# Social and Environmental Screening

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project Title
 | Building Capacities for Civic Engagement, Peacebuilding and Inclusive Dialogue: Towards Inclusive and Participatory Governance |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)
 | 00090594 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country)
 | Phnom Penh, Ratanakiri, Siem Reap, Kampot, Kampong Cham |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation)
 | Implementation |
| 1. Date
 |  |

**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*** |
| Pursuant to the Secretary General’s Call and the UN Guidance Note on Promotion and Protection of Civic Space, that reaffirms public participation and civic space as priority areas, the UN Country Team is developing the UN County Team Human Rights Strategy. A framework of the Human Rights Strategy has been developed with a two-pronged approach and seven pillars for actions. The UNDP’s project will contribute to the Human Rights Strategy by promoting civil society’s rights to participate (one of three ‘Ps’ in the UN guidance note on promotion and protection of civic space) in coordinating with other UN agencies working for protection. The project specifically supports rights to participate through capacity development of duty-bearers (government institutions) and rights-holders (targeting interested civil society organizations) as a part of Output 1. Human rights principles, particularly, participation and inclusion were integrated in all phases of the project management: design, implementation and monitoring. During the design and inception period in 2019 and 2020, more than 75 stakeholders from CSOs, government and development partners were consulted: those stakeholders included human rights organizations including community-based organizations and networks. In the implementation, the capacity development component will apply various innovation approaches in which participation is embedded. For example, the project will adopt a design thinking approach focusing on co-design and empathy building. The result of capacity development will be measured by the level of inclusiveness and responsiveness in decision-making processes in supporting existing infrastructure for engagement between the Government and CSOs. Supporting capacity development of CSOs is driven by their needs in seven dimensions of civil society’s sustainability, including its enabling environment and advocacy, so that their participation is further promoted. Having said that, the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) should be further strengthened in the project in line with three points explained in the “[Statement of Common Understanding”](https://unsdg.un.org/resources/human-rights-based-approach-development-cooperation-towards-common-understanding-among-un) agreed by UN agencies in 2003; The project document will further strengthen the integration of International Human Rights Norms and Standards relevant to civic engagement. For example, country-specific human rights mechanisms’ recommendations, including from the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), UN Special Procedures, and UN Treaty Bodies observations will be integrated as well as the UNSG report on the activities of the UN High Comissioner for Human Rights’ conclusions. Many of these relate directly to SDG16. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project’s gender marker score is 2 (significant contribution to gender equality through gender mainstreaming) and the project mainstreams gender in all phases of project management. During the inception phase in 2020, stakeholders whose organizations’ main objective is gender equality counted more than 14 percent of total stakeholders engaged (11 out of 76 stakeholders consulted from June to August 2020 were working for women’s rights and gender equality). If organizations that promote human rights including women’s rights are included, the percentage is higher. The project included gender analysis that recognizes different development challenges for women and men, and a current situation of women’s participation in decision making. The project results from the outcome to outputs recognized differences of men and women (e.g. output 1 “CSOs and governmental authorities will be able to engage each other better in responding to citizens’ interests and in recognizing different voices of men and women, with particular attention to marginalized groups”). And for M&E, output indicators include sex disaggregated indicators. However, a challenge was identified since the project will not address existing structural and systemic gender inequality in participation. For example, as noted in the gender analysis, women’s participation particularly at the leadership level is still limited and the project does not address the imbalance. This then has a bearing on women’s participation in capacity development (Output 1) both from civil servants and CSOs as well as civic engagement (Output 2), which would need extra efforts to ensure women’s participation and their voices reflection – the risks were recognized in the following risk checklist (i.e. P9 and P10). UNDP’s experience thus far in providing technical assistance for public service innovation demonstrates the challenge of a substantial gender deficit in leadership and decision-making positions, which is a systemic issue.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The project will contribute to inclusive participation by supporting existing infrastructure for engagement between the Government and CSOs and stakeholders’ capacity development, i.e., the project will facilitate the government and CSOs in co-design processes, and in improving structures, purposes and modality of engagement so that inclusive and meaningful participation will be institutionalized. Capacity development in government will also be institutionalized by working with the government capacity development organizations such as the National School of Local Administration.  |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The objective of the project is to contribute to meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, ensuring women and men’s participation with particular consideration of marginalized groups. For this purpose, UNDP organized extensive consultative processes in designing and revising the project (as briefed on the first section above, partly mainstreaming human rights-based approach). The project will strengthen communications about the project activities for transparency and accountability to stakeholders (activity 2.3). Supporting CSOs sustainability from seven dimensions (activity 1.2)[[1]](#footnote-2) will strengthen their capacity to claim their rights as rights-holders and intermediary actors. UNDP will reach out to CSOs as much as possible beyond the project management structure given their diversified areas of works. And UNDP will also take advantage of the UN wide CSO engagement to reach out beyond the conventional partners for UNDP. Given the identified risks, including grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders, a Social and Environmental Management Plan that will be conducted together with a Social and Environmental Impact Assessment, will look into options (including a stakeholder response mechanism) that would be appropriate for the project.  |

