# Annex 5: Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Sri Lanka |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | Atlas project ID: 00135872; PIMS+: 6522 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Sri Lanka |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date | April 2021 |

**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*** |
| The project applies a human rights approach in pursuing its objective ‘’to build social, economic, and socio-ecological resilience” in three selected landscapes-seascapes in Sri Lanka, following the principles of the country’s overarching commitment to human rights at international and national levels. The work of the United Nations in Sri Lanka is committed to ‘’the UN’s normative agenda, building on core programming principles, recognising the inter-linkages between the SDGs and the normative foundation in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that advocate peaceful, just, inclusive and equitable development”[[1]](#footnote-2). The project implementation will follow the UN commitment to ‘leaving no one behind’, focusing specifically on the local level, through the following measures that are consistent with the human rights principle of participation and inclusion:   * Supporting meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, specifically the marginalized individuals and groups, including women, youth, low-income people in the processes that may impact them including design, implementation and monitoring of the project, e.g. through consultations, creating an enabling environment for participation and access, facilitating community level project formulation through capacity building etc. * Strengthening local organisations by providing technical assistance, awareness, training and capacity building to enhance the availability, accessibility and quality of benefits and services for the marginalized individuals and groups. * Increasing the inclusion of the marginalised individuals and groups in planning and decision-making processes in the multi-stakeholder governance platforms of the selected landscapes-seascapes, in the strategic projects and local producer’s groups and associations, women’s self-help groups and other local sustainable development associations. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment considerations have been considered throughout this project’s design and built into the project implementation plan. A Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan have been completed. The Gender Action Plan has identified entry points and affirmative action to address the main gender issues in the landscapes-seascapes such as, unequal access to production resources, limited decision-making opportunities and gender stereotyping. Proposed project activities promote utilising women’s knowledge, capacities and their leadership role in natural resource conservation and management. The project design prioritizes work with women’s groups and sets measurable indicators related to gender equality and women’s empowerment. The results framework includes: (i) specific activities, measures and expected outputs for gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment (ii) indicators to monitor progress.   * The project strategy emphasises engagement of women as primary actors, to prioritise women-led activities and women’s groups in conservation, sustainable production systems, and micro and small enterprise development. * The National Steering Committee (NSC) of the SGP includes a gender focal point who will assess the projects for approval from gender equality and women’s empowerment perspectives (with reference to the Gender Action Plan), facilitate addressing any gaps and limitations, and ensure gender responsiveness in the approval of grant projects. * Resources are allocated in the project budget to regularly review and update the Gender Action Plan (GAP), and grantees will be required to include a gender analysis and an action plan for gender responsive implementation of the individual projects, aligned with the GAP. * The project implementation team will include gender expertise to provide guidance and ensure gender responsive implementation of the conservation and sustainable production system strategies and community grants, deliver gender training, as well as to monitor the achievement of the gender mainstreaming targets outlined in the Gender Action Plan.   The UNDP gender marker for the project is GEN 2, which indicates that project outputs have gender equality as a significant objective. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The project components and local level activities are contributory towards the overall objective of the project, i.e., to build social, economic, and socio-ecological resilience in Sri Lanka of Knuckles Conservation Forest (KCF) and its buffer zone, the coastal region from Mannar Island to Jaffna, and the Colombo urban wetlands through community-based activities for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. Developing and strengthening strategic partnerships, focused technical assistance and co- financing arrangements will be the main approaches that will be applied towards enhancing sustainability and resilience.   * Project components are aligned with the relevant national development programmes, strategies, and priorities, aiming for synergistic effects, i.e. building the project activities at the landscapes-seascapes to have the potential to develop gradually into district and Provincial development programmes. * Organisational linkages are built from the project development and planning stage with the relevant government institutions (such as the Forest Department, Department of Wildlife Conservation, State Plantation Corporation, Tea, Cashew, Palmyra Corporations, National Design Centre), District and Divisional Secretariats to be connected and incorporated into the District and Provincial development programmes. * Technical assistance will be provided to the CBOs and to the producer groups to strengthen their capacities, to enable them to collectively address production, quality control/assurance and marketing issues to sustain the enterprises, business activities. * Partnerships will be created among producer groups and the local and international marketing channels as well as the private sector (following on from the progress made during the sixth Operational Phase (OP 6) of the SGP in Sri Lanka), focusing on the niche products and services from the landscapes-seascapes; medicinal plants, forest products, bee keeping, eco-tourism, conservation activities such as reforestation , sustainable agro-ecological production practices and systems such as Sustainable Land Management, Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), sustainable land and water management, value-addition to crops and certification process such as GAP, Participatory Guaranty System (PGS) and the community product concept. * Mobilisation of co-financing and synergies among several government programmes, the donor community, the private sector, international and domestic NGOs, and the connections already made through ongoing GEF projects implemented by CSOs. * Implementation of strategic projects to lead and support the CBOs to establish market linkages and formalise enterprise mechanisms. * Adjustments will be made to project activities with reference to COVID 19-related ’New Normal’ situation based on a market research study, also incorporating e-solutions where possible and supporting local communities with respect to green recovery approaches. * Integration of addressing the social issues in the community through the project activities. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The main stakeholders of the project include communities in the landscapes-seascape, CBOs, government and local authorities, NGOs, academic and research institutions, the private sector, international donors, and development agencies. A detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan consisting of stakeholder consultation approaches and mechanisms is developed as part of the Project Document. Accountability among the stakeholders is ensured by adopting the following mechanisms and processes:   * Formulating a detailed Knowledge Management and Capacity Building strategy and Plan to enable knowledge management and capacity building, foster Knowledge management synergies at the landscapes-seascape level, contributing to the SGP’s Global Strategy on Knowledge Management. * Setting up a platform of GEF SGP Sri Lanka Knowledge Management and Capacity Building Grantees, linking grantee partners / CBOs with government and local authorities, academic and research institutions, the private sector, international donors and development agencies. * Strengthening multi-stakeholder platforms and policy level groups for each landscape-seascape to facilitate interaction and dialogue throughout the project planning and implementation stages. * Focusing on identifying and sharing common issues, lessons, drawbacks and key messages through the communication and knowledge management components of the strategic projects. Technical and strategic advisory are envisaged to be delivered through strategic projects. * Introducing a Grievance Redress Mechanism at the community level connected to the NSC. * Introducing procedures to demonstrate transparency in grantee selection in accordance with SGP Operational Guidelines. * Ensuring that the work of the NSC meetings include accountability criteria. |

**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:**  Marginalised groups, including the resource poor, women, and persons with disabilities might be excluded from fully participating in planning and decision making in the activities that may collectively involve and impact them, and in accessing resources and services provided and generated through the project.  **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind:**  **Human Rights** (Questions P.5, P.6)  **Accountability** (Questions P.13, P.14) | I = 3  L =3 | **Moderate** | Capacities of CBOs in the project landscapes-seascape are generally low, particularly with respect to marginalised groups. | | **Assessment**:  The socioeconomic baseline analysis documented in the landscapes-seascape profiles annexed to the Project Document include assessment of the communities, with specific attention to the marginalised groups.  The assessment was informed by Landscape-seascape based consultations, discussions with District and Divisional Secretariat Offices, and with some of the local communities and representative CBO s during PPG phase.  Focus Group Discussions were held during the PPG phase with the community groups engaged in the OP-6 of the SGP to understand the priorities and good practices, challenges and limitations in community inclusion and accessing benefits.  Experiences and ideas were explored on potential livelihoods and cash income generation options within the bio diversity conservation scope of the project that can be aligned with the skills and interests of the local communities, and how best the local resource bases can be utilised for this purpose.  The Gender Analysis, annexed to the Project Document, contain issues facing women and girls in the project landscapes-seascape.  **Management**:  Approaches and methodologies of involvement of marginalised groups are addressed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.  