

## Annex 2 Social and Environmental Screening Template

### Project Information

<b>Project Information</b>	
1. Project Title	Governance for Resilience and Sustainability Project
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 preparation of the NEP, NBSAP, MAPDRR and MCCSAP have been individually co-facilitated by accountable UN agencies. Aside from the fundamental goal of promoting resiliency and sustainably, these national plans incorporate aspirational goals that integrate human rights-based approaches (HRBA) to development. Implementation of specific activities under the Project's four components provide opportunities to further translate the HRBA to Myanmar's resilience and sustainability policy frameworks into practical instruments that can guide duty bearers and rights holders in their implementation.

Components 1 and 3 (mainstreaming and organisational capacity building) ensure that project appraisal systems incorporate resilience and sustainability measures that take into account substantive rights (e.g. land rights), procedural rights (participation, access to information and access to redress and remedy) and rights of women, indigenous peoples and children.

Component 4 (subnational demonstration) ensures that identified projects at the local level are results of differentiated situation analyses (including political economy analysis) that take into account the conditions of marginalised groups, among others. These projects should also aim to factor suggestions from women to facilitate their participation and equal access to project benefits.

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

Mainstreaming activities under Output 1 analyse differentiated impacts of environmental degradation, climate change, and disaster risks among women and men (including high death rates among women during disasters); as well as certain policies that tend to limit access to natural capital and government services. The process will recognise the contributions that women can make to address these. Output 1 activities will also promote enhanced public participation in environmental management – a key principle of meaningful public participation processes that will be treated as foundational in these activities is the need to ensure gender considerations in the design of participation mechanisms.

Under Output 2 (green investments), a Project activity of immediate practical significance to women is the promotion of small-scale green business that among others, recognises the contribution of women in the value chain. Activities will include support to female-led green businesses to become more competitive and sustainable. The Project under Output 3 will support the organisational and human resource capacity building requirements of targeted programs under the Environment Conservation Department (ECD), Forest Department (FD) and the Department of Disaster Management (DMM). The capacity of women in these offices will specifically be addressed, so they can attain their full potential for excellence and be supported to obtain equal opportunities for serving in leadership positions. The capacity building initiative will further assist target women leaders in the various ad hoc consultative working groups established by government agencies.

The Project under Output 4 will enable selected subnational governments to implement the location specific adaptation of recent resilience and sustainability policies and programs. Subnational plans will be based on recognition of the differentiated effects of trends, events and policies and programs on women and men; and the potential contributions of women to address these. Procedures for differentiated consultations among women and men will be provided. Program design and budgets will encourage optimum women's participation in preparing, implementing and managing thematic plans indicative of community watershed management, solid waste management and local DRR.

<b>Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability</b>
<p>The Project aims to mainstream environmental sustainability and overall resilience from disaster and climate change. The particular mix of four project components is driven by the urgent need to translate recent policy reforms into actual implementation, taking advantage of increased level of expectations from stakeholders that are affected by environmental impacts, disaster risks and climate change concerns. At the same time, the project would like to help transform current environmental, DRR and climate change measures to become more “preventive” in character. A range of catalytic implementation instruments are employed.</p> <p>On the supply side, sectoral plans will be made more resilient and sustainable while procedures for public participation in environmental management will be made clearer. These are complemented by organisational and human resources capacity building of offices mandated to implement policy reforms on resilience and sustainability.</p> <p>On the demand side, citizens will be encouraged to participate in environmental management functions such as EIA, environmental management plan monitoring and increased access to redress and remedy from environmental harm. Conflict sustainability will be observed through conscious communication with EAOs during project implementation. Green investments by big businesses as well as organised community-based initiatives will be encouraged to help expand the options to economic development from heavy reliance on natural resources extraction to utilisation of the same resources (including undertaking residuals management).</p>

