Annex 13 - Environmental and Social Risk Screening & Residual Risk Management Plan

This annex describes how the project will comply with the GCF Environmental and Social Policy. It contains the following sections:

1. Environmental & Social Risk Screening of the proposed project
2. Environmental and Social Risk Management Plan, for the residual risks and for undefined sub-activities
3. National policies and regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed activities
4. Summary of consultations
5. Stakeholder engagement plan
6. Grievance Redress Mechanism

# 1. Environmental & Social Risk Screening of the project

The WFP *Environmental and Social Risk Screening Tool* is more technically rigorous than the process outlined in the GCF *Guidelines for the Environmental and Social Screening of Activities Proposed under the Simplified Approval Process* and therefore the present project has been screened using the WFP the screening tool.

Given that component 1 of the project includes some activities that will be defined during the implementation of the project through community-based participatory planning (CBPP), section 1.1 lists the eligible and excluded activities, in order to make the screening possible. The list of excluded activities is composed of activities that could entail medium to high risks.

Section 1.2 describes the WFP screening, including the final result (Category C).

## 1.1 List of eligible and excluded activities for component 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Eligible activities** | | |
| **Activity category** | **Description** | **Intervention level** |
| Project setup | Farmers' Clubs | Community |
| Project setup | Village Saving and Loan groups | Community |
| Agriculture | Conservation Agriculture techniques | Household/ Community |
| Agriculture | Preparation and application of compost | Household/ Community |
| Agriculture | Introduction of new cash crops or drought-resistant crops | Household/ Community |
| Agriculture | Creation of additional vegetable gardens at household level | Household |
| Agriculture | Creation of additional vegetable gardens at community level | Community |
| Agriculture | Construction of community post-harvest structures (surface<25m2) | Community |
| Agriculture | Training | Community |
| Forestry | Introduction of energy saving stoves | Household |
| Forestry | Introduction and cultivation of fruit trees | Household/ Community |
| Forestry | Reforestation with native vegetation | Community/watershed |
| Forestry | Production of green charcoal | Household |
| Forestry | Training | Community |
| Land reclamation | Stabilization of land with vetiver | Community/watershed |
| Land reclamation | Reclamation of gullies with Brush Check dam (height<2m) | Community/watershed |
| Land reclamation | Reclamation of gullies with sand bags, dry stone, or gabbions | Community/watershed |
| Land reclamation | Protection of river bank with sand bags, dry stone, or gabbions | Community/watershed |
| Land reclamation | Land demarcation | Community/watershed |
| Land reclamation | Training | Community |
| Water management | Community water ponds for irrigation/livestock use constructed (volume<1000m3) | Community |
| Water management | Water tanks for irrigation/livestock use (volume<20m3) | Community |
| Water management | Small-scale irrigation using river or stream diversion (withdrawal<100m3/day AND diversion<10% of water flow) | Community/watershed |
| Water management | Rock catchments or dams in gullies and small rivers (<2m in height) | Community/watershed |
| Water management | Hand-dug water wells for irrigation and/or livestock (depth<5m and withdrawal<100m3/day) | Community |
| Water management | Creation of *zai* and planting pits | Community/watershed |
| Water management | Training | Community |
| Livestock | Creation of forage and fodder production sites | Community |
| Livestock | Creation or rehabilitation of animal handling (cattle crush) facilities established | Community |
| Livestock | Creation of feed storage facilities (surface<20m2) | Community |
| Livestock | Training | Community |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Excluded activities** | |
| **Activity category** | **Description** |
| Infrastructure | Rehabilitation or construction of roads |
| Infrastructure | Construction of infrastructure with surface>25m2 |
| Water management | Rehabilitation or construction of dams with height>2m |
| Water management | Community water ponds for irrigation/livestock use with volume>1000m3 |
| Water management | Water tanks for irrigation/livestock use with volume>20m3 |
| Water management | Small-scale irrigation using river or stream diversion with withdrawal>100m3/day OR diversion>10% of water flow |
| Water management | Rock catchments or dams in gullies and small rivers with height>2m in height |
| Water management | Hand-dug water wells for irrigation and/or livestock with depth>5m OR withdrawal>100m3/day |
| Land reclamation | Reclamation of gullies with Brush Check dams with height>2m |
| Livestock | Animal dip-tanks with chemicals |
| Forestry | Reforestation with non-native vegetation |
| Agriculture | Use of inputs that are not on the Government list of endorsed inputs, which delimits the use of GMOs |
| Any | Any activity that will lead to involuntary resettlement |
| Any | Any activity that will lead to increased use of agro-chemicals |
| Any | Any other activity that, during implementation, would lead to medium or high environmental or risks, as per WFP risk screening |

## 1.2 Environmental and social risk screening of the project

The WFP screening tool consists of a list of around 20 general level 1 questions (indicated with two digits, e.g. 3.1) and around 60 detailed level 2 questions (indicated with three digits, e.g. 3.1.1). They are categorized in nine thematic areas that correspond to the nine Environmental and Social Standards of WFP.

The level 1 questions need to be answered first and they need to be answered ALL. If a level 1 question is answered with a ‘yes’, it leads to more detailed questions of level 2. All level 2 questions under a level 1 question that triggered a ‘yes’ need to be answered. Level 2 questions can be answered after community consultations, while level 1 questions are answered during community consultations. If a level 1 question is answered with a ‘no’, then the corresponding level 2 questions do not need to be answered but can be if preferred.

