a similar way to the catchment management committees that already exist in Namibia and which are planned under new legislation in Angola. Strengthened water governance through catchment management committees and water associations help reinforce the most respected procedural human rights principles: Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination and Transparency.

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

Equal representation of gender is already realized currently in CUVECOM at its highest decision-making body (i.e. two female and one male commissioner in Namibia and two male and one female in Angola). The same is true for the Kunene PJTC. Gender equality achieved at the highest decision-making level ensures that the proposed gender mainstreaming measures are not sidelined.

The Project continues to mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment through implementation of the Gender Action Plan / GESI measures, with emphasis on women's participation in decision-making, benefit-sharing, training and community governance structures. The implementation-stage ESIA findings further confirm the need for targeted measures to address under-representation of women, GBV/SEAH risks, referral pathways, and gender-responsive consultation and grievance handling.

Although gender mainstreaming has been relatively successful at the senior levels within CUVECOM and the PJTC, major efforts are still required at the community leadership level. The mainstreaming of gender aspects is heavily emphasized in the IWRM Plan for the Cuvelai Basin, yet little progress has been made in terms of implementation. Representation of community-level stakeholders is still largely male. There are several areas where the programme will support gender mainstreaming throughout the project implementation. The project developed a Gender Analysis and Action Plan during the preparatory phase, which will help identify specific gaps and priority areas in the basins and a set of specific actions that the project will take to fill these gaps and address priorities.

The Project will:

- Sensitize stakeholders on the relevance of gender mainstreaming and gauge their interest or willingness
- Promote the dialogue and collaboration of gender experts in the basins, supporting activities on an ongoing basis
- Train all CUVECOM and PJTC technical task teams and other relevant project steering committees on the value of gender mainstreaming and provide concrete support.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience

The overall objective of the Project is to move towards the agreed vision for the two basins that is oriented towards sustainability.

Environmental sustainability is at the heart of the proposed project and one of the most important results to be delivered by projects financed by the Global Environment Facility. It is also one of the principles of an IWRM Plan, which aims to strike balance between the development needs and conservation, and applies the precautionary approach.

Further, specific to the project sites, the basins' population depends heavily on natural resources for their livelihoods, for their health, for their resilience to climate change, and their well-being. It is both clear and accepted by stakeholders that improved livelihoods can only be achieved through an approach that is environmentally sustainable.

The main steps being applied by the Project to ensure environmental sustainability and resilience include:

- strengthened basin knowledge through TDA and related assessments;
- improved stakeholder involvement and water governance;
- climate-resilient design and siting of interventions;
- biodiversity-sensitive planning and avoidance;
- groundwater monitoring, water-use governance and community water committees;
- flood and drought preparedness, including early warning systems;
- implementation of ESMP measures for construction and operation; and
- robust monitoring, grievance management and adaptive management throughout implementation
- Improved technical and institutional capacity

Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders

The project design aims to ensure full accountability for project activities by local stakeholders. The project puts a strong focus on community engagement throughout project design and this will continue throughout implementation. Engagement with project stakeholders in both countries commenced during the project development phase. These activities were led by a Stakeholder Engagement professional who also has good understanding of local contexts. In addition to these consultations, meaningful, effective and informed consultations have been conducted across the project landscape during the initial phase of implementation. Consultations will continue to follow culturally appropriate approaches, and FPIC will be applied where screening confirms that Indigenous Peoples are present and affected by proposed interventions. SESP

