# Social and Environmental Sc

# reening 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 | Governance Reform Fund (GRF) – Phase IV |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 00136398 / Output: 00127317: GEN2 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Georgia |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date | 01 January 2022 |

**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*** |
| In the framework of the project, GRF will integrate Human-Rights Based Approach (HRBA) as a cross-cutting theme to its interventions by drawing attention to the accountability to respect, protect, promote and fulfil the human rights of all people. Increased focus on accountability will hold the key to improved effectiveness and transparency of initiatives. Another important value provided by the application of the HRBA will be the focus on the most vulnerable, marginalized, and excluded in society as their human rights are most widely denied or left unfulfilled (whether in the social, economic, political, civil, or cultural spheres and often, a combination of these) through the establishment of citizen-centric governance systems. HRBA will generally lead to better analysed and more focused strategic interventions by providing the normative foundation for tackling democratic governance issues, including those related with the environmental governance. Those good governance dimensions shall enable the GRF project to align the HRBA principles with consistent analysis of interventions through these lenses. Furthermore, the GRF team will capitalize on the strengths of EU supported and UNDP implemented Human Rights project to seek guidance, advice, and synergy during the next phases. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Within the framework of GRF, UNDP will engage with national counterparts to ensure that gender mainstreaming is observed in the design and implementation of interventions (i.e. impacts on gender equality are analysed in the design phase, gender equality is maintained in implementation, and gender-disaggregated data are collected, where possible, for monitoring and evaluation purposes). Capacity-building measures have a long-term effect on representation and power relations in institutions, and therefore close attention will be paid in the current GRF phase to ensuring that women are proactively involved in the development and implementation of project activities and that they equally benefit from the results. Moreover, fair representation will be sought in different consultative processes, and female experts will be recruited whenever possible. In addition, the GRF team will utilize the knowledge and experience of the Government of Sweden- supported and UNDP implemented Gender project to explore potential avenues for synergies, collaboration and expertise during the implementation phase. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The sustainability of the project is a prerequisite to developing good governance practices and building a professional civil service. In other words, GRF will continue to work hand-in-hand with the Government in building the national capacity of state institutions to better manage public administration-related challenges.  Through a demand-driven, result-oriented, and on-the-job knowledge and skills transfer approach, the project will lay the foundation for sustainable results. GRF will respond to the needs and priorities identified by public institutions at the individual and organizational/institutional levels. Moreover, the project will create an environment that fosters sustainability, incorporating ownership, transparency, and accountability principles.  The sustainability of initiatives and the results will continue to be of the highest priority for UNDP in the GRF project as this criterion is one of the key determinants for selecting initiatives for both CDF and ODS modalities. Moreover, the sustainability of the deliverables will be considered during the Project Board Meetings while presenting the project achievements. Pertinently, the experience and lessons learned from previous interventions as well as UNDP good practices, in general, will feed into the sustainability strategy of the project’s next phase. The approach effectively practiced by the GRF project from its very beginning has been to implement and maintain effective initiatives and systems that are continually responsive to stakeholders’ needs. This has been accomplished by examining factors that can increase the sustainability of interventions and their results if addressed diligently through strategic planning.  Key risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of the next phase are as follows:  - Elections (municipal and parliamentary) could delay or even prevent implementation, and/or lead to personnel changes in partner agency leadership and subsequent priority changes.  - Lack of ownership and commitment from the national partners.  - Frequent changes in the senior management of implementing or beneficiary partner state institutions.  - Changes in the priority directions of GoG.  - Continued spread of COVID-19 and extension of corresponding restrictions; and  - Changes in the senior political leadership.  However, the GRF team will instill a high degree of ownership among the beneficiary agencies regarding the design, development, implementation, and sustainability of respective initiatives. By concentrating support on GoG’s priority areas, continuing to provide demand-driven assistance, and implementing principles of ownership and cooperation, potential risks would be reduced. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| GRF intends to create an environment for multi-stakeholder collaboration, strengthen partnerships with key actors and implementing partners, stimulate experience sharing while at the same time expanding the capabilities of applying gender lens and giving impetus to the cooperation patterns where gender and inclusivity aspects are supported.  The Administration of the Government of Georgia (with its Policy Planning Unit (PPU) and the Donor Coordination Unit (DCU)) will serve as the project’s Implementing Partner to ensure the overall coordination of the processes and at the same time identify the most critical needs, gaps and challenges that should be addressed by GRF in good governance direction, including the environmental one. However, at the implementation level, the project will cooperate with the key state institution, such as the Parliament of Georgia, Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Labour, Health and Social Affairs, Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development, LEPL National Statistics Office of Georgia (Geostat), LEPL Civil Service Bureau of Georgia, LEPL National Center for Disease Control and Public Health, LEPL National Environmental Agency, LEPL Social Service Agency, and other central and local level public agencies. Furthermore, in some instances, the project will encourage engagement of the civil society organizations with extensive experience and a good reputation in the respective sector as well as the think tanks.  GRF will conduct the project board meetings on an annual basis with the participation of AoG, donor representatives, and beneficiary state institutions and CSOs to take stock of the ongoing work and evaluate progress towards the set objectives. During the previous phase of the GRF project, a close partnership has been built with other development partners (such as EU, UKAID, GIZ, USAID) and was engaged in the coordination meetings to update information about its activities. The project will continue engagement in the PAR Donor Coordination meetings organized by donor organizations on a rotation basis averagely once in two months, which supports both policy level communication/intervention and guarantees the complementarity of initiatives. |

**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: No Risk Identified | I =  L = |  |  | |  | | | |
|  | **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 Assessor: Gigi Bregadze, DG Team Leader |  | 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:  Anna Chernyshova, DRR |  | 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: Nick Beresford, RR |  | 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)? | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | *No* |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| 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) | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | *No* |
| **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)? | *No* |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* | *No* |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | *No* |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 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*. | *No* |
| **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? | *No* |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| **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* | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| 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) | *No* |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | *No* |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | *No* |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species? | *No* |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | *No* |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | *No* |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | *No* |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | *No* |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | *No* |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-2) | *No* |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3) | *No* |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | *No* |
| **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? | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | *No* |
| **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) | *No* |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | *No* |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | *No* |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | *No* |
| 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)? | *No* |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | *No* |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | *No* |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | *No* |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | *No* |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | *No* |
| 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) | *No* |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | *No* |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | *No* |
| **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)? | *No* |
| 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)? | *No* |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[4]](#footnote-4) | *No* |
| 5.4 impacts on or changes to land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources? | *No* |
| **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)? | *No* |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 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? | *No* |
| 6.5 the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | *No* |
| 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* | *No* |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | *No* |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | *No* |
| 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.* | *No* |
| **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? | *No* |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | *No* |
| 7.3 use of child labour? | *No* |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | *No* |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | *No* |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? | *No* |
| **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)? | *No* |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | *No* |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals? | *No* |
| 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/) | *No* |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | *No* |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | *No* |

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)