

2. Social and Environmental Screening Template

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Liberia Electoral Support Project
2. Project Number	
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Africa / West Africa / Liberia

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 focuses on support to Liberia on its road towards 2020 Special Senatorial Elections, Constitutional Referendum, and 2023 General Elections. It provides advice to Liberia Electoral Management Body (EMB) according to international electoral standards in line with Article 21 of UN Declaration of Human rights and Article 25 of the of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The Project adopts a human rights-based approach, leaving no-one behind by focusing programs on the most vulnerable and marginalized, being adaptable and flexible in order to cater to changing and unforeseen circumstances, addressing structural issues for lasting results, and ensuring sustainability. The Project seeks to mainstream diversity throughout its activities by working with women organizations, local communities, and Disabled People Organizations (DPOs). Through close collaboration with UNHCHR, as subject-matter expert in the area of human rights, the Project seeks to ensure human-rights-based proofing and where needed trainings in the area of human rights for relevant interlocutors, counterparts and project staff.

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

The gender approach to elections borrows from the UNSDCF pillar 4 and UN Women Flagship Programme Initiatives (FPI) theory of change which shows that the gender sensitive capacity strengthening of Liberian institutions will lead to delivery of women’s participation and leadership in elections and politics in line with the law, policies, standards, norms, frameworks ensuring that the rights holders have the knowledge, service seeking behaviors and capacity to utilize them. Gender will be mainstreamed throughout all Project’s interventions. In addition, a sub-output is dedicated to improved access and opportunity of the right to vote by women along with vulnerable and marginalized groups, with a specific focus on: (i) developing formative influence of the Gender Section over the NEC to ensure all policies are gender-proofed and action is taken to increase participation of women in electoral process; (ii) promoting inclusion

and eliminating obstacles to inclusive political participation; (iii) Promoting inclusion at the Liberia House of Representatives (HoR) through the implementation of a citizen consultation platform. The Project will also work to raise awareness and mitigate violence against women in elections under Output 3 – Conflict Prevention and Mitigation Mechanisms to Support Peaceful Conduct of Elections Are Strengthened. The Project will work closely with UN Women, especially in implementation of specific gender-related goals but also to ensure gender-lense is applied to the Project activities in general.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

In 2016, the Project has supported NEC in installation of solar panels to its magisterial offices. The Project will continue supporting the maintenance policies of those panels to ensure sustainable energy is continuously used. Where possible, the Project will advise and/or prioritize the use of sustainable energy. Under Output 2, the Project seeks to strengthen sustainable planning and budgeting that goes hand-in-hand with sustainable procurement. The Project will consider environmental sustainability in its advice, where applicable. Where applicable, the Project will also consider the environment in Procurement actions, with an attempt of employing re-usable materials and support sustainable energy.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

<p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p>			<p>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)?</p>
<p><i>Risk Description</i></p>	<p><i>Impact and</i></p>	<p><i>Significance</i></p>	<p><i>Comments</i></p>	<p><i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design.</i></p>

	<i>Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>(Low, Moderate, High)</i>		<i>If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
Risk 1: Voter register is not perceived as credible by political parties and electoral stakeholders, which may exacerbate electoral violence potential.	I = 4 P = 3	High	In 2017 elections and subsequent bi-elections, electoral stakeholders demonstrated lack of confidence in the voter list. If the voter list and related public perception is not improved, the issue may exacerbate electoral violence.	The Project has incorporated support to voter roll (VRU) process with specific aspects to enhance its credibility. These include international data center consultant, voter list audit (computer and field based), additional security measures to the data center, as well as future feasibility study and measures taken to make a more sustainable and credible voter list. The VRU support is accompanied by the advice to communication strategies critical to enhance perceptions by electoral stakeholders.
Risk 2: Exclusion of some members of vulnerable population from the electoral process	I = 3 P = 4	Moderate	The vulnerable groups, notably persons with disabilities, face significant obstacles in participating in elections, due to cultural attitudes and physical obstacles.	The Project intends to involve disabled people's organizations (DPOs) in electoral activities to ensure their views are incorporated into the work of the NEC and physical obstacles are minimized. The Project will also work with the NEC to mainstream disability in electoral operations.
Risk 3: Eruption of electoral violence during the electoral period, including violence against women candidates	I = 5 P = 2	High	Previous electoral process suggests Liberia's vulnerability to sporadic electoral violence.	The entire Output 3 of the Project focuses on prevention and elimination of electoral violence, including violence against women in elections.
Risk 4: Spread of Covid-19 amidst electoral activities	I=5 P=3	High	Electoral activities involve gathering of people, which may lead to spread of Covid-19.	The Project works closely with the NEC to ensure health protocols are incorporated and observed during the electoral activities; there is a strict observations of the Protocol during the activities supported by the Project.

