# Social and Environmental Screening Template (2021 SESP Template, Version 1)

*The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annexe to the Project Document at the design stage. Note: this template will be converted into an online tool. The online version will guide users through the process and will embed relevant guidance.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Temporary Basic Income (TBI) Pilot Project |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 00125560 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Country: Malaysia |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date | 26 May 2021 |

**Part A. Integrating Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability**

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach*** |
| The Temporary Basic Income (TBI) pilot project aims to support inclusive social protection measures that can reduce income uncertainty for a period of time during a crisis. TBI provides continuous and unconditional assistance, making it a valuable intervention during a crisis to secure the financial stability and security of vulnerable households. Several economic sectors were particularly affected by the outbreak of the COVID-19 and the imposition of the Movement Control Order (MCO). The service, construction, and mining sectors experienced negative growth in the first half of 2020, resulting in layoffs. To mitigate the impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Government of Malaysia (GOM) implemented monetary and fiscal measures. The *Bantuan Prihatin Nasional* (PRIHATIN), *Pelan Jana Semula Ekonomi Negara* (PENJANA), and *Kita Prihatin* packages provided mostly one-off financial assistance to many affected citizens. However, these financial assistances exclude certain sections of society primarily by virtue of its design that favours formal sector/registered business and therefore fails to provide similar coverage to workers and entrepreneurs in the informal economy or those earning unstable stream of income which is highly represented by the self-employed and women, also those young people, refugees and migrants, and people with disabilities who are hardest hit by this pandemic crisis. Given the characteristic of TBI that is unconditional, it embedded the feature of leaving no one behind as the programme interventions address the situation of those most marginalized, discriminated and excluded – who are vulnerable to economic shocks – as highlighted in the UNDP TBI Report (2020), wherein this case attempts to close the exclusion gap in existing GOM cash assistance identified above which denied access to the assistance by virtue of the GOM assistance design as a means to improve livelihood, socio-economic security and provide a social protection intervention.  This project designed pilot site selection criteria that ensures the most marginalized groups are included in the study. The criteria are as follows: i. Experienced high negative socio-economic impacts due to COVID-19; ii. High incidence of precarious income earners (e.g., informal sector); and iii. Covering both urban and rural districts. Based on consultation with Government Stakeholders and Project Technical Committee, the 3 selected states are Selangor/KL, Melaka and Negeri Sembilan, of which, the exact sites will be finalized upon consultation with DOSM. The project has incorporated a baseline study that includes extensive consultations with local government and community members, paying attention to gender dynamics and the special needs of the marginalized groups including the Persons with Disabilities, the gig workers as well as the indigenous and local peoples (if present). Specifically, during the baseline study, all key stakeholders at the national, state and local levels will be consulted and have the opportunity to raise any concerns. Additionally, the project management team and the steering committee (chaired by UNDP Deputy Resident Representative) may include the UNDP regional advisor, who will provide oversight for project implementation, including decisions or risks pertaining to human rights issues arising from the project implementation.  The voices of the marginalized communities will be represented by community representatives, NGOs and civil society which are conversant with the needs and the plight of women, gig workers, and the specific group of indigenous communities (if any at the site location). The project research team, trained on robust research methodology and ethics, will be a key conduit to channel concerns from the selected communities and community leaders at each pilot site to the project management team. In addition, the project will establish a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism to (i) receive and address any concerns, complaints, notices of emerging conflicts or grievances; and (ii) assist in the resolution of grievances among stakeholders as required under corporate guidelines. The project will be further supported with an external Ethics Review Board from UNU which serves as an independent ethics review process to ensure the project upholds ethical and human rights principles.  Project M&E includes targets and indicators relating to equal participation of stakeholders and gender representation. The Project results framework contains 2 outputs and indicators to measure intervention and the benefits to the beneficiaries at the disaggregated level (gender/disability population) at household and community levels. Household-level include indicators for economic security/ income; poverty; living environment; education; household nutrition; well-being (physical and mental health); time scarcity and social relationship; gender mainstreaming in economic freedom and decision making; and social protection. While for community level, indicators for labour participation; local economy and markets and socio-cultural norms and social cohesion are included in the study. A systematic data collection framework has been prepared to support tracking for these indicators before and after the intervention. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| At the project design, gaps including gender equality in receiving Government cash assistance were identified as GOM cash assistance is channelled solely to the head of the household, where intrahousehold distribution and its effect on gender inequality is unclear. Labour Force Survey in Quarter 1 2020 DOSM showed female employment dropped from 6.2 million in Q1 to 6.1 million in Q2 2020, which suggested female labour participation dropped due to the direct effect of job loss during the pandemic or increased care work faced by the household forced female workers to quit labour market to focus on. It has been shown that in some households, due to the prominent role of men in the social hierarchy, women face barriers and discrimination to participate in the decision-making process which affects them. Studies have also established that there is a notable difference in spending pattern between gender on food, household essentials goods, household essentials between men and women Head of Household, which started to get recognition even in national statistics (in DOSM Household Expenditure Survey Report 2019) suggests more evidence generation to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment is pertinent for policymakers.  