ANNEX 5: Social and Environmental Screening Template

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Supporting Effective & Responsive Institutions Project (SERIP)
2. Project Number	
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Myanmar

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 Project will support the development of systems, procedures and institutions for duty-bearers to better understand their responsibilities, more inclusively and meaningfully consult with people on their needs and for right-holders to have better access to decision-making by duty-bearers and opportunities for exerting their social accountability. The project applies the following approach to promote human rights: 1) human rights mainstreamed into all training packages delivered to both duty bearers and rights holders; 2) facilitating regular dialogue between duty bearers and right holders on policy, development and service needs; 3) mainstreaming a systematic vulnerability lens onto decision-making processes around public policy management, state resource appropriation, service delivery; 4) strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems over the government's actions that effectively measure resulting development progress (or absence of) to increase the accountability of decision-makers; 5) supporting social accountability mechanisms to open government processes and practices up to the public; 6) systematically organizing access of representatives from marginalized groups, in particular women, conflict-, disaster- and climate change-affected populations to all project activities.
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment
The Project has adopted a systematic mainstreaming approach to reduce factors of marginalization through policy-making, planning / budgeting and service delivery. Three core factors are considered, and among these, gender inequality is prioritized. The intent is that, gender equality becomes a systematic element guiding policy-making in all areas of public policies (not just those related to women's rights or social welfare), be considered at a strategic level (and not solely in terms of service delivery) and that decreasing gender inequality in access to public goods and services be systematically considered as a policy objective and measure of success of the state's performance. The Project has dedicated activities to increase the use of gender disaggregated statistics, the capacity to apply a gender-differentiated analysis among decision-makers, including MPs, and planners, the participation of women in decision-making (both as elected representatives and civil servants), the consultation of women's groups during planning and budgeting processes, especially at the grassroots level, the provision of practical analytical and programming tools highlighting the differentiated impact on women of policies, plans and budgets in order to render public sector management more gender-sensitive.
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability
The Project has adopted a systematic mainstreaming approach to reduce factors of marginalization through policy-making, planning / budgeting and service delivery. Three core factors are considered, and among these, environment is prioritized as a source of marginalization when not properly managed for populations leaving in locations rich in extractives, and/or in disaster-exposed and/or climate change-affected areas. Environment is also considered in terms of the differentiated effect of pollution on certain categories of populations, such as the urban poor. The Project will help mainstream environmental safeguards norms, developed by relevant institutions, into regular policy-making, planning & budgeting, and service delivery processes used in public sector. It will support existing processes and institutions mandated to increase the environmental responsive of the government's work and

reduce environmental vulnerabilities, with technical and process support. Statisticians across different line ministries and agencies will be trained to be better able to measure environmental risks, decision-makers trained to better use risk modelling and results of environmental impact assessments into shaping their decisions and put more emphasis on prevention of environmental crises. The Project will also work with GoM to ensure that environmental sustainability is systematically measured as a criteria of success (or failure) in the implementation of any public policy and budget.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?			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)?
Risk Description	*Impact and Probability (1-5)*	*Significance (Low, Moderate, High)*	*Comments*	*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.*
Risk 1: Strategic Development Plans prepared by S/R Governments with Project support might overlook the needs of certain vulnerable groups, including indigenous people, not well represented among the government staff and/or S/R MPs.	I = 2 P = 3	**Moderate**	S/R Strategic Plans are meant to be guiding frameworks for a start, no single investment decision would be made at this stage – hence potential negative impact on certain minority groups would not be automatic. Other checks and balances would apply before these plans result in a programmatic decision in S/RG.	All large-scale projects or public policy in government needs to be screened through a Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment process, and SERIP will support S/RGs in applying this rule. Also, the participation of environmental agencies will be systematic in all planning process, as well as of citizen representatives and CSOs, especially through the Rule of Law Centers supported by UNDP, which have capacities for HRBA. MPs representing minority groups and women's MPs will be also receiving additional support to make sure that they have the necessary skills to represent the interests of their constituencies.
Risk 2: Community consultations during TS planning, led by W/VTAs and women representatives, may not capture needs of certain vulnerable and/or minority groups, including in EAO areas.	I = 2 P = 3	**Moderate**	Apart from Risk 1, all other potential SES risks posed by SERIP to right-holders or natural assets concern planning and investment decisions made through: (i) TS planning and grants; (ii) EAO inclusion in local governance; and (iii) urban service delivery.	Inclusion and facilitations skills needed by W/VTAs and women representatives. Project staffs to conduct spot checks and monitor situation. Project will provide specific awareness-raising and training to EAO representatives to make sure that participatory approaches are applied to planning process and consultation, even where TS staff and UNDP staff access may be restricted, limiting possibilities of direct outreach to communities.
Risk 3: People not included in regular W/VTA and women representative consultations may not be informed about opportunities for participation in project.	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**		Utilise multiple outreach channels to inform public about project. Utilise local CSOs to ensure inclusion.
Risk 4: Communities with higher incidence of vulnerable groups not selected for sub-grant	I = 2 P = 4	**Moderate**		Project selection criteria to include assessment of level of inclusive benefit for all components of communities, including vulnerable groups. Develop comprehensive communications

projects may feel excluded from project benefits.				strategy and equip W/VTAs, women representatives, local CSOs and township administrations to give clear messages on project purpose.
Risk 5: Project funded constructions (e.g. school renovation) might be undertaken by contractors at substandard levels posing safety risks to communities	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**		Engage civil engineer to support township administrations during procurement, planning and implementation stages. Also to conduct spot check at construction sites.
Risk 6: Contractor labour might be exposed to physical health risks at construction sites	I = 3 P = 3	**Moderate**		Engage civil engineer to train contractors and ensure minimum safety measures at construction sites. Develop minimum safety conditions as part of contracts.

QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?		
Select one (see SESP for guidance)		**Comments**
Low Risk	☐	
Moderate Risk	X	Project includes limited social risks mainly related inclusion of vulnerable/minority groups, capacity of stakeholders to uphold human rights and safety related to project funded construction.
		These risks may be mitigated by planning and targeting capacity building measures on inclusion and facilitation, designing a comprehensive communication strategy and applying standard best practices e.g. related occupational safety.
High Risk	☐	

QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
Check all that apply		**Comments**
Principle 1: Human Rights	X	
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	☐	
1. *Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*	X	
2. *Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*	X	
3. *Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*	X	Bago Region Construction Control Authority (BRCCA), consist of civil engineers, has been recently established with a mandate to assure quality of government project implementations. BRCCA will be one of key institutions

			SERIP will engage with in order to monitor SES requirements as the project is rolled out.
	4. *Cultural Heritage*	☐	
	5. *Displacement and Resettlement*	☐	
	6. *Indigenous Peoples*	☐	
	7. *Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*	☐	

Final Sign Off

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	
Principles 1: Human Rights	**Answer (Yes/No)**
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?	No
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?	No
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?	No
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
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	
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?	No
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?	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	
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
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?	Yes
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?	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?	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?	Yes
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	
2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant 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?	Yes
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)?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	
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

3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	Yes
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	Yes
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?	Yes
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
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
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)?	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
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?	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
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
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)?	No
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?	N/A
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
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
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?	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