The Stakeholder Engagement Plan also includes a description of the project’s grievance redress mechanism (GRM) and information on UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism.  The multi-stakeholder governance platforms and policy level groups initiated in the landscapes-seascape under the OP 6 of the SGP will be further strengthened to enable greater interaction among the stakeholders including the marginalised groups, to have equitable representation of all the stakeholders and the issues of concern that needs to be addressed in the landscape strategies and action plans.  Community-based organisations (CBOs) from the landscapes-seascape will be assisted in preparing grant proposals as needed, also allowing local languages to be used.  The Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan are integral parts of the project design and implementation phases, will be communicated to the project implementing organisations and referred to during the implementation, review and monitoring. | | |
| **Risk 2:**  Project approaches, design and activities might not fully incorporate or reflect views, priorities and constraints of women and girls and might not ensure equitable opportunities for their involvement in implementation and accessing opportunities and benefits.  **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind:**  **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** (Questions P.8, P.9, P.10, P.11, P.12) | I = 3  L = 4 | **Moderate** | While considerable progress has been achieved in the areas of education and health, as noted in indicators such as adult literacy, secondary and tertiary education, maternal mortality and adolescent birth rates, globally, Sri Lanka has the 14th-largest gender gap in labour force participation. There are disparities in access to land, water and production inputs, access to markets and to skills training. These disparities are often concealed at the District and Divisional levels, due to limitations in sex-based disaggregation of data and information. Women are also under-represented in political and public decision-making bodies. | | **Assessment:**  A gender analysis was conducted during the PPG phase to identify the main gender issues within the context of the country and those specific to the landscapes-seascape.  The Gender Action Plan (GAP) is informed by secondary sources of information, including the mid-term reviews of the OP-6 of the SGP, consultations with the CBO s and women’s and community groups in the landscapes-seascape.  **Management:**  The GAP includes proposed approaches and activities to ensure the project is gender responsive and focus on gender equality and women’s empowerment, annexed to the project document is an integral part of the Project Document and the project implementation process.  In addition, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan includes key entry points for articulating and addressing gender considerations in all project components from design to implementation.  To meet the gender equality and women’s empowerment considerations, the GAP recommends considering women as primary producers/actors in conservation and production systems in all assessments and planning processes.  The project will promote proposals from women’s groups with the aim that at least 40% of all proposals awarded are women led.  All awarded projects must include a gender analysis and an action plan for gender responsive implementation of the individual projects, aligned with the GAP, and grantees will be required to provide monitoring and evaluation (M&E) feedback regularly.  The Country Programme Management Unit will include gender expertise to provide guidance and ensure gender responsive implementation of the conservation and sustainable production system strategies and community grants, as well as to monitor and evaluate the achievement of the gender mainstreaming targets outlined in the Gender Action Plan.  Innovative approaches for women’s empowerment such as Champions and Advocators are promoted in the GAP. | | |
| **Risk 3:**  Project activities in the KCF, Colombo Wetlands, Mannar/Jaffna Seascape involve ecological reforestation, replacement of pine plantations with native plants, harvesting of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), harvesting of fish and Good Agricultural Practices to build climate resilience, which might pose some risks to biodiversity and ecosystem services.  **Project-Level Standards:**  **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** (Questions 1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 1.8. 1.10) | I = 3  L = 4 | **Moderate** | There are globally significant biodiversity and critical ecosystems situated within the project landscapes-seascapes which require careful consideration in the project design and implementation. | | **Assessment**:  Updated participatory landscape baseline assessments will be completed at project inception. These assessments will build upon the results of OP6 of the SGP, as well as the landscape profiles developed as part of the OP7 project preparation phase.  The baseline assessments will include site inventories and analyses of biodiversity, land use, local livelihoods, climate conditions, climate change issues in the landscapes to confirm project sites and outline strategies for socio-ecological production landscapes.  Principles, obligations, and recommendations of the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan Sri Lanka 2016-2022 and the National Action Program for Combating Land Degradation in Sri Lanka 2015-2024 will be considered in the baseline assessments[[2]](#footnote-3).  