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

<b>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?</b>	<b>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?</b>			<b>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</b>
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>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.</i>
Risk 1. Random disruptions of the peace process in some geographic areas might prevent consistent delivery of project interventions identified by subnational governments, which are helping remote, marginalised communities who need most the interventions.	I=4 P=2	Moderate	There are ongoing peace negotiations in two of the three States and Regions identified by the project (Sagaing and Rakhine), but the project will focus on areas relatively remote from conflict sites.	Establish and maintain formal and informal communication lines with EAOS early in the project identification process. Design local projects to include provisions for training resident community leaders in conflict areas who can maintain project interventions during unstable periods, with limited or non-presence of regular project staff.
Risk 2. The process of mainstreaming the resilience and sustainability policy framework to sector specific plans may overlook the needs of certain marginalised groups, including indigenous people, not well represented among the government staff at Union and subnational levels.	I=3 P=3	Moderate	NEP, NBSAP, MAPDRR and MCSSAP have built-in provisions for protecting the welfare of indigenous people in the form of aspirational targets. This needs to be translated into specific implementation instruments.	Develop or update an illustrative profile of cases where programs and projects have direct relevance for the livelihoods and welfare of indigenous peoples and use as part of the discussions among MONREC, MSWRR and the targeted sectors where mainstreaming will be conducted. Invite representation from indigenous peoples in key sessions on the mainstreaming process of the sectors.

Risk 3. The needs of women in indigenous communities may be glossed over by the broader aim of addressing the needs of the indigenous peoples themselves.	I= 3 P=2	Moderate	The provisions for women in indigenous groups are generally described under the provisions for women.	Include discrete provisions for factoring women's concerns in the activity plans that involve work with indigenous communities. Secure specialist advice in project planning and implementation processes to take into account the sociocultural realities of specific indigenous groups. This is to ensure the acceptability and sustainability of such measures.
Risk 4. Locally identified interventions for resilience and sustainability at the subnational levels may not be complemented by strategies for matching interventions in land use plans which can jeopardise their long-term effectiveness.	I=3 P=4	Moderate	Land use policy has recently been updated but the pace of implementation is slow. Development partners from some projects are helping selected urban areas begin to address urban land use problems.	During the situation analysis phase of Output 4, include a general analysis of the land use trends situation so that these are factored when identifying priority projects for resilience and sustainability. Collaborate with the local representation of the Ministry of Construction and consider identifying complementary strategies for land use planning and zoning and include in recommendations for S/R governments. Help the S/R government identify development partners that may be interested to explore these land use planning issues further.
Risk 5. The choice of green technologies to be applied may be haphazard leading to the long-term detriment of environmental conservation measures. Examples: a) application of conventional reforestation in watersheds where less costly assisted regeneration methods may be more appropriate; b) labour scarcity (due to seasonal competition for labour from other economic pursuits) in places where some natural conservation efforts are needed, etc.	I=4 P=2	Moderate	There is limited availability of resident expertise in the different sectors.	Capacity building initiatives for government staff need to include information and tools to rapidly screen popular technology options based on experience from other places with similar conditions. An illustrative typology of technologies and available assessments about their feasibility may also be developed, based on the recurrent proposals coming from the subnational levels. This rapid assessment should be done at the early stage of project identification and need not wait until the detailed project preparation or environmental screening stage.
<b>QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?</b>				
<b>Select one (see <a href="#">SESP</a> for guidance)</b>			<b>Comments</b>	
<i>Low Risk</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Moderate Risk</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Project includes limited social risks which are mainly related to inclusion of vulnerable/minority groups. Some environmental and economic risks may be possible if the selection of green technologies is haphazardly done.  These risks may be mitigated by planning and targeting capacity building measures on inclusion and preparing and communicating information that analyse technical options for addressing resiliency and sustainability at the ground level.
<i>High Risk</i>			<input type="checkbox"/>	

<b>QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?</b>		
Check all that apply		Comments
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	X	
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	X	
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	X	
<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	X	
<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	X	
<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>	X	
<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>	X	
<i>7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### Final Sign Off

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor		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.