

CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT:

Tackling Acid and Burns Violence: ASTI Asia Regional Programme



Sarah Selby

April 2013



**EVIDENCE
ON DEMAND**

CLIMATE & ENVIRONMENT
INFRASTRUCTURE | LIVELIHOODS



This report has been produced by Practical Action Consulting for Evidence on Demand with the assistance of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) contracted through the Climate, Environment, Infrastructure and Livelihoods Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services (CEIL PEAKS) programme, jointly managed by HTSPE Limited and IMC Worldwide Limited.

The views expressed in the report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent DFID's own views or policies, or those of Evidence on Demand. Comments and discussion on items related to content and opinion should be addressed to the author, via enquiries@evidenceondemand.org

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12774/eod_hd049.apr2013.selby



Contents

Report Summary	ii
SECTION 1	1
Climate & Environment Assessment	1
Negative Impacts:.....	1
Opportunities:	2
Final Climate and Environment Categorisation	2
SECTION 2	4
Management Case	4
What are the risks and how these will be managed?	4

List of Annexes

Annex 1 Environmental and Climate Change Sensitivity Analysis	5
Annex 2 Draft Climate & Environment Assurance Note.....	8



Report Summary

Evidence on Demand was requested by DFID to carry out a climate and environmental assessment as part of the Business Case for Tackling Acid and Burns Violence in Asia. DFID will provide an Accountable Grant to Acid Survivors Trust International (ASTI) to support survivors of acid and burns violence in Nepal and Pakistan by: i) strengthening services (e.g. medical and legal); ii) providing support (e.g. rehabilitation and reintegration); and iii) preventing further attacks (e.g. through awareness programmes, media attention and prevention campaigns). The consultant carried out a Climate and Environmental Assessment of this Business Case which involved defining the climate and environmental context; applying a Climate and Environmental Sensitivity Analysis (to identify climate and environmental impacts and opportunities); assigning a final risk categorisation; and preparing the climate and environment assurance note.

Note to readers: Climate and Environment Assessments are used to ensure that climate and environment risks and opportunities are considered as part of the process in developing new DFID Business Cases. The CEA presented here is in draft form, as submitted by Evidence on Demand to DFID for quality assurance and approval by a DFID Climate & Environment adviser.



SECTION 1

Climate & Environment Assessment

What is the likely impact (positive and negative) on climate change and environment for each feasible option?

A Climate and Environment Sensitivity Analysis was undertaken for each feasible option to identify the expected impacts. The full analysis is available in *Annex 1* and is summarised below taking into consideration the effect of climate change and the environment on the proposed intervention, and conversely the effect of the intervention on climate change and the environment.

Negative Impacts:

The programme is unlikely to contribute significantly to climate change and environmental degradation. Direct negative impacts are limited to:

- *Resource use from administration, management and monitoring of the programme.*
The first three options will result in environmental resource use (e.g. energy, water and paper) for office based activities.¹ The environmental footprint of each option will vary depending on organisational environmental policies and procedures. An initial search of ASTI's website suggests that environmental issues are not integral to ASTI's mandate,² unlike a number of larger international NGOs³ or private sector organisations.⁴ Therefore if this option is selected, a requirement to manage these environmental issues should be included in the programme grant letter.
- *Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from travel.*⁵
All options (with the exception of the counterfactual) will result in an increase in GHG emissions: from both the daily commute for key staff (in London, Nepal and Pakistan); and more significantly, a limited number of field trips. The latter will comprise international travel for data collection (to build the evidence base), the advocacy learning workshop in Kathmandu, and on-going monitoring activities.

The programme objectives and outputs are assessed to be at low risk from climate change and environmental degradation for the first three feasible options; and no direct impacts were identified. The assessment identified the following indirect impact:

¹ Carbon Management Unit (2009) *Green Office Resource Guide for Climate-smart buildings*
² A review of ASTI's website shows that its vision, mission and values reflect its focus on eradicating acid violence using its network of organisations to share knowledge, expertise and best practice with no reference to environmental issues.
³ For example ActionAid: see http://www.actionaid.org/sites/files/actionaid/environment_policy_nov_2012.pdf
⁴ OECD & EIRIS *An Overview of Corporate Environmental Management Practices*. Available from <http://www.oecd.org/industry/inv/corporateresponsibility/18269204.pdf> (downloaded 6 April, 2013)
⁵ Kollmus, A. and Lane, J. (2008) *Carbon Offsetting and Air Travel*, Stockholm Environment Institute Discussion Paper

- *Climate and disaster hazards and stresses can decrease survivor access to medical, rehabilitation and reintegration services (e.g. by damaging infrastructure, limiting movement, increasing migration). However, the ASFP (option 1) have direct experience of working in the aftermath of the 2010 floods⁶ and this experience alongside training will help mitigate this risk.*

Although the assessment highlighted a possible link between climate induced disasters/ environmental degradation with increasing vulnerability and a reported increase in gender based violence,^{7 8} this impact is rated low in terms of likelihood and significance and therefore discounted from further consideration here.