Answers to the detailed level 2 questions result in one of three degrees of concern. If any level 2 question is answered with a ‘yes’, the indicated degree of concern will determine the degree of concern for the whole activity. This means that if a single question indicates a high degree of concern, the activity is classified as an activity of high concern and appropriate measures must be taken. If no question is answered with a high degree of concern, but at least one medium-level concern is raised, then the activity is a medium concern activity. If no level 1 or level 2 question is answered with a ‘yes’, then the activity is of low concern and no further action is required.

It is possible that a level 1 question is answered with a ‘yes’ and all associated level 2 questions are answered ‘no’ as they are more detailed and specific questions of the same issue. If all the level 2 questions are answered ‘no’, then this area will be of low concern, even if the level 1 questions was answered with a ‘yes’. There is no pre-determined degree of concern for level 1 questions.

If a potential impact is not covered by any of the L1 or L2 questions, it can be added in the empty box at the end of each of the nine sections.

Below is the full screening tool applied to the Mozambique project proposal. The answers to the questions and the comments are in Red.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 1 Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 1.1 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on soils, groundwater, water bodies, water ways, coastal areas, or the sea | | | | No | The project aims at improving water retention through erosion management, water management, and soil reclamation. All water management infrastructure introduced or rehabilitated in this project are small scale (managed at household or community level) and water extraction from groundwater or surface water sources is limited. This is in line with the hydrological study conducted for the area. |
| **Level 2** | 1.1.1 Could there be significant impacts on quality or quantity of surface- or ground-water? | Medium | No |  |
| 1.1.2 Could the activity lead to major changes in flow regimes of local waterways, conditions of water bodies, or coastal areas? | High | No |  |
| 1.1.3 Could the activity lead to increased soil erosion, run-off, or significant changes to soil characteristics? | Medium | No |  |
| 1.1.4 Could the activity lead to serious soil erosion (e.g. major gullies, sheet erosion etc.) or major detriments to soil quality over a large or locally important area? | High | No |  |
| 1.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on forests, wetlands, farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance? | | | | No | The communities engage in indiscriminate cutting of trees for firewood and charcoal production, in particular as coping strategy against climate change, leading to severe deforestation in the province. This project will reduce these practices by introducing clean cooking stoves, better fuel practices, and more options for livelihood. |
| **Level 2** | 1.2.1 Could the activity lead to degradation or fragmentation of local forest areas, wetlands, prime farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance? | Medium | No |  |
| 1.2.2 Could forests, wetlands, prime farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance be almost fully destroyed or degraded or heavily fragmented? | High | No |  |
| 1.2.3 Could the activity lead to significant increase in consumption of locally sourced fuel-wood? | Medium | No |  |
| 1.3 Could the activity lead to changes in local tenure arrangements for existing resources or resources created by the activity? | | | | No | Access to productive land (gardens) and water is highly unequal in the communities and between communities. There is a risk that new assets increase this inequality; for this reason, all new assets created in this project will be managed at community level or by dedicated associations. Community consultations and O&M plans will ensure clear and approved access, use, and maintenance of assets. The grievance mechanism will allow unforeseen negative effects of the project to be reported to WFP for corrective actions. This is also in line with the hydrological study which found that water-related infrastructure has been unsuccessful based on the lack of ownership and management of the structures during the maintenance phase. |
| **Level 2** | 1.3.1 Could the activity lead to changes in tenure arrangements that potentially could put groups or individuals at a disadvantage or could lead to disagreements and conflicts? | High | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 2* *Biodiversity & Ecosystems*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 2.1 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on biodiversity, natural habitats, or endangered species? | | | | No | The communities engage in indiscriminate cutting of trees for firewood and charcoal production, including the protected tree species Swartzia Madagascariensis and Colophospermum Mopane. This project aims at reducing these negative coping practices by introducing clean cooking stoves, better fuel practices, and other livelihood options.  The communities also create agricultural land in the savannah, interfering in the natural habitat of protected mammals such as elephants, rhinoceroses, and leopards. This project will not incentivize the creation of new agricultural land in the savannah. The project aims at creating options for livelihoods that do not degrade the savannah. |
| **Level 2** | 2.1.1 Could the activity lead to degradation of biodiversity or significant reduction in one or more common animal, insect, or plant species? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.2 Could the activity lead to loss (eradication or removal from local area) of one or more animal, insect, or plant species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.3 Could there be negative impact on any endangered or critically endangered animal, insect, or plant species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.4 Could there be negative impacts on critical migration corridors of endangered or otherwise or important animal or insect species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.5 Could the activity lead to increase in unregulated or unlicensed collecting, hunting, or fishing? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.6 Could the activity lead to introduction of invasive alien varieties or species which could influence local genetic resources? | Medium | No | The project will avoid introducing alien plant species in agriculture or reforestation and will refrain from introducing invasive plant species. |
| 2.1.7 Could the activity lead to introduction of invasive alien varieties or species which potentially could eradicate, change, or significantly reduce local naturally occurring varieties or species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.8 Could the activity introduce genetically altered organisms? | Medium | No | WFP will follow its policies of aligning to the Governments regulation on GMOs. In Mozambique, the import of GMO inputs for commercial cultivation is prohibited. To ensure the project follows the Government strategy, only inputs included in MASA’s agricultural strategy will be procured and used. In addition, the inputs will only be sourced from MASA-approved retailers. |
| 2.1.9 Could a natural habitat be significantly degraded, fragmented, or more than half of extent destroyed? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.10 Could a natural habitat be almost fully destroyed or degraded so that it no longer could function as natural habitat for the original fauna/flora? | High | No |  |
