

## Annex [#]. 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

<b>Project Information</b>	
1. Project Title	Spotlight Initiative
2. Project Number	00118237
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Belize

### 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?

##### **Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach**

The aim of the project is to target specific populations guided by the **leave no one behind principle**, these include indigenous and rural women facing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination, women and girls with disabilities, and other marginalized groups such as LGBTI, and adolescent girls. Secondary target groups will be parents, men and boys and community leaders. A total of 125 legislators, police, members of the judiciary and other government officials that will be sensitized on human rights standards, gender, and family violence. The project will also strengthen evidence-based knowledge and capacities to assess gaps and draft new and/or strengthen existing legislation on ending VAWG including family violence and/or gender equality and non-discrimination that are in line with international HR standards and treaty bodies' recommendations.

##### **Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment**

The project will seek to strengthen the policy and legislative environment to improve national response to family violence and increase protection for women and girls. Critical gaps in the legislative and policy framework have been identified such as the absence of protocols to operationalize key pieces of legislation, weak evidence base to inform policy and legal reviews and lengthy processes for legal review and amendments. Actions will seek to eliminate bottlenecks, ensuring that Belize's legal and policy frameworks are responsive and offer the greatest level of justice and protection for girls.

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

Not Applicable.

## Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks



<b>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</b> <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>	<b>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</b> <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			<b>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)?</b>
<b>Risk Description</b>	<b>Impact and Probability (1-5)</b>	<b>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>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.</b>
<b>Contextual Risk</b>				
Limited government/state ownership of Spotlight	I = 5 P = 4	<b>MODERATE</b>	If this risk were to occur, the project's progress would be stalled, and implementation would not benefit from sustainability	Ensure that the project is nationally owned at the highest level demonstrating the benefits of Spotlight and alignment to existing initiatives.
Inadequate policy and legal framework	I = 3 P = 4	<b>MODERATE</b>	Project successes would be superficial and there would be limited impact beyond on the surface changes	Inclusion of intervention to support strengthening policy and legal reform. Engage CSOs in advocacy and strengthen their capacity to advocate for improved policy and legislation.
Limited infrastructure and human resources for expansion of service delivery in rural areas	I = 5 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	If the project is unable to reach some of its target population that are furthest from reach the impact could be compromised	Identify innovative modalities for service delivery such as mobile service delivery, partnerships with CSOs at the community level, integration of new services into the package of services delivered by existing service providers at the community level.
Rejection of Spotlight by non-traditional leaders in indigenous communities	I = 4 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	If the project is slow in being accepted by non-traditional leaders, results will be compromised	Ensure inclusion of non-traditional leaders in Spotlight from the onset and sensitize community leaders on the benefits of Spotlight.

Culture of Silence	I = 3 P = 3	<b>HIGH</b>	If victims continue to remain silent then the VAWG will remain unresolved.	Ensure that programme is accompanied by strong behaviour change communication that engages communities, engage women and girls, promote clear and consistent messages that VAWG is not okay and consistently encourage victims to speak out.
Natural Disasters	I = 3 P = 4	<b>HIGH</b>	If the project has a natural disaster plan where delivery is not interrupted, then impact will be minimal.	Ensure that the programme includes a plan that identifies interventions such as service delivery, communication and some aspects of prevention that can still be implemented in emergency settings to ensure minimal disruption to implementation
<b>Programmatic Risks</b>				
Capacity of government and CSO actors to reach the hardest to reach population	I = 5 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	In order for the project to be impactful and impartial it needs to leave no one behind and reach the entire population.	Continue ensuring linkages with existing programmes in rural communities, develop a plan for coordination of service delivery to the hardest reached populations to reduce cost and maximize the impact of interventions. Build capacity of local personnel to deliver some services and interventions (community health workers, teachers, nurses, etc.)
Government stakeholders unwilling to adopt new and innovative approaches	I = 3 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	Innovation and creativity will lead to greater engagement, and documentation of lessons learnt for future adaptation and use.	Use evidence and data to demonstrate the need for new and innovative approaches, establish a system for recognizing and rewarding innovation in Spotlight, document and demonstrate the impact of innovations.
Resistance of religious entities to the expansion of CSE	I = 3 P = 3	<b>HIGH</b>	Ensure the religious entities are also included and there is also dialogue to overcome any barriers that may exist	Engage religious leaders from the onset. Identify barriers and bottlenecks to the introduction of CSE and develop a plan to address barriers.
Funds are not expended at optimal level due to limitations and bottlenecks in absorption capacity at national capacity	I = 3 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	Low delivery rate can impact the disbursement of funds to advance to the next phase and can delay implementation.	Ensure broad based partnership in the implementation of interventions. Even if only a few stakeholders will receive funds directly, ensure that multiple partners responsible for achieving the results are able to support implementation.
Availability of complementary resources (in addition to EU resources) to fund Spotlight	I = 3 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	Additional resources for advocacy will increase visibility and awareness.	Meetings with the Regional Offices and Headquarters to discuss the need for high-level advocacy from HQ
Acquired capacity and knowledge by various stakeholders through the initiative (government, civil, society etc.) not translated into transformative actions	I = 3 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	Ensure that results are evidenced within communities and programmes are impactful achieving indicators	Ensure that capacity building in key areas is accompanied by mentoring to ensure application of new skills, strong monitoring framework, and recognition and reward for transformative actions by stakeholders
Fear of discrimination and victimization among women's rights advocates	I = 5 P = 3	<b>HIGH</b>	If women feel protected, they will be more vocal about violence	Strengthen the network of CSO actors and CSNRG to increase support and protection for women's rights advocates through legislative and policy reform.