The Project has developed Stakeholder Engagement Plans and is implementing them. A project-level and country/site-accessible Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) has been established/operationalized and communicated to stakeholders. The GRM is designed to be accessible, transparent, culturally appropriate and responsive, including for vulnerable groups and for sensitive complaints such as GBV/SEAH, with referral and escalation pathways in place. Consultations and participation of stakeholders, including both women and men in local communities, is not only a component of project design but will continue to be implemented as a guiding principle throughout the project's implementation and mainstreamed into governance principles promoted by the project. Consultations will seek to ensure that both women and men are able to fully participate, with ability to safely voice their own particular needs, concerns and interests. This may require the hosting of separate consultations for women and girls using different methodologies and outreach approaches.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.</i>	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 5</i>			QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High
Risk Description <i>(broken down by event, cause, impact)</i>	Impact and Likelihood <i>(1-5)</i>	Significance <i>(Low, Moderate, Substantial, High)</i>	Comments (optional)	Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High
Risk 01 – Issues related to access to water resources Project could potentially require some adjustments or alterations to traditional or conventional ways of access to water practiced by water users, if those practices are found to be contributing to inefficient water utilization, environmental degradation, water quality degradation, etc., in order to achieve a long-term water use efficiency, environment sustainability, and fair distribution of water resources. If not designed or implemented well, such changes could cause harm to indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC) or increase their	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	The objectives of Outcome 1 and 2 are to improve water resources management in the project landscape, achieve the long-term water use efficiency, environment sustainability, stronger resilience of communities to climate change, and improved water quality in the basins. In this quest, there are chances that traditionally or commonly practiced practices, which are found to be environmentally unsustainable and/or leading to inefficient water use, etc.,	An Environmental & Social Management Framework (ESMF) has guided implementation-stage screening and assessment. Appropriately scoped implementation-stage ESIA and ESMPs have now been completed for pilot interventions in Angola and Namibia, and these refine the project's management measures for access to water resources, groundwater abstraction, community governance and equitable benefit-sharing In each country, the ESIA assessed potential social and environmental impacts (both short-term and long-term) of any restriction or altered access to water resources by any water users, with a particular focus on marginalized individuals or groups prior to any of such restrictions or alterations occur, to develop and implement management measures, and to monitor the implementation of such measures and their

<p>vulnerability, especially if changes are administered top-down without adequate participation and inclusion of communities concerned.</p> <p>Principle 1: Leave No One Behind Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 5: Accountability Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</p>			<p>may need to be altered during the project implementation period, which could potentially restrict the water access which has been traditionally practiced. However, new approaches to supplying water are not being proposed.</p>	<p>effectiveness. But before the ESIA's, additional screenings were completed for activities definition and site selection, that will have minimal environmental and social impacts.</p> <p>Along with each ESIA, an Environmental & Social Impact Management Plan (ESMP) was prepared. The ESMP includes plans that promote the sustainable use of water resources. The Project will specifically implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to enhance natural recharge of aquifers where possible, and • an agreed governance system to allocate water resources to users • ecological water requirements at several locations across the project landscape • a long-term Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) Plan that will be negotiated and endorsed at the ministerial level. <p>Consultations during the ESIA's followed the FPIC approach when Indigenous Peoples are involved (see risk 6 below). The ESIA's and ESMP's were completed during the first year of project implementation to further refine risk identification, mitigation and management strategies, as well as to establish a system for monitoring risks.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultations took place during project design. Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEP) were also developed (one for each country) and these SEPs will be implemented during the full project, aimed at actively involving all relevant groups through targeted communication and outreach efforts.</p> <p>The project-level/country-accessible Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is being implemented to address concerns relating to access, allocation, equity, human rights and environmental or social impacts arising from project activities.</p> <p>These GRMs will be activated in case any concerns are raised by partners or beneficiaries about human rights infringements, adverse socio-economic or environmental impacts directly or indirectly attributed to project implementation. The GRMs will also include a section dealing with potential complaints by water users and/or downstream communities who might experience or perceive negative impacts on their resource supply. All concerns will be assessed, documented, and followed up with appropriate responses in order to address the issue.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Risk 02 – Perpetuation of discriminations against women The project (especially for Component 5) might perpetuate existing or lead to new discriminations against women in their access to project benefit. The low knowledge of the formal law within rural communities, and the ambiguous customary practices, promote gender discrimination on accessing and controlling land. High number of women in both basins lack ID Card. This lack of a formal ID Card promotes the violation of an infinite list of rights, including civil, political, economic, cultural, and social rights. There is also a risk that women will be under-represented in pilot project activities.</p> <p>Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 3: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>This risk is prevalent given the baseline situation in the project landscape (including gender-based violence, under-representation in stakeholder groups). The practice of polygamy in rural areas, promotes land disputes over inheritance, if women become widows.</p>	<p>During the PPG, the project ensured women's full participation in the discussions and decisions about project activities. A Gender Expert, member of the PPG Team, developed a Gender Analysis and Action Plan during the PPG phase. The Plan will ensure that women are adequately represented in the stakeholder groups to be set up to avoid under representation of women. This Plan will be regularly updated, implemented, and monitored during the full project. The implementation-stage ESIAs/ESMPs have reviewed the impacts specifically associated with women and vulnerable groups and require gender-responsive consultation, women's representation in governance structures, benefit-sharing, GBV/SEAH risk prevention, referral pathways and gender-responsive grievance handling. During the implementation phase, in advance of undertaking consultations, steps will be taken to gather information about obstacles faced by women, their preferred approaches for consultation, and how to provide and share information with them.</p>
<p>Risk 03 – Limited institutional capacity towards Safeguards standards Project implementation partners (e.g. Government ministries, agencies, NGOs, private sector partners, as well as community associations) in both countries may not have all the capacity and tools needed to meet their obligations in the project, especially those related to their roles and responsibilities in the project cycle, as well as the social and environmental safeguarding. There is limited institutional, technical, financial capacity for joint planning and management at the transboundary basin level.</p> <p>Principle 1: Leave No One Behind Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 5: Accountability</p>	<p>I = 2 L = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The project will involve personnel from several parties for its implementation (various Government ministries, NGOs, community associations, and other third-party institutions) to implement activities on the ground. At the time of project implementation, all these partners will not necessarily be aware of UNDP technical and safeguarding requirements. Capacity gaps are also expected to have a gender and Indigenous Peoples dimension.</p>	<p>The implementation-stage ESIAs/ESMPs have confirmed capacity gaps relating to safeguards implementation, contractor oversight, OHS, labour management, SEAH prevention, heritage chance-finds, grievance handling and community engagement. Specific procedures are now integrated into the ESMPs, and targeted capacity building will be provided to project staff, implementing partners, contractors, community committees and relevant authorities. At a minimum, these procedures will include requirements for partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ adhere to the UNDP social and environmental standards (SES). ▪ subject all on-the-ground activities to screening, using the SESP. ▪ clear the on-the-ground interventions with the Project Safeguards expert ▪ ensure that gender and Indigenous Peoples considerations are fully integrated into all activities, and that activities proactively promote women's empowerment and human rights. ▪ prepare bi-annual reports on progress, including status of their compliance with UNDP environment and social policies