| 2.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts in protected or internationally recognised areas? | | | | No | The province of Tete counts one national park (Parque Nacional de Máguè). The project will not be implemented in this area. |
| **Level 2** | 2.2.1 Will any major constructions be located close (<200m) to critical habitats, protected areas, or areas of particular or locally recognised ecological significance? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.2.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on protected or internationally recognised areas? | High | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 3 Resource Efficiency and Waste Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 3.1 Could the activity lead to very high resource use (such as fuel or water) during operation? | | | | No | All water management infrastructure introduced or rehabilitated during this project are small scale (managed at household or community level) and water extraction from groundwater or surface water sources is limited. The hydrological study serves as guidance to this end. |
| **L2** | 3.1.1 Could the activity lead to more than 100,000 litres per year of diesel, in vehicles and/or generators? | Medium | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 3.1.1 Could the activity lead to major use of water from unsustainable sources (bottled and transported, gradual depletion of ground- or surface-water, change of local waterways etc.)? | Medium | No |  |
| 3.2 Could the activity lead to generation or transport of hazardous or non-hazardous waste which could have negative environmental impacts? | | | | No | This project will not increase the production of waste (neither non-hazardous nor hazardous) above current levels. |
| **Level 2** | 3.2.1 Could the activity lead to significant increase in generation of waste that will not be disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner (recycled, re-used, or recovered) by WFP, beneficiaries, or third parties? | Medium | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 3. 2.2 Could the activity lead to generation of hazardous waste which will not be handled and disposed of safely by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 4 Pollution Prevention and Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 4.1 Could the activity lead to significantly increased release of pollution to air, land, or water during construction or operation? | | | | No | As one of the coping strategies, the communities produce charcoal from collected wood. This project aims at reducing these negative coping practices by introducing clean cooking stoves, better fuel practices, and other livelihood options.  The project will not increase the use of agro-chemicals above the current use. |
| **Level 2** | 4.1.1 Could the activity lead to a dangerous increase in release of pollutants (incl. noise) to air, land, or water during **construction** or as result of accidents? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.2 Could the activity lead to a dangerous increase in release of pollutants (incl. noise) to air, land, or water during normal **operation**? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.3 Will the activity lead to any open burning of plastic waste during construction or operation? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.4 Could the activity lead to significant negative impacts on visual aesthetic values? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.5 Could the activity lead to discharge of untreated wastewater to the environment? | High |  |  |
| 4.2 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals, hazardous materials, or ozone depleting substances subject to international bans? | | | | No | The project will not introduce chemicals or hazardous materials |
| **Level 2** | 4.2.1 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals or other hazardous materials, including asbestos and ozone depleting gases which will not be handled and disposed of safely by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.2.2 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals or other hazardous materials subject to international bans? | High |  |  |
| 4.3 Could the activity lead to increased use of agro-chemicals? | | | | No | The project will not increase the use of agro-chemicals above the current use. Component 1 of the project focuses on Conservation Agriculture. Where possible, farmers will be trained on the creation and use of organic fertilizers, pesticides and insecticides. |
| **L2** | 4.3.1 Could the activity lead to use of agro-chemicals that potentially could be replaced or reduced by alternative environmental friendly products or techniques? | Medium | No |  |
| 4.3.2 Could the activity lead to use of pesticides or other chemicals, which could have an unintended effect on non-target species and environment? | Medium | No |  |
| 4.3.3 Could the activity lead to use of WHO class 1a, 1b, or Class II pesticides without proper application of the International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management? | High | No |  |
| 4.3.4 Could the activity lead to use of pesticides, herbicides or other chemicals or materials containing or polluted by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP’s) as listed by the Stockholm Convention? | High | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 5 Climate Change*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 5.1 Could the activity lead to increased exposure, increased vulnerability, or reduced resilience of beneficiaries to the effects of climate change? | | | | No | The overall aim of the project is to increase resilience of the communities, in particular the most vulnerable members, to climate change. WFP will make sure that the introduced solutions benefit the most vulnerable and do not increase existing inequalities. |
| **Level 2** | 5.1.1 Could the activities result in increased exposure to climate induced hazards? | High | No |  |
| 5.1.2 Could the activity result in beneficiaries being more vulnerable to climate-related stresses? | High | No |  |
| 5.1.3 Could the activity lead to beneficiaries having less means or options to withstand shocks resulting from extreme weather events (floods, storms, drought)? | High | No |  |
| 5.2 Could the activity lead to increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or to reduction of carbon sinks? | | | | No | The communities engage in indiscriminate cutting of trees for firewood and charcoal production, in particular as coping strategy against climate change, leading to severe deforestation in the province. This project will reduce these practices by introducing clean cooking stoves, better fuel practices, and more options for livelihood. |
| **L2** | 5.2.1 Could the activity lead to significant increases in GHG emissions during **operation** phase? | Medium | No |  |
| 5.2.2 Could the activity lead to significant degradation or destruction of elements which absorbs and stores carbon from the atmosphere (trees, plants, soils)? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 6 Human Rights*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 6.1 Could the activity lead to violation of human rights, use of child or forced labour, involuntary resettlement, or negatively affect vulnerable groups? | | | | No | WFP has clear policies and directives on human rights, child labour, and involuntary resettlement that the organization and its cooperating partners have to adhere to. All project design and implementation approaches used are designed to ensure the participation, consultation and adequate consideration of vulnerable and marginalized groups, including women. |
| **Level 2** | 6.1.1 Could the activity, or that of partners, contractors, or suppliers, lead to violation of fundamental human rights as defined by international, national or local law? | High | No |  |