To further investigate the role of gender in distributing/utilizing cash assistance at the household level, the TBI pilot will be rolled out targeting a balanced number of male and female-headed households, with an intention to surface gender-based nuances to provide insights for policy consideration. At the project outset, a gender analysis will be conducted to assess pre-intervention gender roles and power dynamics at the community level, in accordance with the UNDP SESP corporate guidelines. The Gender Analysis will focus on gender-inclusive modes of cash-based interventions with specific output explicitly mention, the economic autonomy of decision making of women. All data will be collected and monitored at the sex-disaggregated level (with allocated resources as part of the project) where applicable and gender analysis will be conducted as per SESP corporate guidelines.  This pilot aims to target women through:  (1) indirect benefits from TBI assistance activity that will be channelled to the household itself and  (2) direct benefits from participating as the selected female member of the households  To measure these results, the Gender Mainstreaming in Economic Freedom (Decision making) indicators will be measured looking into decision making (autonomy) between men and women in the household and change of pooling expenses between different gender of heads of household. The project will also deliberately capture lessons and best practices to inform a gender-inclusive TBI strategy that may have wider use in enhancing gender-responsive social protection. For the above reasons, the TBI Project is tagged as GEN 2. |
| **Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience** |
| The pilot project has the potential to mainstreams sustainability and resilience through a resource-efficient, resilient and socially inclusive social protection system in the nation. In particular, by supporting more sustainable and inclusive pathways to recovery to build back better after the COVID-19 crisis, and focusing on fostering resilience to future shocks, the standard of livelihood and mechanism of welfare process aspects will be enhanced. Furthermore, as this pilot is testing on recipient’s readiness on digital transfer, it opens up distribution channel possibility and possibly lower Government costs to conduct cash transfer programme. This contributes to the long term effects of strengthened social protection for communities made vulnerable due to the pandemic. In addition, this study will also inform the current social protection strategy which is not gender responsive and provide evidence towards a more inclusive and sustainable cash assistance programme/social protection mechanism to have a more resilient society to bounce back from crisis.  On the other end, this pilot project will be able to support the reduction of vulnerabilities and strengthen the resilience of communities to economic shock due to COVID-19 and national strategy to cope with the health crisis. The policymakers will be empowered with more evidence to make an informed decision on the national cash assistance mechanism in times of crisis. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| The project is undergoing a series of Government and stakeholders’ consultations. The ongoing Government consultation which has started has provided concrete indication with supporting statement and leadership that the Government, in particular, the Ministry of Finance Malaysia (MoF) is interested in the findings of the pilot study and would like to ensure this pilot study be able to provide valuable insights on their current cash disbursement programmes. Participation of Government counterparts such as the Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Social Services Division and MoF from the initiation stage ensures access to relevant information and opportunity to provide insights into the project design and implementation. Furthermore, the consultation with MoF has further catalysed greater participation from 8 other Government ministries and departments. That shows accountability shift, and the result of this project is intended to be taken by the Government to make an informed decision for the relevant policy. The outputs of this pilot will be able to strengthen the enrolment of current Government policy as it provides examples on the ground.  The study will ensure the appointed research team will adopt a standard research protocol and ethical conduct aligned with the human-rights principles. Communities’ consent to participate in the programme will be obtained through Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) procedures to ensure full information is provided to the communities. The participants will be well informed of the study and its risk in participating. Available channels for participants to direct their queries and provide an avenue for participants to address queries during the study provide a meaningful mechanism to ensure accountability and in accordance with the rule of human rights principle. The selection process of random sampling methods and treatments shall be witnessed by GOM and community representatives to ensure transparency and fairness of the pilot process. Monitoring of process for the disbursement will be conducted through evidence-based receipt either digital or hard copy (varies for each household depending on their selection) to ensure transparency with evidentiary support where the disbursement method and execution will be monitored by the research team and project management team through physical or digital receipt of the TBI assistance. |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | | | | **QUESTION 6: Describe the assessment and management measures for each risk rated Moderate, Substantial or High** | | | |
| ***Risk Description***  ***(broken down by event, cause, impact)*** | ***Impact and Likelihood (1-5)*** | ***Significance***  ***(Low, Moderate Substantial, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High*** | | | |
| Risk 1: The project may lead to perceived inequitable or discriminatory impacts on the affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals including by gender or groups, such as persons with disabilities due to the nature of the design of the project (Randomised Control Trial). | I = 3  L = 3 | M | Participation in the project is limited in terms of resources and timeline although the opportunity is equal. The participants will be briefed to understand the implication of their participation through the FPIC process. | | During the baseline study, the project will conduct stakeholder analysis and consultations regarding the project aim and activities to understand the composition of demography. The project design includes specific stakeholder involvement mechanisms to ensure that both control and treatment groups will be compensated (where needed) for the time while participating in the project. | | | |
| Risk 2: Sustainability and resilient aspect where the project may lead to grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders, who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project. | I = 3  L = 3 | M | Although full consultation will be conducted, and written consent will be obtained to indicate their understanding of the impact they may face by participating in this project, those who want to be part of the project but are not included may have objections. | | During the baseline study, the project will conduct stakeholder analysis and consultations regarding the project aim and activities to minimize the grievances or objections that potentially arise. | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **x** | |  | | |