				<p>When necessary, the Project will organize trainings and/or workshops to build the capacity of key project implementation partners and equip them with necessary knowledge and tools needed to achieve the objectives of the Project effectively and efficiently. This is key to ensuring continued success over the course of the project implementation, and beyond.</p> <p>Such capacity building activities will start before the implementation of the first activity and will include a combination of the following topics :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES) ▪ Stakeholder Engagement and FPIC (Free Prior and Informed Consent), ▪ UNDP Accountability Mechanism (Grievance Redress Mechanism, SRM, SECU), ▪ Understanding UNDP Project Cycle, ▪ Monitoring and Evaluation of UNDP Projects, ▪ Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, ▪ Human Rights <p>Overall, the project will have a strong focus on enhancing capacity of relevant authorities and targeted communities to ensure that they have the required knowledge and skills to actively participate in project interventions, incorporate lessons learned, and uptake good practices.</p>
<p>Risk 04 – Consultations may not be comprehensive Full participation of potentially affected stakeholders in the design and implementation of the Project is critical. However, because of logistical, social and/or cultural barriers, there is a risk that consultations with local women and men, vulnerable groups, youth, persons with disabilities and culturally distinct communities may not be comprehensive. FPIC will apply only where screening confirms Indigenous Peoples are present and affected by proposed interventions.</p> <p>Principle 1: No One Left behind Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 3: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Principle 5: Accountability Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>All the project outcomes require consultation and/or engagement with stakeholders. If the stakeholder engagement is not properly designed and managed including by ensuring the full and equitable participation of various ethnic groups, women and the most vulnerable, there is a risk that women, minorities and other marginalized groups (including persons with disabilities) could be discriminated, sidelined, and not effectively involved during the different project phases resulting in them being negatively impacted by the</p>	<p>During the PPG, consultations with stakeholder and communities were conducted in the project landscape. These activities were led by experienced Stakeholder Engagement professionals who has good understanding of local contexts and profound knowledge of consultation with local communities, to both gather views and concerns of stakeholders and facilitate their full contribution to project design.</p> <p>The Project will continue to adhere with those principles during the implementation phase. The Project will put measures in place to ensure that local people are inclusively consulted and provided with regular feedback on how their input is taken into consideration and to address any additional concerns that may be identified as the project moves forward. This engagement process will include disclosure of information in an appropriate format that is understandable and relevant to local women and men and consultation in a culturally appropriate manner. Moreover, the Project will maintain a clear and transparent communication channel with the communities by presenting the activities and objectives of the project, and what are being done with the Project.</p>