| 6.1.2 Could the activity aggravate the situation of vulnerable, marginalised, or otherwise disadvantaged individuals or groups? | High | No |  |
| 6.1.3 Could the activity, or that of partners, contractors, or suppliers, involve use of child (<14y) or forced labour? | High | No | Vulnerable minors, such as orphans, are often employed in domestic or agricultural work. WFP has a strict policy that no children younger than 14 years should be involved in any work. This policy also applies to all Cooperating Partners. |
| 6.2 Could the activity negatively affect indigenous peoples or cultural heritage? | | | | No | Mozambique is a diverse country with over 40 ethnic groups. None of them are recognized as “indigenous” in the sense of UNDRIP. The project will be implemented in an area where only 1 ethnic group is present and there are no known tensions between different groups in the area. In any case, all the consultation processes used by WFP and its partners in the field are designed to be totally inclusive of all the groups represented in the area where the project will be implemented. The same goes for implementation and the choice of activities which are done by the communities themselves, with some activities targeted to the most vulnerable groups. The needs, situation and preferences of vulnerable groups are of special concern during these consultations, activity design and implementation. |
| **Level 2** | 6.2.1 Could the activity lead to involuntary economic or physical resettlement of households or individuals? | High | No |  |
| 6.2.2 Could the activity negatively affect indigenous peoples, culturally or otherwise, without their specific Free, Prior, Informed, Consent (FPIC)? | High | No |  |
| 6.2.3 Could the activity negatively impact any form of cultural heritage? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 7 Gender Equality*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 7.1 Could the activity lead to gender-based inequality, discrimination, exclusion, unwanted workload, or violence? | | | | No | Women and men have unequal access to different resources (water, agricultural land, gardens, animals, firewood, charcoal, other cash-generating livelihoods), as these resources seem to be ‘gendered’. WFP will make sure that the activities implemented during this project do not increase these inequalities and will actively seek to reduce them - see the Gender Action Plan. |
| **Level 2** | 7.1.1 Could the activity create or amplify conditions for gender-based inequalities? | High | No |  |
| 7.1.2 Could the activity lead to gender-based violence? | High | No |  |
| 7.1.3 Could the activity lead to gender inequities in who makes decisions? | Medium | No |  |
| 7.1.4 Could the activity lead to increased unpaid work for women and girls? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 8 Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 8.1 Could the activity lead to increased risk to community health and safety from use of equipment, materials, transportation, or natural hazards? | | | | No | All asset-creation activities are community-based and do not involve heavy machinery. The assets and infrastructure aim at reducing the exposure of the communities to natural hazards. |
| **Level 2** | 8.1.1 Could activities during construction or operation phase lead to increased community risks from e.g. increased traffic, inappropriate design or use of equipment and materials which would not be handled by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium | No |  |
| 8.1.2 Could the activity cause community exposure to water-born, water-based, water-related, vector-born or communicable diseases? | Medium | No | The project includes the construction of small-scale water harvesting or retentions, which could increase water-born, -based, or -related pests or diseases. If a residual risk is identified during the implementation of the project, adequate mitigation measures will be taken. |
| 8.2 Could the activity lead to influx of a temporary or permanent alien workforce? | | | | No | The asset creation activities in this project will only involve community members, no alien work force. |
| **Level 2** | 8.2.1 Could the activity lead to influx of a temporary or permanent alien workforce of relatively small size in a relatively isolated or culturally sensitive community? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.2.2 Could the activity lead to influx of a relatively large temporary or permanent major alien workforce (>10% of existing community) or a smaller group which could be expected to have important cultural, health, or socio-economic impact on a local community? | High |  |  |
| 8.3 Could the activity create or exacerbate intra- or inter-community conflicts? | | | | No | Access to productive land (gardens) and water is highly unequal in the communities and between communities. There is a risk that new assets increase this inequality; for this reason, all new assets created in this project will be managed at community level or by dedicated associations. Community consultations and O&M plans will ensure clear and approved access, use, and maintenance of assets.  Also access to information and trainings is highly unequal in the communities. WFP activities will target the most vulnerable members of the communities and make sure the content/timing/location of trainings is suitable for them.  The grievance redress mechanism will allow unforeseen negative effects of the project to be reported to WFP for corrective actions. |
| **Level 2** | 8.3.1 Could activities lead to opening up of existing or creating new minor conflicts or disagreements within or between groupings or communities? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.3.2 Could activities lead to opening up of existing or creating new conflicts or disagreements within or between groupings or communities which potentially could become entrenched, violent, or spread to additional groups or communities? | High |  |  |
| 8.3.3 Could the activity bring unequal economic benefits to a limited subset of the target group? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.3.4 Could the activity lead to increased un-employment that would not be absorbed by other sectors or activities? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 9 Accountability to Affected Populations*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 9.1 Could the target beneficiaries or stakeholders be dissatisfied due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation (including due to inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms)? | | | | No | Most of the activities are identified by the communities through Community-Based Participatory Processes (CBPP), based on their needs and preferences, which should limit dissatisfaction.  The grievance redress mechanism articulated at different levels – which is a common practice in WFP projects - will allow for unforeseen negative effects of the project to be reported to WFP for corrective actions. |
| **Level 2** | 9.1.1 Could the activity lead to dissatisfaction or negative impacts due to lack of beneficiary or other stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, or general decision making? | Medium | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 9.1.2 Is there a risk that not all relevant stakeholders, and especially marginalised or vulnerable groups, have been identified and consulted or that they have been exposed to internal or external pressure or coercion or not able to comprehend the consultations? | Medium | No |  |
| 9.1.3 Could there be negative impacts due to an inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanism during project implementation? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  | No |  |