In the grant proposals, applicants will be required to ensure that UNDP Social and Environmental Standards as well as national environmental protection laws and derivative legislation are followed in the execution of project activities. No invasive alien species will be used; preference will be given to native species. Potential environmental risks associated with ecotourism development will be assessed in grant proposals including such interventions, and mitigation measures will be required in the formulation of the grant proposal. And project interventions will not entail logging of primary forests or other areas of high conservation value.  **Management:**  The NSC, technical advisory consultant(s), and multi-stakeholder landscape platforms will review all project proposals to ensure compliance with national laws and regulations and UNDP Standards, and to confirm that there are no negative impacts on critical habitats, environmentally sensitive areas or on protected areas.  Project interventions will purposefully focus on strengthening biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. Mitigation measures will be implemented, as needed for managing potential environmental risks associated with ecotourism interventions. Restoration-rehabilitation activities will be carried out in accordance with management plans developed through participatory processes. Field Coordinators in each of the three landscapes will provide site level training as well as monitoring of activities in the field. | | |
| **Risk 4:**  Periodic droughts, floods, changes in rainfall distribution, cyclonic winds, tsunamis, extreme weather events such as prolonged drought periods and flash floods occur in the landscapes-seascapes. These climate and disaster hazards can impact the project beneficiaries, project activities and the implementation processes, and the expected results.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** (Questions 2.1 and 2.2) | I =3  L=4 | **Moderate** | Impact of climate risks and disasters have been on the increase in the recent years, similarly the exposure to disaster risks. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction recommends all development investments and activities to be ‘risk informed’. | | **Assessment:**  A Climate and Disaster Risk Screening was prepared during the project preparation phase and annexed to the Project Document.  As part of the updated participatory landscape-seascape baseline assessments, hazard assessments for landscape-seascape areas will be conducted in partnership with the District/Divisional Disaster Management officers of the Disaster Management Centre (DMC) using the available secondary information, to provide additional details with respect to potential disaster and climate risks to inform the activity plans of the grant projects, and to incorporate appropriate preparedness measures.  CBOs will be required to include an assessment in the project proposal documents on the risks of climate and geophysical hazards on proposed infrastructure and assets, and describe what measures are proposed to reduce and manage the risks. The NSC, technical advisory consultant(s), and multi-stakeholder landscape platforms will review the climate and disaster risk assessments and provide guidance to the proposed mitigation measures. Moreover, CBOs have the opportunity to apply for a SGP preparation grant, e.g., to obtain specialist assistance for assessing climate and disaster risks and developing mitigation measures. This information would then be incorporated into the SGP grant proposal for the intervention.  **Management:**  The updated landscape strategies will incorporate information on climate and disaster hazards and key stakeholders responsible for disaster risk reduction and management. The design and implementation of project interventions will be guided by the Country Programme Management Unit (CPMU), technical advisory consultant(s), and the National Steering Committee (NSC) and supported by the multi-stakeholder landscape platforms. Officers from Divisional and/or District level Disaster Management Centres in the project landscapes will be invited to participate on the landscape platforms and to provide inputs and guidance on developing mitigation plans and managing the risks identified in the grant proposals.  Under the multi-stakeholder landscape-seascape governance platforms, the project will promote regular coordination between the grantees and the Divisional Disaster Management Committee for early warning, disaster preparedness updates and awareness, including COVID- 19 pandemic and similar conditions. | | |
| **Risk 5:**  There may be a heightened vulnerability due to a prolonged or recurrent outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic or similar crisis. Members of the project implementing team, local community members involved in project activities may be at a heightened risk of exposure to COVID 19 through the stakeholder consultation meetings, workshops and field visits, etc. There is also potential economic decline, disruptions in product supply-demand as a result of prolonged or recurrent pandemic situations, implicating on the project implementation plans, expected results and coping capacities of local communities.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** (Question 3.4) | I =3  L=4 | **Moderate** | The landscape approach promoted on the project is predicated on participatory processes, including multi-stakeholder meetings, trainings, learning exchanges, seminars, etc.  Ongoing COVID-19 vaccination programme may lead to a change in the context and in the regulations. This is to be observed during project implementation. | | **Assessment**:  A COVID-19 Analysis was undertaken during the PPG phase and is annexed to the Project document.  **Management**:  Adaptive management measures will be implemented to reduce the risk of virus exposure during a potential prolonged or recurrent COVID-19 pandemic, or similar crisis. A COVID-19 Analysis and Action Framework has been prepared and is annexed to the Project Document.  Mitigation measures will be implemented accordingly, e.g., ensuring physical distancing, providing personal protective equipment, avoiding non-essential travel, delivering training on risks and recognition of symptoms, etc. Virtual meetings will be held where feasible.  The project Knowledge Management and Communications Strategy, to be completed during project implementation, will include specific considerations for communication, public awareness and exchange of information under these circumstances. As COVID-19 is an evolving situation and could potentially exacerbate other vulnerabilities and risks, it will be important to remain abreast of the situation during project implementation and regularly review the risk and update mitigation measures as needed.  The project’s COVID-19 Action Framework also includes measures that address opportunities, including promoting sustainable forest management approaches that safeguard critical ecosystems and reduce human-wildlife interactions, facilitating strengthened and broadened partnerships for ensuring stable supply chains for non-timber forest products and other resources produced through the sustainable livelihood interventions on the project, etc. | | |
| **Risk 6:**  Traditional knowledge is used for commercial or other purposes without acknowledgement of local communities.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** (Question 4.5) | I=2  L=2 | **Low** | Traditional knowledge will be promoted in the project landscapes, as part of efforts aimed at broader uptake of agroecological practices. Traditional knowledge will be described in the landscape baseline assessments, as well as the landscape strategies. Community groups develop the grant proposal documents, thus there is a low risk that their traditional knowledge will not be acknowledged. | |  | | |
| **Risk 7:**  There is the possibility that CSOs which manage their grants, may use funds to finance employment-livelihood activities that do not meet national and international labour standards.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** (Question 7.1) | I =3  L=3 | **Moderate** |  | | **Assessment**:  Consistent with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, the grant applicants will be required to conduct due diligence as part of the proposal development process to ascertain that third parties who engage project workers are legitimate and reliable entities and have in place appropriate policies, processes and systems that allow them to operate in accordance with the minimum requirements in the UNDP Standard 7 on Labour and Working Conditions, as well as relevant national laws​. The NSC will ensure compliance in the review of the grant proposals.  **Management**:  Procedures for managing the performance of such third parties in relation to minimum requirements in the UNDP Standards will be incorporated into the grant agreements, including relevant noncompliance remedies. Contractor works will have access to the grievance mechanisms, described in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The Field Coordinators in each of the three landscapes will support site level monitoring, and the Country Programme Management Team will carry out periodic spot checks to reinforce UNDP standards. | | |
| **Risk 8:**  Workers involved in restoration-rehabilitation and agro-ecological production activities might be exposed to hazards in their use and handling of agrochemicals without adequate personal protective equipment, training and safeguards, or which might be subject to international bans.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** (Questions 7.6) | I =3  L=4 | **Moderate** | The landscape strategies will promote reduction and minimization of the use of agrochemicals. In some cases, non-chemical options might not be feasible, e.g., herbicides could be used in some of the restoration activities, e.g., clearing of invasive alien species. There are approved, safe agrochemicals available.  But obsolete stocks are common in many countries. And workers could be ill-informed about the hazards of agrochemicals, including approved ones, and correct health and safety procedures. | | **Assessment**:  In the grant proposals, applicants will be required to ensure that UNDP Social and Environmental Standards as well as national occupational safety and health laws and derivative legislation are followed in the execution of project activities.  **Management**:  Restoration-rehabilitation and agro-ecological production activities are expected to be carried out in collaboration with or under the supervision of responsible governmental entities, or professional partners, such as experienced NGOs. Project proposals will be required to provide details that outline standard operating procedures including but not limited to the following: 1) internationally or nationally banned or restricted agrochemicals will not be used, 2) workers working with agrochemical inputs will be trained and equipped with appropriate personal protective equipment, and 3) national, provincial, and local guidelines and regulations on use and handling of agrochemical inputs will be followed. | | |