			project or in not benefiting from positive project results.	The Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs) developed during the PPG phase continue to guide consultation and engagement activities. FPIC will be applied where implementation-stage screening confirms Indigenous Peoples are present and affected; current pilot-site assessments in Angola and in the assessed Namibia pilot sites did not confirm distinct Indigenous Peoples requiring FPIC at those specific sites. The country-specific Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) will also play a key role in addressing in a timely manner any concerns or grievance from affected the community.
<p>Risk 05 – Impacts of climate change. The project outcomes could be compromised by the impacts of climate change. The Project will carry out activities under Output 5.1 and 4.3 that could be subject to hazards such as severe winds, storms and floods, etc. The interventions of the Project could also be impacted by disasters. This could have negative impact on both the communities, the environment and jeopardize the project objectives</p> <p>Principle 4: Sustainability and Resilience Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</p>	I = 3 L = 2	Moderate	Project activities could be affected by droughts or floods, occurring more frequently and with greater intensity with climate change. For example, the community-driven interventions to improve resilience and livelihoods that the Project will implement under Output 5.1 and 4.3 might be affected by a prolonged dry spell, floods or extreme weather events.	The implementation-stage ESIA's have assessed climate and disaster risks related to the activities and identified measures including climate-resilient design, flood-safe siting, erosion and drainage controls, groundwater monitoring, inclusive water governance, and strengthened early warning and preparedness systems. These measures will be implemented throughout execution. The Project will also ensure, as part of the early warning system (Output 5.3), that beneficiaries have access to timely climate information to take measures in case of climate hazard.
<p>Risk 06 – Presence of various Indigenous People in the project landscape Standard 6 remains triggered at overall project level. However, implementation-stage assessments confirmed that Indigenous Peoples were not present in the assessed Angola pilot sites, and the assessed Namibia pilot sites also did not confirm distinct Indigenous Peoples requiring FPIC for those interventions. Any future interventions in areas where Indigenous Peoples are present or affected will require site-specific screening and, where applicable, FPIC and additional management measures in line with the ESMF/IPPF. While the project has an explicit focus on</p>	I = 4 L = 3	Substantial	At project level, Standard 6 remains relevant because the wider transboundary context includes areas where Indigenous Peoples may be present. However, implementation-stage field verification for the assessed pilot sites found no Indigenous Peoples in Angola pilot sites and no distinct Indigenous Peoples in the assessed Namibia pilot areas. Accordingly, Standard 6 remains triggered at project level, but its application is site-specific and should be confirmed through screening	The consultations that were conducted during PPG phase did not follow FPIC approach. However, the project engaged with stakeholders in a way that ensured that they are fully aware of the Project and able to provide meaningful input. FPIC consultations were undertaken during the early implementation phase, before the commencement of activities. The ESMF/IPPF specifies the activities that require FPIC. The engagement process throughout the implementation phase will take into consideration the rights of Indigenous People and the disadvantages faced by them, linked to vulnerabilities, such as limited access to education, low literacy levels, negative stereo-typing and inadequate understanding of national or project-specific processes. Where necessary, civil society organizations representing and deemed acceptable by Indigenous