## 1.3 Attestation of screening

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and location of the project: | | | Climate resilient food security for women and men smallholders in Mozambique through integrated risk management | | | |
| WFP unit or office responsible for the project: | | | WFP Country Office Mozambique | | | |
| Expected timing & duration of activity: | | | 2020-2025 | | | |
| Brief summary: | | | Climate change adaptation project funded by GCF | | | |
| Screening carried out by: | | | Environmental & Social Specialist of WFP, HQ | | | |
| Result of screening:  Category A / High |  | Category B / Medium | |  | Category C / Low | **X** |
| The overall project design, as well as the list of eligible activities at community level, have been screened using the WFP screening tool. The screening tool indicates a low degree of concern, i.e. category C.  There is a risk that some of the eligible activities at community level could lead to negative environmental or social impacts, but these can be avoided as per the Environmental and Social Risk Management Plan. | | | | | | |

# 2. Potential residual low-level risks, impacts, and mitigation plan

## 2.1 Management of identified residual risks

Due to the small-scale nature of the assets, the risks for the proposed assets and activities is considered “Low”. However, some residual risks are possible, as identified by the risk screening. These residual risks can be minimized following the measures described in the table below.

| Proposed activity | Residual risks | Mitigation measures | Responsible party/person | Timing | Expected results | Cost implication |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Water management: water ponds,  water tanks,  small-scale irrigation, rock catchments, hand-dug water wells | Increased inequality in access to water for productive use | New assets, in particular water management assets, will be owned and managed by dedicated associations.  Where possible, the association will secure land rights through a land use certificate (DUAT ). | Project Management Unit (PMU) | Mitigation measures to be planned/ designed at asset design stage and implemented during asset building stage | Access to water for productive use is more egalitarian in the community. | No additional costs as these are part of the asset-creation budget |
| Increase in vector- and water-borne diseases | Adequate training or sensitization on vector- and water-borne diseases. | Implementing Partners | Communities recognize and adequately act upon vector- and water-borne diseases |
| Gardens | Increased inequality in access to productive gardens | New gardens will be owned and managed by dedicated associations or by the entire community | PMU | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design and asset building | Access to productive gardens is more egalitarian in the community | No additional costs as these are part of the asset-creation budget |
| Potential soil and water pollution by chemical fertilizers and pesticides | No encouragement of agro-chemicals; encouragement of compost as fertilizer and natural remedies against pests | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design and asset building | Use of agrochemicals is avoided or reduced to the maximum in nutritional gardens.  Compost is created and used. | No additional costs as these should be part of the assets building budget. |
| Agriculture:  new crops;  Forestry: introduction of fruit trees | Negative ecological impact from non-native species | If non-native crops were to be introduced, only non-invasive species will be proposed to the communities. Only crops and retailers endorsed by MASA agricultural strategy will be introduced. | PMU | Mitigation measures part of activity design | New crops are non-invasive and do not encroach on natural habitats | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Forestry: reforestation | Negative ecological impact from non-native species | Only native species will be proposed for reforestation | PMU | Mitigation measures part of activity design | Areas are reforested with native vegetation | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Agriculture: creation of post-harvest structures;  Livestock: creation of feed storage facilities  Water management: creation of water tanks | Increased tensions in communities depending on location of infrastructure | The location of new infrastructure is decided through community-based participatory planning.  New infrastructure is owned by either an association or the entire community.  Where possible, the association will secure land rights for the infrastructure through a land use certificate (DUAT ). | PMU | Mitigation measures part of activity design and implementation | Infrastructure is managed by an association or by the community. Land rights are secure. | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Trainings | Vulnerable groups or community members are excluded from trainings | Vulnerable groups or community members are able to participate in trainings by adapting content/location/time/language to their specific needs | PMU | Mitigation measures to be part of activity design | Vulnerable groups or community members have equal access to training | No additional costs as these are part of design. |

## 2.2 Management of risks of activities that will be defined during implementation

As mentioned in the proposal (main document) and in the risk screening (section 1 of this Annex), some community-level activities under component 1 and 2 of the project will be further defined through community-based participatory planning once the project implementation has started. These activities are selected from the menu of ‘eligible’ activities, listed in section 1.1. of this Annex, that are likely to have low environmental and social risks.

In any case, the activities of component 1 and 2 that are defined through the participatory planning will also be screened using the WFP Environmental and Social Risk Screening Tool (same tool that was used in section 1.2 of this Annex). This is in line with the WFP policy, GCF policy, and national regulations on Environmental Risk Assessment (Ministerial Decree nº 129/2006 and Decree 54/2015), these activities. Only ‘low risk’ activities will be accepted for implementation. Activities whose risk level is medium or high will not be accepted.

