# ESMS Questionnaire and Screening Report – for non-field projects

## Project Data

*The fields below are completed by the project proponent*

| Project Title: | Global Learning, Finance and Partnerships project under TRI | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project proponent: | IUCN GFCCP – Joshua Schneck | | |
| Executing agency: | IUCN (Components 1 and 4 of the Project); FAO (Component 2); UN Environment (Component 3) | | |
| Funding agency: | GEF | | |
| Country: | Global | Contract value (add currency): | $1,676,306 USD (IUCN portion); $3,519,725 USD (total project) |
| Start date and duration: | January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2022 | Amount in CHF: | 1,648,714 CHF (IUCN portion); 3,461,790 (total project) |
| Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before? | ☐ yes  ☒ no | Provide details, if yes: | |

## Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

*The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the questionnaire is presented in Annex A*

| | Name and function of individual representing project proponent | Date |
|---|---|---|
| ESMS Questionnaire completed by: | Joshua Schneck, Program Manager, TRI | November 22, 2017 |
| ESMS Screening is  *(tick one of the three options)* | **1. ☒ required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000** <br><br> **2. ☐ required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire** <br><br> 3. ☐ not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 <u>and</u> the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire | |

## Step 2: ESMS Screening

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

| | Name | IUCN unit and function | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| IUCN ESMS Reviewer: | Linda Klare | IUCN ESMS Coordinator | 4/12/2017 |
| | Title | | Date |
| Documents submitted at Screening stage: | Global Child Project_Project Doc_Nov 21 | | 21/11/2017 |

| **ESMS Screening Report[1]** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk category:** | ☒ low risk | ☐ moderate risk | ☐ high risk |
| **Rationale:** Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization <br><br> *See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:* <br><br> **section A** *for findings about the* | The project under review is part of The Restoration Initiative (TRI) program that intends to make making a significant global contribution to restoring ecosystem functioning and improving livelihoods through the restoration of priority degraded and deforested landscapes. The program encompasses ten national child-projects and one Global Child project which will be responsible for overall Program coordination to ensure coherence and promote integration of the | | |

---

[1] For projects below CHF 500,000 where no risks have been identified the screening report is completed by the project proponent - only the section on the rationale but the sections below that as low risk projects don't require assessments. The columns in the ESMS Questionnaire reserved for the IUCN ESMS reviewer will remain blank.

| | |
|---|---|
| *stakeholder engagement process,* **Section B** *on the 4 Standards,* **Section C** *on other E&S impacts and* **Section D** *on risk issues related to Climate change* | different national projects, knowledge sharing and learning, mobilization of financing and development of partnerships. The national child projects are implemented by three different GEF agencies which also share responsibility for the Global Child.<br><br>While the implementation of the national child projects might involve environmental or social risks and/or trigger one or more Standards, the activities conceptualized under the Global Child project are not expected to trigger any of these issues, mainly because the Global Child project does not include any field intervention.<br><br>However, it is recognized that the implementation of certain activities under the four components of the Global Child offers opportunities for promoting ESMS principles and objectives of ESMS Standards - in particular the principles on Rights-based Approach, Gender Equality and Protection of Vulnerable Groups and the Standard on Indigenous Peoples. This could include capturing lessons learned and good practices on relevant safeguard aspects from the different national child projects and sharing them among the executing agencies as well as disseminating key findings to a wider audience. The knowledge products developed by the project present another opportunity for sharing good practices for addressing and mitigating environmental and social risks. Component 4, which aims at enhancing in-country enabling environments for FLR, might provide opportunities for stressing the importance of procedures for assessing and addressing social risks of FLR interventions and for promoting good practices on inclusive decision making and protecting the rights and needs of indigenous communities and vulnerable groups. |
| **Required assessments** | ☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)<br>☐ Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)<br>☐ Social Impact Assessment (SIA)<br>☐ Other: |
| **Required actions for gender mainstreaming** | When coordinating and supporting the Program- and Project-level M&E system the project should promote good practice for collecting gender disaggregated data and monitoring achievements in gender mainstreaming at the level of the national child projects. This component also offers opportunities for sharing good practice among partner agencies on designing and implementing gender-sensitive FLR interventions. Knowledge products developed under component 2 provide further opportunities for disseminating lessons learned of gender mainstreaming in FLR interventions. Within component 4 which involves enhancing in-country enabling environments for FLR, the project should seek opportunities for promoting women's rights and access to land and natural resources and for improving women representation in forest governance bodies. |

| ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts | Trigger | Required tools or plans |
|---|---|---|
| Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions<br>*(see section B1 for details)* | ☐ yes<br>☒ no<br>☐ TBD | ☐ Resettlement Action Plan<br>☐ Resettlement Policy Framework<br>☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction<br>☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework |
| Indigenous Peoples<br>*(see section B2 for details)* | ☐ yes<br>☒ no<br>☐ TBD | ☐ Indigenous People Plan |
| Cultural Heritage<br>*(see section B3 for details)* | ☐ yes<br>☒ no<br>☐ TBD | ☐ Chance Find Procedures |
| Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources<br>*(see section B4 for details)* | ☐ yes<br>☒ no<br>☐ TBD | ☐ Pest Management Plan |

# Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

## Project summary

*To be completed by project proponent - Please summarise the project briefly using no more than one page. The summary can be in form of bullet points. Include goal/objectives, expected results/outcomes, outputs (project deliverables) and main activities.*

**Project Objective:** Strengthen overall delivery of TRI by establishing and supporting structures and processes for coordination, monitoring, and adaptive management of the Program, while providing key supports to TRI country projects in the areas of policy identification and uptake, knowledge generation and dissemination, and mobilization of new/additional finance for FLR, to generate enhanced programmatic benefits and support the achievement of country FLR objectives.

The Global Learning, Finance and Partnerships project under TRI (the Global Child) will be responsible for overall Program coordination to ensure coherence and promote integration of the different national child projects. It will support, strengthen and add value to the work of the TRI national projects along each of the four Program components defined in the PFD. It will play an essential role in ensuring that the TRI Program delivers enhanced programmatic benefits, providing many of the supports that facilitate enhanced learning, partnership, technical support and tools through a single project-based delivery system that captures efficiencies of scale.

Services to be provided by the Global Child Project include:

- *Program-level monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management*, including support for a Program Advisory Committee, Global Coordination Unit, midterm Program and Project review and terminal evaluation, as well as case studies assessing the value for money generated by investment in TRI.
- *Identification and capture of synergies among national child projects.* The Global Child project, particularly through its Global Coordinating Unit, will work to capture synergies among national child projects, and capitalize on emerging opportunities presented over the course of TRI. Work will include development and implementation of a TRI Partnership strategy for effective engagement and partnership with external programs, projects, institutions, and potential donors/investors, that helps foster achievement of TRI objectives.
- *Systematic capture, enhancement, and sharing of FLR knowledge.* This will include use of harmonized tools and processes for capture of information; development of case studies and policy briefs and other informational materials; enhancements to the existing body of FLR knowledge to make these resources more useful and widely accessible, and sharing of experiences via facilitated online Communities of Practice, events, workshops and trainings, as well as through Program and Agency partner web platforms.
- *Support for the mobilization of FLR finance.* National child project teams will be supported in the development of bankable proposals and other tools and incentive programs to mobilize FLR finance, including through the development and delivery of an online course on FLR finance and other trainings and support. In addition, the Global child will present a *Restoration Finance Workshop* in year 3 to connect interested donors with in-country FLR investment opportunities.
- *Support for identification and uptake of FLR-supportive policies.* The Global child project will work in tandem with national projects to support in-country efforts to enhance the enabling policy environment for FLR. Work will include development of relevant case studies and policy briefs, high-level workshops, and an awareness-raising campaign featuring restoration champions from within and outside TRI countries.
- *Development and provision of tools* to support planning, implementation and monitoring of FLR, including monitoring of biodiversity impacts from FLR.

