

Annex G.3.1

CVDB Environmental and Social Screening Report

Environmental and Social Screening Report

Key Project Information			
Project Name	Fostering Adaptive Livelihoods and Agricultural Horizons (FALAH)		
Estimated Project Duration	Start: 2026	Completion: 2032	Months:
Primary Donor (s) & amount	Green Climate Fund - \$25 million Co-Finance - \$25 million	Total Project Amount: \$50 million	
Key Partners (in delivery)	Cities and Villages Development Bank (CVDB) – AE World Food Programme (WFP) – EE Agricultural Credit Corporation (ACC) – EE Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) - EE		
Beneficiary/ies countries	Jordan (Mafraq, Ajloun, Irbid, and Jerash Governorates)		
Has a screening or ESIA been done before?	No		
Screening Questionnaire completed by:	Reem Halloush, E&S and Gender Expert, 23 October 2024		
Screening Questionnaire reviewed by:	Hala Al Huniti, Head of Projects, CVDB, 23 October 2024 Emily Sena, Consultant, WFP, 27 October 2024		

Part I - Potential impacts related to E&S Framework

Important considerations:

- Project activities are screened for their inherent environmental and social risks before applying mitigation and management measures. It is important to form a clear picture of potential inherent risks in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented or fail
- Screening for potential adverse environmental and social impacts must consider all activities with potential direct and indirect impacts across the Project's Area of Influence (including primary facilities, associated facilities, and areas and communities affected by cumulative impacts or induced impacts)

		To be completed by Project Proponent	CVDB E&S Expert Reviewer
		<i>Yes, No, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Comments, additional observations</i>
		<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	

Performance Standard 1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts

1	Can the project demonstrate that sufficient management sponsorship and human and financial resources will be available to the project on an ongoing basis to achieve effective and continuous environmental and social performance?	Yes	Yes, the project's organizational structure and CVDB's internal management structure is sufficient to accommodate and provide appropriate oversight regarding the scope of the project.	
---	---	-----	---	--

Performance Standard 2: Labor and Working Conditions

1	Would the project potentially require migrant workers to construct or implement it?	No		
2	Will the project be required to provide accommodation services for workers?	No		
3	Does the host country allow union activity and permit workers to bargain collectively?	Yes	GOJ allows unions and collective bargaining in the agricultural and production sectors, however this project is not anticipated to engage with such unions and services.	
4	Is there potential for the project to apply adverse discriminatory practices?	Yes	In the agricultural sector in Jordan, there are a large proportion of refugees and women. As such, these vulnerable groups have a number of inherent risks. The project is designed to respect and promote human rights and avoid discrimination. Extensive stakeholder	

			consultations held with key populations, including vulnerable groups such as women, women's organizations, youth, and refugees. A GAP assessment will be developed to mitigate and prevent any gender-specific risks. In regard to refugees, the agricultural sector in Jordan is one of the few sectors where Jordanian farmers and pastoralists welcome refugees – particularly Syrian refugees – as they are valued and often renowned for their experience and prowess in this sector. Still, The project will conduct a comprehensive legal and economic assessment to identify and mitigate any potential labor-related risks.	
5	Will the project involve the employment of children?	No		
6	Is there a risk of child exploitation or abuse linked to the project?	No		
7	Will the project present unsafe or unhealthy working conditions?	No		
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 3: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention				
1	Is the project likely to release pollutants?	No	The project does not promote the use of agrochemicals. Instead, it focuses on nature-based solutions, biological control, and integrated pest management. Some project activities, such as increased agricultural production, could potentially lead to increased GHG emissions if not managed properly. However, the project is focused on efficiency of the use of existing resources, rather than increasing	

			scope/consumption. For any work related to the relocation of water (including pumping to move surface water), the project will be utilizing renewable energy (primarily solar).	
2	Will hazardous waste materials be generated by the project?	No	The project does not promote the use of agrochemicals. Instead, it focuses on nature-based solutions, biological control, and integrated pest management.	
3	Are chemical pesticides likely to be used by the project?	No	The project does not promote the use of agrochemicals. Instead, it focuses on nature-based solutions, biological control, and integrated pest management.	
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 4: Community Health, Safety and Security				
1	Will the project require the construction or rehabilitation or any structural components which could pose a risk to Affected Communities?	No		
2	Does the project involve the construction or rehabilitation of a dam?	No		
3	Is the project likely to increase community exposure to disease (water borne, water based, water related and vector borne diseases as well as communicable diseases)?	No		
4	Will the project retain security workers to protect its property?	No		
5	Is there a risk that security personnel could be responsible for unlawful and abusive acts against Affected Communities?	No		
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 5: Involuntary Resettlement				
1	Will / could the project involve the physical relocation of people?	No		

2	Will / could the project rely upon expropriation to resettle people?	No		
3	Is it likely that the project will need to acquire land from individuals and households, causing them to experience economic displacement?	No		
4	Will the project restrict access to natural resources and areas used by Affected Communities resulting in economic displacement?	No		
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 6: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources				
1	Is the project likely to affect biodiversity or ecosystem services?	No		
2	If the project is expected to impact natural habitat, are plans in place to ensure that no net loss of biodiversity is achieved?	Yes	<p>The project focuses on improving productivity of existing land resources, not developing additional or new land resources. It involves changes in agricultural practices and rangeland management, which will promote water- saving and climate-responsive techniques and technology. The project includes rehabilitation of rangeland with native species, however these activities are intended to rehabilitate reinforce, and restore the natural vegetative cover, not convert it. As such, no negative ecological or economic impacts are foreseen.</p> <p>The project aims to enhance existing agricultural and rangeland areas rather than convert natural vegetation. Any changes are designed to improve resilience and sustainability of current land use.</p>	
3	Is the project expected to affect critical habitat?	No		