**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**: The UN’s and development partners’ support to segments of civil society participation in the project (i.e. output 2) could be perceived as evidence that the ‘rights to participate’ is being fully addressed and so could undermine those advocating for better protection of these rights.  | I = 4L = 3 | Substantial |  |  |
| **Risk 2**: The project supports continuation of civil society engagement without results, i.e. continuation of status quo.  | I = 3L = 3 | Moderate |  |  |
| **Risk 3:** Project participants do not enjoy sufficient access to information and protection to enable project results to be achieved | I = 4L = 3 | Substantial | The project’s theory of change assumes that other UN agencies and development partners support access to information and protection. Activity 1.2 CSO sustainability support could potentially cover those areas too if they are prioritized by CSOs.  |  |
| **Risk 4:** Inadequate coordination within the UN system and/or inability despite efforts to persuade key decision makers to promote and protect civic space could pose a risk to protection, including protection of civil society actors from risks of attacks, harassment, intimidation and reprisals, and missing opportunities of promotion of participation. | I = 4L = 3 | Substantial |  |  |
| **Risk 5**: Institutional capacity and enabling environment would remain the same, and changes in capacity at individual and organizational levels may not result in positive changes (continuation of status quo). | I = 3L= 3 | Moderate | The project capacity development targets both rights-holders and duty-bearers (individual and organizational levels) |  |
| **Risk 6**: The project could fail to include relevant stakeholders due to presence of diverse CSOs and unwillingness of some segments of CSOs to engage with the project.  | I = 3L = 5 | Substantial |  |  |
| **Risk 7**: The project has a risk of the spread of COVID-19 in organizing capacity development and engagement activities.  | I = 2L = 4 | Moderate |  | The project will explore options of online modality for both capacity development and engagement activities. In addition, UNDP will strictly follow the Guidance of the MOH and WHO to prevent spread of COVID-19.  |
| **Risk 8**: Project’s enabling environment to dialogue and civic engagement could face more challenges caused by the 2022 commune elections and general elections in 2023 | I = 4L = 4 | Substantial |  |  |
| [add additional rows as needed] |  |  |  |  |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?**  |
|  |
| ***Low Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | **X** |  |
| ***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)  |  |
|  |  **X** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) -- Scoped ESIA (focused on human rights, gender and accountability principles) | Planned |
|  | **☐** | 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)  |  |
|  | **X** | 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*** | **X** |  |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **X** |  |
| ***Accountability*** | **X** |  |
| ***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*** | **X** |  |
| ***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 |  | UNDP staff member responsible for the project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted. |
| QA Approver |  | UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD)**,** Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC. |
| PAC Chair |  | UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.  |

### SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| 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)? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | Yes |
| *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? | Yes |
| 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? [[2]](#footnote-3)  | Yes |
| 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:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?  | Yes |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| **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?[[3]](#footnote-4) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[4]](#footnote-5)  | 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? | Yes[[5]](#footnote-6) |
| 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?[[6]](#footnote-7) |  |
| 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)? | Yes[[7]](#footnote-8) |
| 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* | Yes[[8]](#footnote-9) |
| 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? | Yes[[9]](#footnote-10) |
| 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? | Yes[[10]](#footnote-11) |
| 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. Seven dimensions include legal environment, organizational capacity, financial viability, advocacy, service provision, sectoral infrastructure and public image. Prioritization of supporting dimensions will be decided in consultation with CSOs. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. 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-3)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. 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-5)
5. COVID-19 risks [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. 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-7)
7. Ratanakiri province [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. The UNDP project will support the Provincial Partnership Dialogue (strengthening the structures, processes, rules etc) but the project will not set the agenda/topic for the engagement. And there is a possibility that the Provincial Partnership Dialogue could be used to discuss about the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Ibid [↑](#footnote-ref-11)