WFP will closely work with the Provincial Directorate of Land, Environment, and Rural Development (DPTADR) for the risk screening of asset-creation activities identified by the communities during the implementation of the project.

# 3. National policies and regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed activities

* Water Law nº 16/91: all water resources are owned by the State
* Land Law nº 19/97: all land is owned by the State but natural persons or legal entities can register land use and obtain a land use certificate (Direito do Uso e Aproveitamento de Terra - DUAT) for max 50 years
* Ministerial decree nº 129/2006: General directive for the elaboration of Environmental Impact Studies
* Law nº16/2014 on the Conservation, Protection, Restauration and Use of Biodiversity
* Decree nº 54/2015 on the Regulation of the Assessment process for Environmental Impacts
* District-level Development Plans
* Local Adaptation Plans
* MASA Agricultural Strategy, including endorsed list of input and certified retailers/providers

# 4. Summary of consultations

## 4.1 List of consultations held for the development of the project proposal

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Nr of representatives** | **Date(s)** |
| Stakeholder and community consultations held before May 2019 in Changara, Marara and Cahora Bassa Districts[[1]](#footnote-2) | 75 women, 97 men | March 2018 -up to May 2019 |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA) – national level | 1 man | 3 May 2019 |
| Ministry of Land, Environment, and Rural Development (MITADER) – national level | 1 man | 3 May 2019 |
| Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Food Security (DPASA) –Tete | 1 woman  2 men | 6 May 2019, 13 May 2019 |
| Provincial Directorate of Land, Environment, and Rural Development (DPTADR) – Tete | 2 men | 6 May 2019, 13 May 2019 |
| Provincial Directorate of Public Works, Housing, and Water Resources - Tete | 2 men | 14 May 2019 |
| Community of Cancune, District of Changara, Province of Tete | 9 women, 9 men | 8 May 2019 |
| Community of Nhalicune, District of Changara, Province of Tete | 6 women, 24 men | 8 May 2019 |
| Community of Carata, District of Changara, Province of Tete | 9 women, 10 men | 9 May 2019 |
| Community of Chicomphende, District of Changara, Province of Tete | 9 women, 9 men | 9 May 2019 |
| Community of Cachembe, District of Marara, Province of Tete | 9 women, 15 men | 10 May 2019 |
| Community of Marara Centro, District of Marara, Province of Tete | 17 women, 12 men | 10 May 2019 |
| Community of Nhanpende, District of Marara, Province of Tete | 9 women, 10 men | 11 May 2019 |
| Community of Mufa Caconde, District of Marara, Province of Tete | 8 women, 10 men | 11 May 2019 |
|  |  |  |

## 4.2 Information disclosed during consultations

* Goal of the project
* Project area
* Setup of the project (summary of the 3 components)
* Eligible activities at community level, under components 1 and 2
* Stakeholders involved in the project
* Disclosure of potential environmental and social risks of eligible activities
* Disclosure of the results of the gender analysis
* Donors involved the project
* Expected level of funding of the project
* Expected timeline of the project
* Linkages with previous or other ongoing projects