<p>strengthening the human rights, participation, and self-determined development of local and forest dependent communities, there is the risk that the Project could face grievances or concerns about project activities affecting the rights of Indigenous People. There is also a risk that project activities can conflict with the development priorities of those Indigenous Communities, as defined by them.</p> <p>Principle 1: Leave No One Behind Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 5: Accountability Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples.</p>			<p>before any new intervention is approved.</p>	<p>communities will also be engaged to provide additional support.</p> <p>During the PPG phase, the Project developed an Indigenous People Planning Framework (IPPF) in addition to the ESMF. During implementation phase, the Project planned to develop an Indigenous People Plan (IPP), one for each country, and for all the relevant consultations to be carried following FPIC principles. However, no distinct indigeneous peoples have been identified so far in the landscapes of pilot interventions.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, FPIC training will be delivered to Project Team and relevant stakeholders in Namibia and Angola.</p> <p>Applicable rights and claims to natural resources will be respected while working closely together with targeted communities to implement SLM/SFM practices and strengthen livelihoods.</p> <p>The Project has also established a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) to handle in an appropriate and timely manner grievances from the Indigenous People.</p>
<p>Risk 07 – Concerns or grievances raised by communities/stakeholders not being properly addressed.</p> <p>Project-affected people (PAP), including Indigenous Peoples, might not be able to effectively claim their rights, raise their concerns or file grievances, due to limiting factors and barriers. Such barriers include, but are not limited to, awareness, logistics, language, culture, literacy, and technology.</p> <p>If the questions, concerns, grievances and/or objections raised by the PAPs are not properly addressed, the achievement of the Project’s objectives could be jeopardized.</p> <p>Principle 1: Leave No One Behind Principle 2: Human Rights Principle 5: Accountability Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Ensuring that all Project-affected people (PAP), including Indigenous Peoples, can communicate their concerns and have access to a rights-compatible grievance redress mechanism is key to the local buy-in and to the success of the Project.</p>	<p>Communities were consulted during the PPG phase. These comprehensive, gender-responsive consultations with local communities allowed them to raise concerns and/or to request additional information. The Project accommodated their expressed interest and concerns in the project design.</p> <p>The engagement process has continue in the implementation phase and will take into consideration the rights Project-affected people (PAP), including Indigenous Peoples, and the disadvantages and vulnerabilities faced by them.</p> <p>The Project has developed / operationalized a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) that is proportional, culturally appropriate, accessible and transparent, and that ensures appropriate protection for claimants. Stakeholders will continue to be informed about the mechanism and how to use it, including escalation pathways and survivor-centred procedures for sensitive complaints such as GBV/SEAH.</p>
<p>Risk 08 – Child Labour</p> <p>Project intervention under Outcome 5 (e.g. agriculture, aquaculture, agroforestry, construction, SLM and SFM activities) could potentially involve child labour. Additional hazards to children</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 4</p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>US Department of Labor reports issued in 2020 indicated that Child labour continues to be prevalent in Namibia (agriculture, fishing, domestic work, each</p>	<p>Risks associated with child labour have been refined through the implementation-stage ESIA/ESMPs. While child labour was not anticipated at the assessed pilot sites, the risk remains managed through labour management procedures, contractor obligations, age</p>