			which will allow for more impact from the programmes	
Male marginalization: tendency of stakeholders and CSOs to highlight the marginalization of men and boys as a justification for including them as a focus for inclusion in programme	I = 3 P = 4	<b>MODERATE</b>	Ensure that there is buy in and men are also involved ensuring that they know the important role they play	Highlight the important role that men play in partnering with women to bring an end to GBV.  Engagement of CSO Partners with a specific focus on addressing male socialization and harmful masculinity
<b>Institutional Risks</b>				
Limited availability of disaggregated data to inform evidence-based programming	I = 2 P = 3	<b>LOW</b>	Baseline and evidence-based programming is important in order to measure progress	Monitor closely baseline study to avoid more delays in the data collection processes that affect other areas in need for evidence-based programming; formation of a Steering Committee to develop/identify innovative and 'rapid' methods to collect data.
Capacity of institutions to implement programmes at scale and to provide essential package of services particularly psychosocial services	I = 5 P = 3	<b>HIGH</b>	Psychosocial support is important as it helps in the recovery process	Ensure capacity assessment is undertaken and identify innovative approaches for service delivery in areas where capacity is weak e.g. psychosocial support. (contract NGOs such as Project Heal to train trainers or to provide a package of services in areas where it is most needed)
Lack of formal frameworks/ mechanisms among government and CSO partners which enables coordinated service delivery, joint planning and programme cohesion	I = 3 P = 2	<b>MODERATE</b>	Coordination and collaboration are important to enhance communication between individuals and institutions to enhance the delivery of service.	Engage partners in joint planning and the design of models for service delivery that mandate coordination and collaboration, integrate behaviour change communication into capacity building sessions to address individual and institutional behaviour change that will foster improved partnerships
<b>Fiduciary Risk</b>				
CSOs lack structure for receiving funds and mechanisms for ensuring accountability for funds	In I = 3 P = 3	<b>MODERATE</b>	Ensuring CSO's have capacity to properly manage and track efficient management of resources as this is critical for work plan delivery.	Evaluate structure and function of CSOs and identify CSOs that have capacity to manage resources. Establish MOUs with CSOs that allow for multiple CSOs to benefit from funding pool managed by one CSO with proven track record of efficient and effective management of resources.
<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?</b>				
<b>Select one (see <a href="#">SESP</a> for guidance)</b>				<b>Comments</b>
<i>Low Risk</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Moderate Risk</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>During 2018, several risks contributed to the slow delivery of the scheduled activities of the project. Additionally, there have been significant changes in the strategic environment that have contributed to its current state. As a result, an in-</b>

			depth mid-term evaluation took place which resulted in several changes in the scheduled work plan. This work plan, if passed by the Project Board, will be implemented in 2019, which will achieve the desired results as was originally anticipated.
	<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?</b>		
	Check all that apply		<b>Comments</b>
	<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	X	
	<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	X	
	<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<i>7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### Final Sign Off

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor 	26-Nov-2020	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

<b>Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks</b>		
<b>Principles 1: Human Rights</b>		<b>Answer (Yes/No)</b>
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?	Yes
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? <sup>1</sup>	Yes
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?	Yes
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
<b>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</b>		
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?	Yes
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
<b>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:</b> Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
<b>Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</b>		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?	No

<sup>1</sup> 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.

	<i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	
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>	No
<b>Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</b>		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant <sup>2</sup> 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
<b>Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</b>		
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

<sup>2</sup> In regards to CO<sub>2</sub>, '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.]

3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
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?	No
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
<b>Standard 4: Cultural Heritage</b>		
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)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
<b>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement</b>		
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? <sup>3</sup>	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?	No
<b>Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples</b>		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	Yes
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

<sup>3</sup> 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.



6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
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
<b>Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</b>		
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?	No