## 4.3 Key issues and concerns raised during the consultations

The table below summarizes the key environmental and social concerns raised during the stakeholder and community consultations and how they will be addressed by the project. The table is organized by the nine WFP standards, which were also used for the environmental and social risk screening in section 1.2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Natural resources management | \*Communities indiscriminately cut Swartzia Madagascariensis (‘pau-ferro’) and Colophospermum Mopane (‘chanate’) for charcoal production, leading to deforestation. The project will introduce alternative sources of livelihood that will reduce this negative coping strategy.  \* Communities indiscriminately cut firewood in non-designated areas, but this should decrease thanks to the introduction of efficient cooking stoves |
| Biodiversity and Ecosystems | \*There are sometimes conflicts between farmers (‘machimbas’ in the ‘mata’) and wildlife (e.g. elephants), but this should not increase as result of WFP activities.  \*There are sometimes conflicts between herds (in the ‘mata’) and wildlife (e.g. elephants), but should not increase as result of WFP activities.  \*Communities started planting new crop varieties, such as short-cycles or short-stemmed sorghum, millet or maize. These are varieties of crops that are traditionally cultivated in the area and would not impact biodiversity. More and more households are also cultivating non-traditional vegetables such as tomatoes or sweet potatoes. This happens at a very small scale (in horticulture) and the species are non-invasive. There is a concern, however, that not all households have equal access to these new crops. The project will address this by promoting associations.  \*Communities indiscriminately cut Swartzia Madagascariensis (pau-ferro) and Colophospermum Mopane (‘chanate’) for charcoal production, leading to a reduction of the population of these two species. The project will introduce alternative sources of livelihood that will reduce this negative coping strategy. |
| Resource Efficiency and Waste Management | \*No major concerns, as activities are small scale and do not produce significant waste |
| Pollution Prevention and Management | \*WFP interventions will focus on Climate Resilient Agriculture and will not promote use of chemicals, hence there is no concern for pollution from agriculture.  \*Some communities mentioned respiratory diseases caused by the production of charcoals. The project will introduce alternative sources of livelihood and fuel efficient cooking stoves and alternative fuels. This will reduce the need to produce charcoal. |
| Climate Change | \*CO2 emissions from charcoal production and clearance of trees, but should reduce as result of WFP activities |
| Human rights | \*There is an overall risk of child labour, in particular vulnerable children, but should not increase as result of WFP activities. WFP has a strict policy against the employment of children below 14 years. |
| Gender Equality | \*Fields (‘machambas’) and gardens (‘hortas’) are looked after by women and men, but they carry out different tasks. Expanded horticulture could increase the burden on women. The project will engage women and men in the planning and implementation of assets – see Gender Action Plan in Annex 4.  \*Women are in charge of fetching water. An increased use of water in agriculture could increase burden on women. The project will engage women and men in the planning and implementation of assets – see Gender Action Plan in Annex 4.  \*Different animals are looked after by women or by men; depending on which type of animal is promoted through the project, the burden on women may increase or decrease, or income for women may increase or decrease. The project will engage women and men in the planning and implementation of assets – see Gender Action Plan in Annex 4.  \*Women collect firewood for domestic use, men produce charcoal for commerce. Depending on the type of cooking stoves introduced by the project, the burden on women could increase or decrease. The project will engage women and men in the planning and implementation of the project – see Gender Action Plan in Annex 4.  \*Increased income from commerce risks benefitting men more than women. The project will engage women and men in the planning and implementation – see Gender Action Plan in Annex 4. |
| Community Health, Safety and Security (including conflicts) | \*Gardens are concentrated in the hands of few families, hence expanded horticulture could reinforce power inequalities. The project will target the most vulnerable households in each community. And whenever possible, the project will create associations, to facilitate equal access to new assets such as vegetable gardens.  \*In theory water points can only be used by paying users, hence they could reinforce power inequalities or risk of abandonment. The project will provide hands-on support to the associations that manage water infrastructure to ensure their sustainability in time and fair access to the water resources.  \*Unequal access to new crops or seeds (short-cycled sorghum, sweet potato) could reinforce inequality. Whenever possible, the project will create associations to facilitate equal access to new technologies or seeds.  \*Potential conflicts between agriculture (‘machimba’) and animal husbandry, due to poor delimitation of areas for agriculture and areas for herding. Where possible, the project will engage communities to demarcate the different land use areas.  Some communities mentioned respiratory diseases caused by the production of charcoals. The project will introduce alternative sources of livelihood and efficient cooking stoves. This will reduce the need to produce charcoal. |
| Accountability to Affected Populations | \*No major concerns on this, as WFP will implement a Complaints and Feedback Mechanism. |

# 5. Stakeholder engagement plan

The engagement of stakeholders will be a continuous process and will be conducted in all project areas.

The community consultations are held in the first year.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder Engagement Plan for GCF Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Activity** | **Who** | **Year 1** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Frequency/Comments** |
| **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** |  |
| Community Based Participatory Planning | WFP, Contractors/Partners, DPASA, DPTADR, community representatives of different socio-economic groups with balanced gender representation |  |  |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  | CBBPs are done at the beginning of the project cycle. The output is a Community Action Plan (CAP), which outlines clear priorities for resilience activities to be implemented. The CAP has a medium/long term vision, covering 5 years. CBBPs are not expected to be re-done during the project cycle, but CAPs can be updated based on the changing context/priorities. CBPPs are done in periods that do not compete with key livelihood activities to ensure all can participate without overburdening anyone. The time period selected is May to July, the period in between agricultural seasons. |