Risk 5: Duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project and the right-holders do not have capacity to claim their rights	I=3 P=3	High	Capacity gaps persists within the NEC and electoral stakeholders, in relation to their obligations and rights under the ICCPR Article 21.	Significant component of the Project is capacity-building of the NEC and electoral stakeholders. The Project therefore aims at mitigating this risk as its core activity.
[add additional rows as needed]				
QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?				
Select one (see SESP for guidance)				
Comments				
<i>Low Risk</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is likely that some members of vulnerable groups will be excluded and there will be sporadic cases of electoral violence; however, mechanisms exist to prevent both. The Project is well placed to support the NEC and other stakeholders in strengthening these mechanisms towards more inclusive process and peaceful elections. There is no environmental risk – direct or indirect, involved in this Project.	
<i>Moderate Risk</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>High Risk</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?				
Check all that apply				
Comments				
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		

	2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	No as per the below template. Nevertheless, there is a risk of Covid-19 transmission amidst electoral activities.
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor <i>Homolková</i> Lenka Homolkova, CTA, Elections	22-09-2020	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver <i>Adel Badji</i>	20-oct-2020	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 <i>Bayan</i>	19-oct-2020	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? ³⁵	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?	YES
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

³⁵ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, 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 people and transsexuals.

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? <i>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</i>	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? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	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?	NO
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? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	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? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	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? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	NO
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ³⁶ 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?	NO
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)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	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)?	NO
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	NO
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

³⁶ In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

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?	NO
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)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	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? ³⁷	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

³⁷ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

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	<p>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)?</p> <p><i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i></p>	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?	NO
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	<p>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?</p> <p><i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i></p>	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

3. Risk Analysis

Project Title: Enhancing Liberia Electoral Credibility, Transparency, and Inclusiveness	Award ID:	Date:
--	------------------	--------------

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact & Probability	Countermeasures / Management Response	Owner	Submitted, updated by	Last Update	Status
1	Non-transformative approach to electoral cycle and deepening democracy issues, leading to non-completion of next electoral cycle legal framework on time	August 2020	Political	I: High P: Low	UNDP will support NEC and CSO efforts to advocate for reforms on the legal framework or improvement of processes through adequate regulations; Appropriate corrective measures when and where necessary; Constant monitoring.				
2	Low citizens' confidence in the electoral process or its aspects owing to the disenchantment of past elections	August 2020	Political	I: Medium P: High	Increased outreach to the voters through focusing on increased transparency and better communication by the NEC; creating paths for more direct communication between the voter and elected institutions as well as strengthening the media in era of disinformation.				
3	Diminishing donor resources for deepening democracy projects in the face of ongoing similar projects in peacebuilding and countering violent extremism and conflicting electoral priorities in the region/worldwide	August 2020	Financial	I: High P: High	Continuous outreach to donors; streamlining of processes within the UN; close coordination, highlighting financial and thematic synergies with relevant UN entities, in particular PBSO, UNDP Governance, violent extremisms.				

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact & Probability	Countermeasures / Management Response	Owner	Submitted , updated by	Last Update	Status
4	Limited capacity of implementing partners and responsible partners	August 2020	Organizational	I: Medium/Low P:Medium/Low	Strong capacity building element				
5	Delay in donor commitment to funding the project as many donors are in the process of identifying their priorities for support and the adverse impact of the COVID-19 pandemic	August 2020	Organisational & Financial	I: High P:High	Close engagement of the UNDP Country Office and UN Resident Coordinator for ongoing communication with donor and programmatic and political level.				
6	A highly dynamic political environment leading to shifting priorities and demands	August 2020	Political	I: Medium P: Medium	Encourage consultations and dialogue among national stakeholders to resolve any impasse and agree on common priorities				