



Annex VI (a): Social and Environmental Screening Template

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) and [Toolkit](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector (ACWA) in the Marshall Islands
2. Project Number	5701
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	The Republic of the Marshall Islands

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

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?
<i>Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach</i>
<p>The project will ensure social equity and equality. The project will increase community resilience by providing strengthened community infrastructure, therefore enhancing the lives of vulnerable groups including those with disabilities, minority groups, youth and the elderly. Improved water supply will provide safe drinking water year round, reduce migration during droughts, improve productivity and education due to reduction in time lost while collecting water, reduce social tensions caused by severe water shortages, and help reduce the incidence of water-stress related diseases (which have been noted to increase during droughts).</p> <p>The project will help improve the governance and communication of water and disaster information / actions. Community management of water resources will be mainstreamed and this in turn will assist the government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) better manage resources across all atolls. Through the development of more transparent governance systems, communities will be able to better control their own destinies and have increased comfort in the actions of the government.</p>
<i>Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment</i>

RMI has a population that is approximately 50% women¹. The population is also very young, the second youngest in the Pacific region, with just over 50% of the population younger than 20 years of age (RMI DHS 2007).

Marshallese women are often responsible for water collection and other activities strongly dependent on availability of water for household chores such as cooking and laundry. An increase in the availability of fresh water means women and girls will spend less time collecting water for their families. Increased water security would also enable women to access safe and clean water for menstrual hygiene. Additionally, the responsibility for caring for new-born babies and those who fall ill due to the increase in water-borne diseases associated with the inevitable decrease in water quality also falls to women and girls. This increase in workload results in women having less time to spend on earning an income and education, or contributing to community-level decision-making processes, including climate change and disaster risk reduction.

Women share a disproportionate burden from water shortages, given their critical roles they play in household responsible for securing and utilizing safe and sufficient water for the family. By improved access to reliable water supplies, women and children will have increased resilience of health and well-being, food and water security.

Access to water is being designed in a way that is equitable and safe for all, but particularly women. By increasing the reliability of water supply, women will have less interruption to their handicraft production – a primary source of income for many women in RMI.

The project governance includes supporting RMI government in empowering national, local government jurisdictions and community stakeholders and institutions. At the national level, the project will support the newly established Water Office within the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), who has the mandate to govern both water quality and quantity throughout RMI under the RMI Water and Sanitation Policy and Proposed Action Plan (2014) and the updated Environmental Protection Act, strengthen its water governance capacities. At the provincial and community levels, the project will support the establishment of Community Water Committees who will develop, monitor, and lead the implementation of their Water Safety Plans. The committees will be made up of representatives from all genders and various age groups. In this way, women will have a greater influence on how water is managed within their communities and households.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

Improved rainwater harvesting and storage is central to the project. There is spatial variation in rainfall across the RMI, Majuro gets an average of 3300mm of rain annually², however current water management practices means that communities sometimes run out of water, which has necessitated the mobilisation of desalination units or delivery of water – actions that are not sustainable over the long-term. Proposed infrastructure will require little maintenance and consume almost no resources once constructed.

An important element of environmental sustainability is having an enabling environment and to achieve this the project includes an institutional capacity building subcomponent, which aims at strengthening capacity at all levels: National, local government jurisdictions (atoll and island municipalities) and community. The expected outcome will be human and infrastructural capacity built and enhanced sustainability across all components of the project, as a result of strengthened institutions, processes, and systems, and increased capacity of human, institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and implementation.

¹ RMI Census 2011 reports that total number of women was 25,918 (48.8%) out of total population of 53,158.

² PACC 2014

The project proposes to partner with existing NGO / CBOs within the RMI to assist in implementation. By working with these groups (eg IOM, Red Cross and WUTMI) it both delivers the project and supports the groups to enable them to continue / expand the environmental and social sustainability programs that they run.

The potential adverse impacts have been deemed to generally be localized to the project implementation sites and to be manageable with the implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures, therefore the project has been assessed as only having moderate environmental risk (Category B), that is, limited in scale, identifiable with a reasonable degree of certainty, and are able to be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures. The project ESMP identifies potential risks and offers avoidance and/or mitigation measures to reduce impacts from the project.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i>	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
Risk Description	Impact and Probability (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
Risk 1: Duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project	I = 3 P = 3	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Currently overlapping responsibilities and lead agency not always clear for water quality, quantity and disaster risk management) Numerous Ministries and Departments that have a role to play) While policy and institutional frameworks at the national level are developed, this is not well communicated and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Additional resources will be provided as part of the project) Improving water governance, including Institutional strengthening and capacity building is a key part of the project) Recent amendments to legislation provide the legal framework for water management in RMI. It provides the mandate for coordination of water management. The project will assist the RMI government to implement this legislation through capacity building and the formation of community-based water management committees