The other steps in the stakeholders’ engagement plan are repeated on a yearly basis and are presented below as a calendar.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder Engagement Plan for GCF Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Activity** | **Who** | **Year 1 to 5, repeated yearly** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Frequency/Comments** |
| **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** |  |
| Community Based Participatory Planning | WFP, Contractors/Partners, DPASA, DPTADR, community representatives of different socio-economic groups with balanced gender representation |  |  |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  | CBBPs are done at the beginning of the project cycle. The output is a Community Action Plan (CAP), which outlines clear priorities for resilience activities to be implemented. The CAP has a medium/long term vision, covering 5 years. CBBPs are not expected to be re-done during the project cycle, but CAPs can be updated based on the changing context/priorities. CBPPs are done in periods that do not compete with key livelihood activities to ensure all can participate without overburdening anyone. The time period selected is May to July, the period in between agricultural seasons. |
| Receiving feedback from participants | WFP Project Manager and Field Office Staff | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | All WFP projects have a complaints and feedback mechanism through which participants can voice their concerns, comments, and suggestions to the project, which are used by the project team to better design and roll out its activities. By having a system that is anonymous and accessible to all, it guarantees that regardless of the individual’s gender, age, or other identifiers, they can have a say in the project to enhance their benefit from the intervention. Participants can call a dedicated hotline or submit written feedback through suggestion boxes placed in key project locations by the field staff. A dedicated staff in the Tete Office reviews and logs the complaints, ensuring they are addressed accordingly. These activities take place throughout the project cycle. |
| Project monitoring (feedback from participants) | WFP Field Office Staff with Country Office support | x | x | x | **x** | x | x | x | x | x | x | **x** | x | WFP and partners conduct output monitoring on a monthly basis using established standard operating procedures and questionnaires. WFP is responsible for outcome monitoring, done through household surveys, and undertakes this work twice a year (shown in bold). In the case of an insurance payout, an additional household survey is conducted by WFP to ascertain the benefit and use of the insurance payout, as well as satisfaction with the insurance product. |
| Provision of tailored climate services information to stakeholders | WFP and partners | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | At the start of activities, there will be a climate services needs assessment to understand the information needs of different users in the targeted area, including women, men, and specific vulnerable groups. This will help ensure that the right information, in the adequate format (including communication channel) and timing is made accessible for users to base their decision-making. The survey is done once. Climate services are provided in advance of the agricultural season (the forecast) and in-season updates are provided every 10 days. The delivery channels are set up to enable two-way communication, so that feedback can be received on an ongoing basis on the type of information needed. |
| Insurance Post Distribution Monitoring (data collection and feedback from participants) | WFP Field Office Staff |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | As noted above, as part of the regular project monitoring, in case of an insurance payout, there is an additional household survey to ascertain the satisfaction with the insurance product, the use and benefit of the payout, and other feedback they may have. This is used to inform the refinement of the insurance product. Payout usually happens around the time of the expected harvest, which is from March to May. |
| Insurance index design and provision | WFP, Cooperating Partners, Insurance Company Staff |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | WFP with the University of Columbia take a participatory approach to index design using both scientific data and farmer feedback to develop the most fitting product for the context. This is achieved through a number of consultations that engage different groups within the target community with gender considerations ensuring that this is fitting to the needs and capacities of all in the project area. This is typically done before the start of the agricultural season from June to August. |
| Insurance and Climate Services Post Season Assessment | WFP, Cooperating Partners, Insurance Company Staff |  |  | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | For climate services a planning and review workshop is held at the end of the season to gather feedback from partners and stakeholders on the delivery of climate services. Based on this, the activities are refined for subsequent years. For insurance, using data on the weather and crop performance during the season, stakeholders engaged in the process also meet to review the component. It is based on this feedback that the activities may be modified. Notably, this may take place at the time that the insurance payout is confirmed to ensure that the payout matches the ground reality. Both take place around the expected time of harvest. |
| VSL feedback processes | WFP, Cooperating Partners | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | When VSL groups are set up, they are supported to establish group dynamics and rules that will help cement the membership and their willingness to pool their resources. Groups are thus supported to set up rules and procedures that are fitting with the needs of the different group members, considerate of gender differences. Based on the findings of the discussions, the project is able to design tailored trainings that help overcome any key limitations in capacities, for example illiteracy among women. Regular follow up is offered to support the groups. |
| Bi-annual meetings in Maputo of the PCC | PCC senior members at national level with PIC members | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | Meet to review yearly progress and provide technical oversight to the project implementation committee. |
| PIC Monthly Meetings in Districts | PIC members, Contractors/Partners, etc. | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | Meet to discuss project operationalization goals and progress, based on the yearly plan. |

# 6. Grievance and redress mechanisms

WFP has a country-level complaints and feedback mechanism in every country where it operations and an institutional-level grievance redress mechanism.

The first interface for complaints or grievances from beneficiaries or affected populations is the country-level complaints and feedback mechanism. The country-level complaints and feedback mechanism in Mozambique has three channels: direct interface committee, suggestion boxes and tollfree helplines. Beneficiaries are free to make a choice of which feedback mechanism to use.

* The **direct interface** committee consists of community members (50% women at least) who are tasked with receiving and recording complaints and feedback from other members of the community, as well as channelling this to the responsible project officer. At all times feedback is given promptly, and for those requiring investigations, the Incident Management Protocol is followed, and this requires that investigations be done between 2-5 working days and findings shared with relevant stakeholders.
* **Suggestion boxes** are a free and easy way to collect real experiences and honest suggestions from anyone. The suggestion box is mostly used where anonymity is required by the user. The suggestion box is located at a strategic, secluded and convenient place so that people are not afraid to use it. It is lockable and the keys are kept with the responsible WFP officer. The box is opened in the presence of the project team. All feedback is documented and categorised for reporting and/ or follow-up if necessary.
* The **tollfree hotline** allow participants to call or text their suggestions and complaints related to the project. The hotline number is throughout the project cycle and especially in key activities like registration. Project staff also ensure that they visibly display banners with details about the hotline through use of posters. The number is also available on registration cards. The management of the toll-free is done by a third party. All calls that come in are documented and categorised and transmitted to WFP. Immediate response can be given depending on the type of feedback/complaint.

The three channels of the complaints and feedback mechanism are explained to the communities during the community consultations that are held in the first year of project implementation. The tollfree number is also printed on all communication material about the project distributed to stakeholders.

For all the 3 mechanisms, data is captured into a common log and some of the information collected includes name of the person providing feedback, village, ward, district, cooperating partner, programme, nature of feedback. Issues are followed-up, investigated and action taken to improve on programme delivery. Data is analysed and reports are shared monthly. Feedback is also communicated through stakeholder meetings and beneficiary meetings during registrations and distributions. For sensitive issues, feedback is given to the concerned persons bilaterally.

Issues of a severe nature that needs urgent escalation are referred immediately to CO management within 24 hours. All non-WFP related cases are referred to relevant stakeholders. Depending on the nature, the incident management protocol can also be initiated, which may lead to elevation of the case to the institutional-level grievance and redress mechanism managed by the Office of Investigations at the WFP headquarters.

The institutional-level grievance and redress mechanism can also be contacted directly at the confidential email [hotline@wfp.org](mailto:hotline@wfp.org) , the confidential phone +39 06 6513 3663, or the confidential fax +39 06 6513 2063.

1. Please refer to Annex 2, section 6 for more details about consultations held before May 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)