# Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)

*The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document at the design stage. Note: this template will be converted into an online tool. The online version will guide users through the process and will embed relevant guidance.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project Title
 | EU4Dialogue: Support to Conflict Transformation in the South Caucasus and the Republic of Moldova |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)
 | 00129755 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country)
 | The project will cover South Caucasus region and the Republic of Moldova |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation)
 | Design |
| 1. Date
 | 29.12.2020 |

**Part A. Integrating Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability**

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach*** |
| This project offers a vehicle to address these deficits and, by reducing the gap in quality of life, help to reverse the divergence in living conditions and life opportunities that has till now been expanding across the conflict divides and among the conflict-affected populations more broadly. Not only does this approach offer opportunities to leverage improvements in socio-economic conditions for conflict transformation; it is fully in keeping with the EU’s commitment to improve the lives of every individual within the European Neighbourhood, including in the conflict regions. It is also in line with the human rights-based approach that the EU and the UN share, which sees adherence to human rights norms as binding for everyone regardless of the status of the territory in which they live. Besides, the project goals and results will contribute to Outcome 4 of UNSDCF 2021-2025/CPD 2021-2025 Georgia: By 2025, conflict affected communities enjoy human rights, enhanced human security and resilience.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project aims to improve the socio-economic development and human security of conflict-affected communities, with all project activities driving progress towards gender equality and improving the prospects of children and youth. Achieving gender equality and pursuing the Women, Peace and Security agenda will be a priority aim for any assistance and activity under the grant mechanism for conflict-affected communities. This applies not only in the participatory approach taken to prioritize community projects but also in ensuring that any facility built or reconstructed meets the needs of women and girls as well as men and boys. The Project will build on the wealth of good practices gained through similar interventions across the region, and in particular best practices related to the involvement of women and youth as agents of change within conflict-affected communities. In particular, the women, peace and security approach will be mainstreamed in grassroots and civil society-driven initiatives to ensure that they address the need to engage, empower, protect and support women and girls in the pursuit of sustainable peace.The Project will also contribute to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Project is most explicitly linked to three SDGs: SDG 5 for gender equality; SDG 10 for reduced inequalities; and SDG 16 for peace, justice and strong institutions. The effectiveness of the intervention will be assessed through measurable indicators with disaggregated indicator targets in order to ensure that cross-cutting issues, such as gender, youth and vulnerable groups (displaced persons, persons with disabilities, ethnic and religious minorities, households living in remote and rural areas), are monitored. The project will be assigned the GEN2 marker, meaning that gender equality is a significant objective of the project.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| UNDP will ensure that the impact of the intervention will be sustainable not only at the institutional level, but also at the level of individuals, including boys and girls, men and women and the population in disadvantaged regions in equal manner with particular focus on vulnerable groups. Therefore, the programme considers this individual development as a key area of sustainability since the skills, knowledge and experience imparted will remain.The underlying paradigm of the project is that improving living conditions and building community resilience at local level is of long-term benefit to conflict resolution.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| While sustainability of project results in protracted conflict settings is usually at risk due to general uncertainty and frequently changing environment, this risk will be mitigated by UNDP through close monitoring and building the ownership and partnership with local stakeholders. For the latter to be sustainable after completion of the programme, it is essential to obtain a “buy-in” from a wide range of public and private stakeholders already in the programme planning stages and to maintain this ownership and partnership throughout the programme implementation. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?** *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?***Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | **QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High**  |
| ***Risk Description******(broken down by event, cause, impact)*** | ***Impact and Likelihood (1-5)*** | ***Significance*** ***(Low, Moderate Substantial, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High***  |
| Risk 1: Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project; | I = 2L = 2 | Low | Unstable political and security situation on the ground, which may result into operational delays of the project implementation; Uncertain and frequently changing positions of local stakeholders (including non-state actors) about the international support as well as traditional carefulness towards conflict transformation; this may result into programmatic delays of the project implementation | Regular consultations with local stakeholders, including high level meetings to win their support for project implementation; risk assessment of political and security situation on the ground; Close monitoring of the project implementation process by representatives of UNDP Country Offices in the area of responsibility as well as UNDP Liaison Office in Brussels and representatives of the donor organization; continuous (formal and informal) contact with local actors at all levels to keep an eye on changing positions and act accordingly;Continuous coordination and liaison with UN Country Team, European Union and other partners on the ground, as relevant; |
| Risk 2: Is there a risk that that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights; | I = 2L = 2 | Low | Vulnerability and possible insufficient resilience of local CSOs, initiative groups or individuals towards the potential pressure from state or non-state actors; Possible introduction of the “law on foreign agents” or any other restrictive measure on individuals, limiting the flexibility of local CSOs, initiative groups or individual rights-holders to partner with and be beneficiaries of the international support; | As a result, and thanks to the previous support and assistance, local CSOs in the area of responsibility proved to be resilient and flexible enough to respond to possible pressure from state or non-state actors. However, continuous (formal and informal) contact with stakeholders at all levels to understand the changing attitudes and policies will further reduce the risk.Initiative groups [without formal registration as legal entities] or individual rights-holders are much more vulnerable; therefore, the project will continue their capacity building as individual beneficiaries by helping them to broaden the peer networking, establish professional organizations/associations, improve their access to social and legal services. |
| Risk 3: Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities? | I = 3L = 1 | Low | Possible safety threats to local communities as a result of construction and/or renovation of the community-led social infrastructure. Risks to communities as a result of possible collapse of structural elements. | Competitive selection process of construction companies, intensive and regular consultations with local stakeholders in charge of construction/renovation/architecture related issues, hiring a local or international civil engineer/s to ensure quality of construction/renovation works both in the process of design and implementation, etc will all serve as risk mitigation measures. Through the help of local or international civil engineer/s, the project will ensure that construction and/or reconstruction of community-led social infrastructure is planned and implemented in risk-informed manner, meeting the minimum safety standards. The project team does not possess the expertise in civil engineering; therefore, a local or international civil engineer will act as an external expert/advisor for construction/renovation works.  |
| Risk 4: 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)?  | I = 2L = 2 | Low | Among other issues, the project aims at improving the access to livelihoods. Since the project covers breakaway regions as well where international standards are not guaranteed by local stakeholders, there is risk that employment or livelihoods stimulated by the project may fail to comply with national or international standards.  | UNDP’s current interventions in breakaway region of Abkhazia in support of livelihoods, agriculture and rural development are governed by EU’s LEADER approach through ENPARD project, which is the community-led rural development methodology applied and promoted by the EU across the EaP countries. The project plans to build its support to beneficiaries based on previous practice and experience in the region., including the ENPARD methodology. |
| Risk 5: Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous | I = 2L = 2 | Low | Non-hazardous waste might be generated as a result of construction and/renovation of social infrastructure. But impact will be minor due to small scale construction works. Besides, the project will have mitigation measures to contain and reduce the impact.  | The project plans to hire a local or international civil engineer to provide various pieces of advice on design and implementation of construction/renovation works as well as safe accommodation and utilization of the construction waste. |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?**  |
|  |
| ***Low Risk*** | **X** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***High Risk*** | **☐** |  |
|  | **QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are triggered? (check all that apply)** |
| Question only required for Moderate, Substantial and High Risk projects  |
| ***Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)*** | **☐** |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* |  | **☐** | Targeted assessment(s)  |  |
|  | **☐** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | **☐** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)  |  |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | **☐** |  |  |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* |  | **☐** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others)  |  |
|  | **☐** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) |  |
|  | **☐** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) |  |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** |  | **Comments (not required)** |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind***  |  |  |
| ***Human Rights*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Accountability*** | **☐** |  |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | **☐** |  |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | **☐** |  |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | **☐** |  |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **☐** |  |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **☐** |  |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **☐** |  |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | **☐** |  |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** |  |