4	Is the project located in a legally protected area or internationally recognised area?	No		
5	Is the project likely to introduce invasive alien species to the project area?	No		
6	Will the project impact on priority ecosystem services?	No		
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples				
1	Is the project likely to affect Indigenous Peoples?	No		
2	Is the project likely to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) be located on or commercially develop natural resources on lands traditionally owned by Indigenous Peoples, with adverse impacts anticipated? b) Require the relocation of Indigenous Peoples from lands and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or customary use? c) Significantly impact critical cultural heritage? d) Use cultural heritage for commercial purposes? 	No	<p>Bedouin people in Jordan have governed their rangelands through their own land tenure systems and grazing rights known as “Hima” for millennia. Today, with Bedouin communities living closely (and sometimes among) local communities, the practice is more similar to what the development sector considers a “community-led approach” to rangeland management and pastoralism.</p> <p>The Jordanian legal framework, particularly the Agriculture Law No. 13 of 2015, recognizes state ownership of rangelands while also acknowledging traditional use rights.</p> <p>The project will operate within this legal framework, respecting both state ownership and traditional usage patterns. It is particularly conscious of the Bedouin community in Northern Jordan and will work to expand their traditional knowledge and practices through a community-based approach. The rangeland development component has a specific activity to build</p>	

			<p>trust at the community level and ensure active engagement and investment, and to ensure that existing channels and systems are being utilized.</p> <p>While changes in rangeland management practices and agricultural techniques could temporarily affect traditional practices of pastoral communities, the concept note emphasizes community-led approaches and building on traditional structures, suggesting that any impacts would likely be temporary and remediable.</p>	
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	
Performance Standard 8: Cultural Heritage				
1	Is the project likely to affected cultural heritage?	No		
2	Is the project located in a legally protected cultural heritage area or is it likely to impact critical cultural heritage?	No		
	<i>Is the Performance Standard triggered?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Per the above, there are no anticipated adverse risks that would categorize the project as medium or high risk.</i>	

Part II – Assessment of Risk Level, Categorization of Project and Type of E&S Assessment Required

Drawing on the responses to Part I, and the risk framework described below, the Project Proponent should complete the following questions:

- What are the potential environmental and social risks?
- What s their likelihood and consequence?
- What is the significance of the risk?

The following risk approach should be applied when completing these tables:

Definition of Consequence¹

Critical – Significant adverse impacts on human populations and/or the environment. Adverse impacts high in magnitude and/or spatial extent (e.g. large geographic area; large number of people affected; transboundary impacts; cumulative impacts) and duration (e.g. long-term, permanent, and/or irreversible); areas impacted include areas of high value and sensitivity (e.g. priority ecosystems; critical habitats; critical cultural heritage sites; legally protected areas); adverse impacts to rights, land, resources and territories of Indigenous Peoples; involve significant displacement or resettlement; generates significant quantities of greenhouse gas emissions; impacts may give rise to social conflict.

Severe – Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of medium to large magnitude, spatial extent and duration more limited that critical (e.g. predictable, mostly temporary and reversible). The potential risk impacts of projects that may affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples at a minimum potentially severe.

Moderate – Impacts of low magnitude, limited in scale (site-specific) and duration (temporary) can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated with relatively uncomplicated accepted measures.

Minor – Very limited impacts in terms of magnitude (e.g. small affected area, very low number of people affected) and duration (short), may be easily avoided, managed or mitigated.

¹Note, this risk format draws heavily upon the approach designed by the UNDP in their Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (2014)

Determining significance of risk:

Likelihood	Consequence				
	Slight	Not Likely	Moderately Likely	Highly Likely	Expected
Critical	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Severe	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Moderate	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Minor	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Negligible	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green

Green = Low Risk
 Yellow = Medium Risk
 Red = High Risk

What are the potential environmental and social risks (as identified through the screening process in Part I)?		What is the likelihood and consequence of the risk before mitigation measures are applied?	What is the significance of the risk? (low, medium or high)?
1	PS 6: There may be some changes to land coverage and natural habitats, However, the project focuses on <u>improving</u> productivity of existing land resources, not developing additional or new land resources.	Minor	Not likely
2	PS 2: In the agricultural sector in Jordan, there are a large proportion of refugees and women. As such, these vulnerable groups have a number of inherent risks. However, comprehensive GAP, legal assessment, and mitigation strategy has been developed to prevent discrimination, exploitation, and further marginalization of women and refugees.	Moderate	Not likely

What is the overall project categorization based on the potential risk and impact profile?

Category	Comments
Category A - Projects with the potential to cause significant adverse social and / or environmental impacts that are diverse, irreversible or unprecedented.	
Category B – Projects with the potential to cause limited adverse social and/or environmental impacts that are few in number, generally site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed through mitigation measures	
Category C – Projects that include activities with minimal or no risks of adverse environmental and social consequences	Per the screening above, we have determined the scope of this project to be Category C.