			<p>implemented at the local government jurisdictions and community levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">) Key departments eg CSO, EPA, MWSC, NDMO are resource constrained 	
<p>Risk 3: Project has the potential to cause adverse impacts to habitats – in particular reef habitats via consequential actions</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Physical structures will be built, but generally have minor footprint and in urban areas) Rehabilitation of concrete tanks will require construction materials and the source of materials needs to be carefully considered – sand and aggregate on the RMI typically from mining fringing reefs, which both damages reefs and leads to potential increased erosion.) Desal units create brine which requires discharge, increased salinity can have adverse impacts on areas with limited circulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Interventions proposed for areas that are already disturbed) Alternate tank designs will be considered.) Opportunities to obtain aggregate through recycling of old structures (particularly WWII structures) will be investigated) Material, such as concrete blocks will be imported, as domestically produced blocks may utilise materials sourced from the reefs around RMI.) Siting of desalination units will consider discharge impacts – preference will be given to discharge to ocean side of islands where wave and current energy is high. Atolls with enclosed or partially enclosed lagoons should not discharge brine to the lagoon
<p>Risk 4: The Project be susceptible to extreme climatic conditions</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Community storages could be impacted by storm surges /tsunamis) SLR will increase the chance of islands being overtopped by storm surge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Positioning and design of tanks to consider potential barrage by storm surge.) Tanks to be protected from ingress of saltwater and other pollutants) Where possible, tanks may be positioned and orientated such that they provide a degree of protection to designated shelters
<p>Risk 5: Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Limited government owned land in RMI. Community facilities provided with agreement of land owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) New infrastructure will generally be provided adjacent to existing community facilities where there is both space and existing agreements) Land use agreements to be obtained or renewed as appropriate to ensure that agreements are sufficient for expected life of infrastructure) Community-based management framework to be created so that access is equitable and transparent

<p>Risk 6: Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water</p>	<p>I = 2 P =2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) The source of construction materials needs to be carefully considered – sand and aggregate in the RMI often comes from mining fringing reefs, which both damages reefs and leads to potential increased erosion.) Construction often requires considerable volumes of water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Alternate tank designs/materials will be considered.) Opportunities to obtain aggregate through recycling of old structures (particularly WWII structures) will be investigated) Materials may require importing) Water for construction planned so that does not cause any shortages for community
<p>Risk 7: General construction impacts eg noise, dust, erosion, spread of weeds, potential to discover contamination</p>	<p>I = 2 P =3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) All construction has some impact. Construction activities proposed are unlikely to have significant impacts) Noise will occur through the use of construction equipment. This can impact on local communities using the adjacent area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) An assessment should consider any sensitive receptors) Construction activities to occur during daylight hours only) Best practice construction practices to be adopted eg sediment and erosion control, fuel management, waste minimisation, etc
<p>Risk 8: Water storages become breeding places for disease vectors such as mosquitos</p>	<p>I = 3 P =1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) The creation of water bodies (storages) will provide potential breeding grounds for mosquitoes) Vector borne diseases such as malaria, dengue, and zika virus are already known in RMI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) All efforts will be undertaken to manage any pest or vector species) Tanks will be designed to be enclosed (also prevents other contaminants entering) and have mosquito mesh over potential access points) RMI already has an active community program regarding mosquito and other insect disease vectors run by the Health department and supported by NGOs such as IOM. The project can build on this where appropriate.
<p>Risk 9: Waste generation - project has potential to generate waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)</p>	<p>I = 2 P =2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Some waste will be generated during construction phase) If plastic tanks used, then at end of useful life will need to be disposed of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Plastic tanks and liners have a product life of 10-30 years, depending upon material and degree of exposure to UV) Measures to protect plastic tanks/bladders from UV will be considered) RMI currently developing a comprehensive waste management strategy, disposal of plastics to be included in this) Consideration of recycling options including re-purposing to be incorporated into project

Risk 10: General construction/operational health and safety risks	I = 2 P = 2	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Provide workers with personal protective equipment) Ensure adequate training) Abide by relevant laws) Have emergency plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Interventions are not significant in scale or likely to require specialised equipment that is unusual to construction) RMI has health and disaster management systems through RMI Health and National Disaster Management Organisation– project to utilise and enhance these) Consideration of any sensitive receptors including communities to be included in the Environmental and Social Management Framework
Risk 11: Cultural Heritage – potential indirect impacts due to consequential development (eg concrete recycling market)	I = 2 P = 1	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) the project is unlikely to directly impact any areas of cultural heritage value, however if concrete recycling becomes a source of aggregate, then the heritage value of WWII structures will need to be considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">) Source of aggregate will be investigated) Option to recycle abandoned structures, buildings and other WWII infrastructure can provide a valid and valuable source of material, but only if not of significant heritage value.) Any structure to be recycled would first require heritage assessment and clearance
QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?				
Select one (see SESP for guidance)				
Low Risk			<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments
Moderate Risk			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Most of the risks are typical risks associated with construction. If the appropriate mitigation measures are put in place during the project, the project will have a low risk over the short to medium term impacts.
High Risk			<input type="checkbox"/>	
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?				
Check all that apply				
Principle 1: Human Rights			<input type="checkbox"/>	The project has no impact on human rights.
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project will provide improved climate resilient water investments to households and communities, including female led households. With increased water security will increase food, WASH and income security.
1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management			<input type="checkbox"/>	

	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	X	The project is designed to provide the community with drinking water in the face of increasing droughts. Consideration of the risk of storm surge is also being incorporated into the design to enhance water security in extreme events.
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	X	The project has a positive benefit of increasing the communities' health and safety through improved potable water supply and therefore improving the longevity of peoples' lives and incomes. The project will also promote best practice in terms of construction, safety and waste management.
	4. Cultural Heritage	X	RMI has numerous relic military structures, some of which may be of historic value. The nature of the project is unlikely to adversely impact this structures. In some cases, rehabilitation of water structures may be possible.
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	X	Improved capture and storage of water will result in less reliance on desalination and bottled water, reducing fuel use and plastic waste. The project will improve protection of groundwater through enhancement of wells and installation of composting toilets.

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor		UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		
Principles 1: Human Rights		Answer (Yes/No)
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ³	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	Yes
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	Yes

³ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	No
1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	Yes
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ⁴ greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	No
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No

⁴ In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	Yes
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	Yes
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ⁵	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	Yes
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of	No

⁵ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

	achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	Yes