<p>could include disrupted physical, mental, moral and social development, exposure to extreme weather conditions, injuries, infections, and diseases, etc.</p> <p>Principle 2: Human Rights Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions</p>			<p>sometimes as a result of human trafficking) and in Angola (agriculture, construction, artisanal diamond mining, domestic work, each sometimes as a result of human trafficking). Project interventions intersect these high risks sectors.</p>	<p>verification, worker registries, documentary checks, supervision and referral to authorities where required.</p>
<p>Risk 09 – Non-compliance with labour and safety standards Project activities Project intervention under Outcome 5 and field activities under Outcome 4 could potentially involve practices that fail to comply with national and/or international labour standards and/or occupational health and safety standards. Project staff, third-party workers and/or communities could be exposed to those risks.</p> <p>Principle 2: Human Rights Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Unsafe work practices are poor labour practices also prevalent in the country.</p>	<p>Risks associated with occupational health and safety, working conditions and labour practices have been assessed through the implementation-stage ESIA/ESMPs. Labour management and OHS measures include worker induction, PPE, safe manual handling, confined-space precautions, well-works rescue planning, work suspension during heavy rain where necessary, codes of conduct, SEAH awareness and supervision, and contractor compliance with labour and safety requirements.</p> <p>The procedures set out the conditions in which project workers will be employed or engaged and managed, in accordance with the requirements of the SES and applicable labour laws, rules and regulations.</p>
<p>Risk 10 – Impact on Key Biodiversity Areas and potential critical habitats. The Project will carry out activities within or near potential Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) that are present in the project landscape. When project activities, especially 'hard interventions' such as water dams, concrete structure, borehole drilling, canal construction, etc.) under Outcome 4 and 5 are carried out in these areas, there could be adverse impacts to the fauna and/or flora species living in these KBAs and the ecosystems that support them.</p> <p>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management.</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 3</p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The project landscape (adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene basins) overlaps with internationally recognized protected areas, including Iona National Park, Bicuare National Park, and Mupa National Park in Angola, and Etosha National Park in Namibia. These national parks are Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and could qualify for Critical Habitats. Careful planning and monitoring of activities in these areas is needed.</p>	<p>Further screening has been completed before the ESIA. This allowed the Project to make decision on the best course of action with regards to siting the planned activities. Then the Project conducted the ESIA, to confirm level of risk to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The ESIA evaluated whether Endangered, Vulnerable or Critically Endangered species are found at the project's intervention sites, as well as the ecosystem services that could be impacted.</p> <p>The ESMPs address any biodiversity risks identified in or near the protected areas and other critical habitats, and management actions will be designed to achieve net gains of those biodiversity values that might be impacted within the Protected Areas. Existing Protected Area Management Plans will be reviewed to ensure alignment with this requirement.</p>
<p>Risk 11 – Exposing communities to communicable, vector-borne and other disease risks Project activities may expose communities and workers to</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>As a consequence, it would affect the ability of vulnerable people to get back into</p>	<p>Relevant public health protocols will continue to be applied during meetings, consultations and field activities. Implementation-stage ESIA/ESMP measures also include pond maintenance and drainage, larval</p>

<p>communicable, vector-borne and other disease risks, including malaria and water-related diseases associated with ponds, water infrastructure, meetings, field visits and worker-community interaction.</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security</p>			<p>economic activities as any lingering or new zoonotic disease outbreaks can affect vulnerable groups in the project area the most and leave them out from participating and accruing benefits from the project in particular from the livelihood activities.</p>	<p>control where relevant, health education, and coordination with local health authorities to monitor and respond to malaria and water-related disease risks</p>
<p>Risk 12 – Use of chemicals and pesticides The community-driven interventions to improve resilience and livelihoods (Outcome 5) supported by the Project could be using pesticides or other chemicals that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health. These interventions could also generate waste (e.g. human waste, metal scraps, plastic, batteries, chemicals, etc.). Any poor waste management at these places could cause environmental pollution and pose a threat to the health of the community and eventual workers.</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</p>	<p>I = 3 L = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Activities such as agriculture, fodder production, poultry, piggery, etc., presented in Outcome 5 will make use of chemicals and generate waste to some extent.</p>	<p>The Project will promote practices that minimize the use of pesticides and harmful chemicals and ensure proper handling of wastes generated at project sites. Implementation-stage ESIA/ESMP measures now specify waste segregation, approved disposal of rubble and old parts, spill prevention and response, storage and handling of fuels/chemicals, and control of pollution associated with construction and operation.</p>
<p>Risk 13 – Risk of drowning in water reservoirs (dams, rainwater retention infrastructure). The rainwater retention infrastructure (water reservoirs) built by the Project may pose risks of drowning to communities and/or livestock.</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security</p>	<p>I = 4 L = 2</p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>Outcome 5</p>	<p>The Project will ensure that rainwater/floodwater harvesting ponds and related water retention infrastructure are designed, constructed and operated to reduce drowning risks for people, especially children, and livestock. Measures include robust fencing with lockable gates, designated safe access points such as ramps/steps, non-slip edges, warning signage in local language(s), controlled access through community by-laws and supervised use times, community safety awareness including child-safety messaging, incident reporting and emergency response arrangements, and regular inspection and maintenance of pond edges, fences and gates.</p>
<p>Risk 14 – Risk of water-borne diseases</p>	<p>I = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Outcome 5</p>	<p>Safety and public health measures will be put in place around water reservoirs, including signage, controlled</p>