**Final Sign Off**

*Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA AssessorGiorgi VardishviliCPR Team Leader | 29.12.2020 | 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 ApproverAnna ChernyshovaDRR |  | 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 ChairLouisa VintonRR |  | 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** |  |
| INSTRUCTIONS: The risk screening checklist will assist in answering Questions 2-6 of the Screening Template. Answers to the checklist questions help to (1) identify potential risks, (2) determine the overall risk categorization of the project, and (3) determine required level of assessment and management measures. Refer to the [SES toolkit](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/Pages/Homepage.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind****Human Rights** | **Answer (Yes/No)** |
| P.1 Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? |  |
| P.2 Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project? |  |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.4 adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? |  |
| P.5 inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? [[1]](#footnote-1)  |  |
| P.6 restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? |  |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? |  |
| **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| P.8 Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?  |  |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? |  |
| P.11 limitations on 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? *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* |  |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? *For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc*. |  |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability**  |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.13 exclusion of any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups and excluded individuals (including persons with disabilities), from fully participating in decisions that may affect them? |  |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? |  |
| P.15 risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project? |  |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* |  |
| 1.2 activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) 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? |  |
| 1.3 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) |  |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? |  |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? |  |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species?  |  |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? |  |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? |  |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production?  |  |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? |  |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* |  |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-2) |  |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3)  |  |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? |  |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? |  |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* |  |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?*For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* |  |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? |  |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 3.1 construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams) |  |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? |  |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? |  |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? |  |
| 3.5 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? |  |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? |  |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? |  |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? |  |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? |  |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? |  |
| 4.3 adverse impacts to 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) |  |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? |  |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? |  |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 5.1 temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)? |  |
| 5.2 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)?  |  |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[4]](#footnote-4) |  |
| 5.4 impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?  |  |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:*  |  |
| 6.1 areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)? |  |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? |  |
| 6.3 impacts (positive or negative) to 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)? *If the answer to screening question 6.3 is “yes”, then the potential risk impacts are considered significant and the project would be categorized as either Substantial Risk or High Risk* |  |
| 6.4 the 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? |  |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? |  |
| 6.6 forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources? *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above* |  |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? |  |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? |  |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?*Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* |  |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions**  |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)* |  |
| 7.1 working conditions that do not meet national labour laws and international commitments? |  |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? |  |
| 7.3 use of child labour? |  |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? |  |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? |  |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? |  |
| **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 8.1 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)?  |  |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? |  |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals?  |  |
| 8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) |  |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? |  |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?  |  |

1. Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, sex, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, 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 and transsexual people. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Forced eviction is defined here as the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. Forced evictions constitute gross violations of a range of internationally recognized human rights. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)