| **Risk 9**: Project interventions involving agrochemicals may result in release of pollutants to the environment and in the generation of hazardous waste.  **Project-Level Standard:**  **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** (Questions 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.5) | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Unsafe use and handling of agrochemicals and associated hazardous wastes generated (e.g., used containers) may release harmful pollutants to the environment. | | **Assessment**:  In the grant proposals, applicants will be required to ensure that UNDP Social and Environmental Standards as well as national environmental protection laws and derivative legislation are followed in the execution of project activities.  **Management**:  Non-chemical options will be promoted. In cases where agrochemicals are used, workers involved in the restoration and other activities will be trained in the safe use and management of agrochemicals inputs. The Field Coordinators in each of the three landscapes will provide site level training as well as monitoring of safe use and management of agrochemicals and generated wastes. | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | ☑ | The overall risk rating of the project is ‘Moderate’.  Among the nine (9) project risks identified through the SESP, eight (8) have been assessed as Moderate and one (1) risk was rated as Low.  To meet the SES requirements, the following safeguard plans have been prepared: (i) Stakeholder Engagement Plan (ii) Gender Analysis and Action Plan, (iii) Climate and Disaster Risk Screening, and (iv) COVID-19 Analysis and Action Framework. These plans are annexed to the Project Document.  Risks associated with biodiversity conservation and natural resource management, climate change, and community health, safety, and working conditions, and pollution prevention will be addressed through application of UNDP social and environmental standards, mitigation measures and proactive stakeholder engagement during project implementation. Specific management measures are captured in the project design, including a Risk Register which captures all project risks, including the ones identified in the SESP, and identifies risk management measures and risk owners.  Standard M&E and adaptive management procedures will be applied during project implementation. | | |
| ***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) | Completed during PPG:  Gender Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis; COVID-19 Analysis  Planned: Participatory landscape baseline assessments |
|  | **☐** | 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 | Completed during PPG: Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan; Stakeholder Engagement Plan; COVID-19 Action Framework  Planned: Individual grant proposals will include specific safeguard management plans, including social inclusion, gender mainstreaming, biodiversity conservation, climate risk, natural hazards and disaster risk, labour, and pollution. |
|  | **☐** | 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*** | | | **☐** | The PIF’s pre-screening had identified the potential presence of Veddhas peoples in the project area. After careful review, the PPG team determined that the Veddhas peoples and no other indigenous peoples are present in the project landscapes or area of influence. | | |
| ***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)? | *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:* |  |
| 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? [[3]](#footnote-4) | **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? | **Yes** |
| 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)? | **Yes** |
| *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* | **Yes** |
| 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*. | **Yes** |
| **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? | 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* | **Yes** |
| 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? | **Yes** |
| 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? | **Yes** |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | No |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | **Yes** |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | No |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | **Yes** |
| 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?[[4]](#footnote-5) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[5]](#footnote-6) | 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, droughts, cyclones severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | **Yes** |
| 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* | **Yes** |
| 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** |
| 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? | **Yes** |
| **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) | 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? | **Yes** |
| 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? | **Yes** |
| **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)? | **Yes** |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | **Yes** |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals? | **Yes** |
| 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? | **Yes** |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |

1. United Nations Sustainable Development Framework 2018-2022 Sri Lanka

   https://lk.one.un.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Final\_UNSDF\_2018-2022.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The National Environmental Action Plan 2021-2030 and the Nationally Determined Contributions for Climate Change which are being currently developed will provide guidance for the GEF 7 implementation process. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. 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-4)
4. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. 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-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)