<p>The rainwater retention/harvesting infrastructure (water reservoirs) to be built by the Project can be contaminated and/or be the source of waterborne diseases, such as malaria or schistosomiasis, and thus affect the health of surrounding communities.</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security Standard 8: Pollution prevention and resource efficiency</p>	L = 3			<p>access, community awareness, regular pond maintenance and drainage, vector control / larval control where relevant, and coordination with local health authorities to monitor and respond to malaria and other water-related disease risks in intervention communities.</p>
<p>Risk 15 – Environmental and Physical Hazards during construction activities During the construction activities supported by the Project, there is a risk of air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, vibration, erosion, river dredging, physical hazards, accidents, unexploded ordnance (UXO), etc. that could affect the workers, environment and the communities around the intervention sites.</p> <p>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</p>	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	Outcome 5	<p>Per the ESMF and the implementation-stage ESIA/ESMP requirements, contractors involved in construction activities will be required to submit and implement a Construction Environmental and Social Management Plan (C-ESMP) before works commence. The C-ESMP shall include, as relevant, erosion and drainage control, waste segregation and approved disposal, spill prevention and response, dust suppression, daytime noise controls, structural assessment before well rehabilitation, shoring/bracing, confined-space precautions, rescue planning, fencing of work areas, safe manual handling, and compliance with national laws and UNDP SES.</p>
<p>Risk 16 – Introduction of invasive alien fish species This risk is not applicable to the current implementation scope. Aquaculture was considered at design stage but implementation-stage feasibility assessment concluded that it is not feasible under current conditions and is therefore not included in the current project interventions. If aquaculture is introduced in future, separate screening and assessment will be required.</p> <p>Principle 4: Sustainability and Resilience Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</p>	I = 4 L = 3	Substantial	<p>Although the project is designed around the best practice in integrated fish farming, it is possible that project participants could fail to use these best practice techniques and instead introduce inappropriate exotic fish species. These could escape from aquaculture ponds into river tributaries, leading to these fish preying on small indigenous fish species. Such exotic species are often fast-breeding, voracious omnivores that eat plants and animal matter, living or dead, and can</p>	<p>No further management measures are required for current implementation because aquaculture is not included in the active pilot interventions. Any future aquaculture proposal must be separately screened and assessed, including risks related to invasive alien species.</p>

			therefore be high-impact invaders that alter the structure and function of ecosystems.	
<p>Risk 17 - Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) Project-sponsored activities could increase the frequency of interactions between humans and wildlife, consequently increasing the likelihood of conflicts between people and animals. The conflicts will be mainly associated with droughts and water scarcity in the two basins.</p> <p>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</p>	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	There are immense challenges in addressing HWC, in particular because underlying cultural, political and economic aspects that shape these conflicts are often very complex and poorly understood	The Project will develop and implement a human-wildlife conflict mitigation program, if the need arises during project implementation, following widely-recognized IUCN Best Practices guidelines or similar, to ensure that efforts to manage human-wildlife conflicts are pursued through well-informed, holistic and collaborative processes that take into account underlying social, cultural and economic contexts.
<p>Risk 18 – Impact on cultural resources The Project activities, especially those involving construction or excavation, could lead to an unintentional impact on cultural resources.</p> <p>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</p>	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	Cultural resources can be in urban or rural contexts and can be underground or underwater. Their cultural interest may be local, provincial or national, or within the international community.	Implementation-stage cultural heritage assessments have now been completed for Angola and Namibia pilot interventions. The Project will avoid identified heritage resources where present, demarcate sensitive sites and buffer zones, maintain full and effective community participation and consultation, implement a chance finds procedure for all earthworks and excavation, provide cultural heritage awareness to contractors and workers, undertake archaeological/heritage monitoring where required, and immediately report discoveries to the competent heritage authorities. In Angola, current assessed sites are generally low risk for direct cultural heritage impact, while in Namibia identified graves, burial grounds and sacred places require avoidance, buffering and monitoring any archaeological sites discovered.
<p>Risk 19– Possible economic displacement The Project activities, especially those under Component 5, could lead to economic displacement.</p> <p>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</p>	I = 3 L = 3	Moderate	With the Project activities under Component 5, there is a possibility of temporary restriction to access some areas, etc.).	Implementation-stage ESIA's indicate that current assessed pilot interventions do not require physical resettlement, and Angola pilot sites did not trigger displacement/resettlement beyond good-practice screening. Any temporary restriction of access or economic impacts that may arise during implementation shall be managed through consultation, site-specific screening, grievance handling, and livelihood restoration measures where required. FPIC shall apply only where screening confirms Indigenous Peoples are present and affected.
QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?				