Opportunities:

The programme is assessed as having no direct benefits for climate change/the environment. Only indirect benefits of low likelihood/significance were found:

- *Advocacy in support of legislation regulating the supply/sale of acid could indirectly contribute to the reduction of harmful chemicals on the environment. However, any knock-on benefits for the environment (e.g. reduced soil and water contamination)⁹ are likely to be limited in scale and scope. Further this opportunity is outside the direct sphere of influence of the programme and will be difficult to maximise without more direct intervention (which is unlikely to be feasible for this programme).*
- *Improved long term resilience of survivors.* Long term support and rehabilitation, including vocational, educational and livelihood opportunities could indirectly build resilience of women to future changes in the climate and the environment. However, the magnitude and likelihood of this benefit are both low.

Finally **no opportunities (direct or indirect) resulting from the impacts of climate change/environment (and their management) on the programme** were identified.

On the basis of this assessment, the final climate and environment categorisation is provided as follows:

Final Climate and Environment Categorisation

Option	Climate change and environment risks	Climate change and environment opportunities/benefits
1	C	C
2	C	C
3	C	C
4	C	C

Definition of Categories:

A High potential risk / opportunity

⁶ AlertNet (2011) Pakistan floods 2010: Worst floods in living memory: <http://www.trust.org/alertnet/crisis-centre/crisis/pakistan-floods-2010>

⁷ UNEP (2011) *Women at the Frontline of Climate Change: Gender Risks and Hopes, A Rapid Response Assessment*. Available at: <http://www.grida.no/publications/rr/women-and-climate-change/> (downloaded 4 April, 2013)

⁸ ICIMOD (2008) *Case Study: Gender and Climate Change in the Hindu Kush Himalayas of Nepal: WEDO*. Available from: <http://www.wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/nepalcasestudy.pdf> (downloaded 4 April, 2013)

⁹ EPA *Environmental Effects of hydrochloric acid, sulphuric acid and nitric acid*. Available from: <http://www.npi.gov.au/substances/hydrochloric-acid/environmental.html> (downloaded 4 April, 2013)



B	Medium / manageable potential risk / opportunity
C	No / Low potential impact / opportunity
D	Core contribution to a Multilateral Organisation



SECTION 2

Management Case

What are the risks and how these will be managed?

The main impacts from the programme itself are limited and easily managed with appropriate management measures, notably:

- Resource use (e.g. paper, energy) primarily from office based activities; and
- GHG emissions from project transportation including field trips.

These risks will be mitigated by:

Inclusion of environmental criteria in the grant letter. The programme grant letter should include a specific requirement for ASTI to consider environmental elements both in terms of minimising direct impacts through mitigation and optimising benefits.

- **Implementation of environmental management measures.** Specific measures to minimise operational impacts on the environment and global climate should be identified by ASTI to promote carbon and environmental savings (for example through green procurement, reducing the carbon footprint, minimising waste and recycling). It is recommended that ASTI develop an environmental policy outlining its principles/proposed course of action to guide their consideration of environmental issues.
- **Training on disaster and climate risk management.** ASFP staff are trained on risk reduction and disaster management given that the areas they work in are prone to flooding. They also have direct experience having worked in the aftermath of recent disasters. It is recommended that disaster and climate risk management training is regularly reviewed and extended to other partners such as BVSN.



Annex 1 Environmental and Climate Change Sensitivity Analysis

Table 1: Impacts of the Intervention on Climate Change and Environment

	Option 1: Fund ASTI	Option 2: Fund another NGO	Option 3: Fund a private sector partner	Option 4: “Do Nothing”
Negative Impacts				
<i>Is the proposed intervention likely to contribute to:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> climate change 	Greenhouse gas emissions particularly from international travel.	Greenhouse gas emissions particularly from international travel although larger NGOs may already have environmental policies in place to limit these.	Greenhouse gas emissions particularly from international travel although larger NGOs may already have environmental policies in place to limit these.	No increase in GHG emissions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> environmental degradation 	Resource use notably from office based activities.	Resource use notably from office based activities although environmental management measures may already be in place to reduce this.	Resource use notably from office based activities although environmental management measures may already be in place to reduce this.	No increase in resource use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased vulnerability to climate change/ environmental degradation 	Negligible risk	Negligible risk	Negligible risk	No risk
RISK RATING	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	No risk
Positive Impacts				
<i>Could the proposed intervention help:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tackle climate change 	No direct benefits identified for climate change mitigation.	No direct benefits identified for climate change mitigation.	No direct benefits identified for climate change mitigation.	No direct benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve environmental management 	Advocacy in support of legislation regulating the supply of acid could indirectly result in fewer environmental impacts (e.g. pollution).	Advocacy in support of legislation regulating the supply of acid could indirectly result in fewer environmental impacts (e.g. pollution).	Advocacy in support of legislation regulating the supply of acid could indirectly result in fewer environmental impacts (e.g. pollution).	No direct benefits