| A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Section A is not applicable for non-field projects* | | | |

| B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards | | | |
|---|---|---|---|

| B1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Project proponent** | | **IUCN ESMS Reviewer** |
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might lead to future relocation or resettlement of people? **if yes, answer a-b below** | No | *Shaded cells do not need to be filled out* | |
|    a. Describe the project activities that might prompt relocation or resettlement of people | | | |
|    b. Have risks been considered and advice been given to minimise adverse impacts? If yes, explain. | | | |
| 2. Is there a risk that advice or knowledge provided by the project might lead to future restrictions on access to land or natural resources or changes in the use and management of natural resources? **if yes, answer a-b below** | No | | |
|    a. Describe how project activities might prompt future access restrictions | | | |
|    b. Have these risks been considered and advice been given to minimise adverse impacts? If yes, explain how. | | | |
| 3. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might negatively influence current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources or land through measures other than access restrictions? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. In the event that that information generated by the project touches upon land tenure or community-based property rights, it will be sure to note that the rights of communities and users need to be taken into consideration whenever adopting new policies, and that any recommendations provided are in no way meant to be usurp the rights these stakeholders, or negatively influence current land tenure arrangements. | |

| Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer[2] on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why* | No | The project does not include any activities that would require physical or economic displacement. Hence the Standard is not triggered. |
| *Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?* | | n/a |
| *Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?* | | n/a |

[2] If the project budget is < CHF 500,000 this field (and the equivalent fields below) needs to be completed by the proponent (instead of the IUCN ESMS Reviewer).

| B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples[3] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Project proponent** | | <span style="color:red">**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**</span> |
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | <span style="color:red">*Comments, additional considerations*</span> |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might indirectly affect the rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples? Consider material and non-material impacts on livelihoods (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Restoration of deforested and degraded lands are intended to support and enhance local livelihoods. | |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | No | Unlikely – There is always a risk that commercial development may occur on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples, but this would not be linked to the Project's activities. | |
| 3. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project prompt the use of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples? | No | Possibly – best practice FLR, as promoted by the Project, certainly includes bringing indigenous peoples into the process of planning, implementing, and monitoring forest landscape restoration. | |
| 4. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to promote culturally appropriate and gender inclusive benefits to indigenous peoples. | | The project will promote best practice forest landscape restoration. This includes use of ROAM and other tools to assess and identify restoration opportunities so as to fully involve community members, including women and indigenous peoples in decision making and sharing of benefits. | |

<span style="color:red">**Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples**</span>

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why* | No | <span style="color:red">The national child projects might include involvement of indigenous peoples and might impact these communities positively or negatively, but any risks related to indigenous peoples are managed at the level of each national child project. The Global Child Project does not include any field intervention as it acts as an umbrella for coordinating and enhancing the implementation of national projects. Nevertheless, it is highly recommended that the three executing agencies seek opportunities for promoting the rights of indigenous peoples; this should include capturing lessons learned and good practices from the different national child projects and sharing them through dissemination events and through the knowledge products.</span> |
| *Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?* | | n/a |
| *Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?* | | n/a |
| B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage[4] | | |

---

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

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

| | | Project proponent | IUCN ESMS Reviewer |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger physical interventions that affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. There is little to no chance that restoration of deforested and degraded lands – principally forest and agricultural lands - would affect known or unknown cultural resources negatively. | |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt access restrictions to cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance (relevant for local users)? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. There is no chance that restoration of deforested and degraded lands – principally forest and agricultural lands - would prompt access restrictions to cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance. | |
| 3. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project prompt the development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance? | Yes | Possible that the Project's recommendations on restoring deforested and degraded lands would prompt the development of enhanced economic benefits from natural features with cultural significance – a sacred forest for example that had become degraded. But recommended actions would be those identified and chosen by community members for the benefit of community members. | |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4"><strong>Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage</strong></td></tr>
</table>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why*** | No | *While national child projects might include risks related to cultural heritage, these are managed at the level of the respective child project. The Global Child Project does not include any field intervention and as such no risks are expected in relation to tangible or non-tangible cultural resources. However, when implementing the project the three executing agencies should seize opportunities for flagging issues and risks of forest restoration interventions related to cultural heritage but also good practices as mentioned above, e.g. through case studies, policy briefs etc.* | |
| ***Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?*** | | n/a | |
| ***Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?*** | | n/a | |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4"><strong>B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources</strong></td></tr>
</table>