	Low Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Moderate Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Substantial Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A few Substantial Risks and multiple Moderate Risks. Implementation-stage ESIA findings in Angola and Namibia confirm that the overall project risk category remains Substantial. Site-specific findings refine mitigation and management measures, but do not reduce the overall project-level categorization
	High Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)			
Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High Risk projects			
	<u>Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Status? (completed, planned)
	<i>if yes, indicate overall type and status</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Targeted assessment(s) Completed
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) Completed
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) Completed
	<u>Are management plans required? (check if “yes”)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>if yes, indicate overall type</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Targeted management plans Completed / under implementation
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Indigenous People Plan, Grievance Redress Mechanism, Livelihood Action Plan.) Completed
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) Completed (with IPPF)
	Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?		Comments (not required)
	Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind		
	Human Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Accountability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

	2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Community Health, Safety and Security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Labour and Working Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Final Sign Off

Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included

Signature	Date	Description
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		
INSTRUCTIONS: The risk screening checklist will assist in answering Questions 2-6 of the Screening Template. Answers to the checklist questions help to (1) identify potential risks, (2) determine the overall risk categorization of the project, and (3) determine required level of assessment and management measures. Refer to the SES toolkit for further guidance on addressing screening questions.		
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind		Answer (Yes/No)
Human Rights		
P.1	Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
P.2	Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	Yes
P.3	Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	Yes
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.4	adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	Yes
P.5	inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? ¹	Yes
P.6	restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities?	Yes
P.7	exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
P.8	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.9	adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	Yes
P.10	reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	Yes
P.11	limitations on 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? <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>	Yes
P.12	exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? <i>For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc.</i>	Yes
Sustainability and Resilience: Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below		

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

Accountability		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.13	exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	Yes
P.14	grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders?	Yes
P.15	risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project?	No
Project-Level Standards		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
1.1	adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	Yes
1.2	activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes
1.3	changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)?	Yes
1.5	exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade?	No
1.6	introduction of invasive alien species?	Yes
1.7	adverse impacts on soils?	Yes
1.8	harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.9	significant agricultural production?	Yes
1.10	animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	Yes
1.11	significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	Yes
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms? ²	No
1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) ³	Yes
1.14	adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	Yes
Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
2.1	areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions?	Yes
2.2	outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?	Yes

² See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#).

³ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Nagoya Protocol](#) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

	<i>For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes</i>	
2.3	increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping 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
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
3.1	construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams)	Yes
3.2	air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation?	Yes
3.3	harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)?	Yes
3.4	risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health?	Yes
3.5	transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.6	adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities' health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)?	Yes
3.7	influx of project workers to project areas?	No
3.8	engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
4.1	activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site?	No
4.2	significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes?	Yes
4.3	adverse impacts to 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
4.4	alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance?	No
4.5	utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
5.1	temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)?	No
5.2	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	risk of forced evictions? ⁴	
5.4	impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
6.1	areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? retain at project level pending site-specific screening for future interventions.	Yes
6.3	impacts (positive or negative) to the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples.	Yes
6.4	the absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC	Yes
6.5	the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.6	forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above</i>	No
6.7	adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	Yes
6.8	risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.</i>	No
Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)</i>		
7.1	working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments?	Yes
7.2	working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining?	Yes
7.3	use of child labour?	Yes
7.4	use of forced labour?	No
7.5	discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity?	Yes
7.6	occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle?	Yes
Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
8.1	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
8.2	the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	Yes

⁴ Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights.

8.3	the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals?	Yes
8.4	the 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 Montreal Protocol, Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention</i>	No
8.5	the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	Yes
8.6	significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	Yes



CUVKUN Project Coordination

Unit 1281 Kwame Nkrumah Street,

Oshakati East

Email: info@cuvkun.org

www.cuvkun.org

Supported By



Led By



In Partnership With