	Option 1: Fund ASTI	Option 2: Fund another NGO	Option 3: Fund a private sector partner	Option 4: “Do Nothing”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce vulnerability and/or build resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change/environmental degradation and shocks 	Opportunity to increase resilience of survivors to climate change. Rehabilitation services can contribute to reducing vulnerability to future risks including climate change.	Opportunity to increase resilience of survivors to climate change. Rehabilitation services can contribute to reducing vulnerability to future risks including climate change.	Opportunity to increase resilience of survivors to climate change. Rehabilitation services can contribute to reducing vulnerability to future risks including climate change.	No direct benefits
OPPORTUNITY RATING	Low opportunity	Low opportunity	Low opportunity	No opportunity

Table 2: Impacts of Climate and the Environment on the Intervention

	Option 1: Fund ASTI	Option 2: Fund another NGO	Option 3: Fund a private sector partner	Option 4: “Do Nothing”
Negative Impacts				
<i>Are the objectives of the project likely to be at risk from:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> climate change 	<p>Scale of challenge could increase as a result of: i) a rise in climate related disasters; and ii) the knock-on socioeconomic impacts of climate change. Both increase vulnerability and are linked to gender-based violence.</p> <p>Movement of survivors may be hindered by climate related disasters impacting access to medical, legal and rehabilitation services.</p> <p>ASTI’s experience and training on risk reduction and disaster</p>	<p>Scale of challenge could increase as a result of: i) a rise in climate related disasters; and ii) the knock-on socioeconomic impacts of climate change. Both increase vulnerability and are linked to gender-based violence.</p> <p>Movement of survivors may be hindered by climate related disasters impacting access to medical, legal and rehabilitation services.</p>	<p>Scale of challenge could increase as a result of: i) a rise in climate related disasters; and ii) the knock-on socioeconomic impacts of climate change. Both increase vulnerability and are linked to gender-based violence.</p> <p>Movement of survivors may be hindered by climate related disasters impacting access to medical, legal and rehabilitation services.</p>	No risk



	Option 1: Fund ASTI	Option 2: Fund another NGO	Option 3: Fund a private sector partner	Option 4: “Do Nothing”
	management will help manage this risk.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> environmental degradation 	No risk identified	No risk identified	No risk identified	No risk
RISK RATING	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk	No risk
Positive Impacts				
<i>Could the outcomes of the intervention be enhanced by:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> tackling climate change 	<i>Project outcomes could be maximised by tackling linked issues of poverty, vulnerability and climate change adaptation but these are outside the scope of the programme</i>	<i>As for option 1</i>	<i>As for option 1</i>	No risk
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved management of natural resources 	<i>Project outcomes could be maximised by tackling linked issues of poverty, vulnerability and environmental management (e.g. land), but these are outside the scope of the programme</i>	<i>As for option 1</i>	<i>As for option 1</i>	No risk
OPPORTUNITY RATING	Low opportunity	Low opportunity	Low opportunity	No opportunity

Definition of Categories:

A	High potential risk / opportunity
B	Medium / manageable potential risk / opportunity
C	No / Low potential impact / opportunity
D	Core contribution to a Multilateral Organisation



Annex 2 Draft Climate & Environment Assurance Note

Intervention Details		
Title	Home Department	Budget
Tackling Acid and Burns Violence Regional programme 2013-2016	CHASE	£415,911

Responsible Officers		
Title	Name	Department
Project Owner	John McGinn	CHASE
Climate Change and Environment Advisor		

Appraisal	
Success Criteria	Sensitivity Analysis
None	Climate and Environment Sensitivity Analysis carried out for all four options
Climate & Environment Category	
Risks & impacts	Opportunities
C = low risks	C = low opportunities

Management		
Risks and opportunities defined	Climate & Environment Measures agreed	Climate & Environment Measures in log-frame
Risks		

Impacts of the intervention on climate change/the environment

None of the options proposed would generate any unmanageable risks.

Impacts are limited to:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource use from administration, management and monitoring of the programme including: energy, water and paper use associated with office based activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of environmental criteria in the grant letter. The programme grant letter should include a specific requirement for bidders to consider measures to minimise negative impacts and maximise opportunities. 	<p>No climate or environment actions were included in the log-frame.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenhouse gas emissions from travel including field trips for data collection, learning workshops etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of environmental management measures. The grantee will need to identify measures to minimise its operational footprint on the environment and global climate including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopting carbon and environmental saving measures (e.g. economy class flights) Promoting green procurement (e.g. using recycled paper) Minimising waste (e.g. printing waste). 	

Impact of climate change/ environmental degradation on the intervention

The programme objectives and outputs are assessed to be at low risk from climate change and environmental degradation.

		No climate or environment actions were included in the log-frame.
--	--	---

Opportunities



Management		
Risks and opportunities defined	Climate & Environment Measures agreed	Climate & Environment Measures in log-frame
Impacts of the intervention on climate change/the environment <i>The proposed programme has no direct benefits. Indirect benefits exist but these are generally outside the scope of the project and are of low likelihood/significance.</i>		
		No climate or environment actions were included in the log-frame.
Impact of climate change/ environmental degradation and their management on the programme <i>No significant direct/indirect opportunities were identified within the scope of the programme.</i>		
Evidence		
Relevant documents		
Business Case and logframe		

SIGNED OFF BY
DATE