| | | Project proponent | IUCN ESMS Reviewer |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might inadvertently affect biodiversity in areas of high biodiversity value? Consider risks related to the development of infrastructure for PA management or to ecotourism. | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Conservation and enhancement of biodiversity is one objective of restoration that will be considered in identifying and selective restoration interventions. | |
| 2. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project trigger risks for biodiversity related to the introduction or translocation of species (e.g. development invasive characteristics) or other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of faciliatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Recommendations include assessing and mitigating the risk that restoration would trigger risks for biodiversity related to the introduction or translocation of species. | |
| 3. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger activities that negatively affect the hydrological cycle, water flows, river connectivity or water quality? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Restoration, where applicable, would more than likely positively affect hydrological cycle, water flows, river connectivity and/or water quality. | |
| 4. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt an unsustainable use of living natural resources? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Best practice restoration promotes the sustainable use of natural resources. | |
| 5. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt uncontrolled application of pest management techniques? | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. Recommendations, where applicable, would include using appropriate and biologically responsible pest management techniques. | |

## Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ***Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why*** | No | While national child projects might include risks to different components of biodiversity (e.g. through unintended site- or knock-on effects, due to the complexity of ecological systems or due to trade-offs to meet societal demand of ecosystem services), these are expected to be managed at the level of the respective child project. The Global Child Project does not include any field intervention; hence no negative direct impacts on biodiversity components are expected. This being said, the three executing agencies should seek opportunities for articulating issues and particular risks encountered by the national child projects and for sharing opportunities and good practices for mitigating such risks. |
| ***Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?*** | n/a | |
| ***Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?*** | n/a | |

## C. Other social or environmental impacts

### C1: Other social impacts

| | Project proponent | | IUCN ESMS Reviewer |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |
| 1. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project trigger risks related to human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? | No | No risks related to human rights will arise due to Project activities. | |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt or aggravate inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the livelihood conditions of women or girls in other ways? | No | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project – includes designing and implementing restoration in a gender sensitive way, that does not prompt or aggravate inequalities between women and men or adversely impact the livelihood conditions of women or girls. | |
| 3. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women? | | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project – includes designing and implementing restoration in a gender sensitive way, that seeks opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women. | |
| 4. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources? | | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project –seeks opportunities to provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources. | |
| 5. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt risks for vulnerable groups[5] in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation? | No | No risks related to vulnerable groups in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or the discrimination or marginalisation of these groups will arise due to Project activities. | |
| 6. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people. | No | The project will provide case studies, policy briefs, information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. There is little to no chance that advice/knowledge provided by the Project would prompt conflict among communities, groups or individuals. | |
| 7. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)? | No | There is no risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems. | |
| 14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to? | No | | |

---

[5] Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

| 15. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms? | No | | |
|---|---|---|---|

## C2: Other environmental impacts

| | **Project proponent** | | **IUCN ESMS Reviewer** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |
| 1. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to? | No | Project has no field component. | |
| 2. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations? | No | Project has no field component. | |

**Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts**

| ***Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?*** | No | While national child projects might include environmental or social risks, these are expected to be managed at the level of the respective child project. The Global Child Project does not include any field intervention and negative direct impacts are not expected. Wherever possible and opportune, risk issues encountered by the national child projects as well as opportunities for mitigating such issues should be brought up and shared among the executing agencies. |
|---|---|---|
| ***Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?*** | n/a | |
| ***Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?*** | n/a | |

## D. Climate change risks (Risks caused by a failure to adequately take the effects of climate change on people and ecosystem into consideration)

| | **Project proponent** | | **IUCN ESMS Reviewer** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Yes,no, n/a,TBD* | *Answer question and provide further detail* | *Comments, additional considerations* |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future climate variability and changes (e.g., through risks and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding or droughts)? | No | Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the vulnerability of local communities to current and future climate variability and changes. | |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might increase the vulnerability of the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes? | No | Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the ecosystems to current and future climate variability and changes. | |
| 3. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change? | | Yes - Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the vulnerability of local communities to current and future climate variability and | |

| | | changes and increasing the adaptive capacity of these communities. | |
|---|---|---|---|

| **Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Climate Change Risks** | | |
|---|---|---|
| ***Are negative impacts expected from the project?*** | No | No risks are expected from the Global Child project. |
| ***Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed*** | n/a | |
| ***Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?*** | n/a | |