| ***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”)*** | | | **x** | |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* | | |  | | **x** | Targeted assessment(s) | Project undergoing independent Ethics Review Board (ERB) and planned social baseline study |
|  | | **☐** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) |  |
|  | | **☐** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) |  |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | **x** | |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | |  | | **x** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) | Will be planned based on the review of ERB and planned social baseline study |
|  | | **☐** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) |  |
|  | | **☐** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) |  |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** | | |  | | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | | |  | |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | | | **x** | |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | **x** | |  | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | **☐** | |  | | |
| ***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: Head of Programme |  | 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: Deputy Resident Representative |  | 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; as engagement with the potential participants will be conducted during baseline study, before the pilot project starts. |
| 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; as this is a short study to collect evidence to inform policy. |
| P.3 Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights? | No, as this project is not involving land use or other related initiatives. |
| *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; as equal participation are given to anyone who meets the criteria to be part of the project, and it is a temporary study where resources are additional. |
| 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? [[1]](#footnote-2) | Yes; as the participation in the project is limited to budget although the opportunity is equal, and the participants understand the implication of their participation. |
| P.6 restrictions in availability, quality of and/or access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? | No, as participatory in the project is voluntary and the participants will be made to understand of the purpose of this project is a study and the design of the project is using randomization method. The method adopted for this project similar to many clinical studies and not the first RCT study in cash disbursement study, where basis to human rights is addressed adequately through communication. Most importantly, this project is a temporary study with the intention to generate evidence, and the resources given are temporary additional. The project itself does not pose or lead to any restrictions to any resources or basic services. |
| P.7 exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | No, as the project only aims to observe the impact of the initiative. |
| **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** |  |
| P.8 Have women’s groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)? | No; because the consultation process with the potential participants will be conducted later during the baseline study, before the pilot starts. |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | No; as the project aims to make an assessment on the impact before the government rolls this nationally, which at this point, could be either positive or negative. |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | No, as the criteria chosen is equal – at the household level where equal access to participate is given to both men and women head of household. And assessment benefits of on women empowerment in the household lead by men and women will be conducted -as it aims to look into gender-responsive disbursement. |
| P.11 limitations on women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?  *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being* | No; as it is depending on the marriage relationship dynamic naturally. The project attempt to make observation and do not have an influence on women’s ability or position of men and women in the household to make the decision on spending and saving patterns. |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  *For example, through the influx of workers to a community, changes in community and household power dynamics, increased exposure to unsafe public places and/or transport, etc*. | No, as the project attempts to only make observations of the initiative for a short period of time. |
| **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, as the design as set to be randomized and the participants have no control over the type of assistance they will be receiving. |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | Yes; although full consultation will be conducted, and written consent will be obtained to indicate their understanding of the impact they may face by participating in this project, those who want to be part of the project but not included may have objections. |
| 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, as the project will be managed by NGOs on the ground and not managed by the local communities. |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | No |
| 1.2 activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including (but not limited to) legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | No |
| 1.3 changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5) | No |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | No |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | No |
| 1.6 introduction of invasive alien species? | No |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | No |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | No |
| 1.9 significant agricultural production? | No |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | No |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-4) | No |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 2.1 areas subject to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, severe winds, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions? | No |
| 2.2 outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | No |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | No |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 3.1 construction and/or infrastructure development (e.g. roads, buildings, dams)? (Note: the GEF does not finance projects that would involve the construction or rehabilitation of large or complex dams) | No |
| 3.2 air pollution, noise, vibration, traffic, injuries, physical hazards, poor surface water quality due to runoff, erosion, sanitation? | No |
| 3.3 harm or losses due to failure of structural elements of the project (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)? | No |
| 3.4 risks of water-borne or other vector-borne diseases (e.g. temporary breeding habitats), communicable and noncommunicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | No |
| 3.5 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | No |
| 3.6 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | No |
| 3.7 influx of project workers to project areas? | No |
| 3.8 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | No |
| **Standard 4: Cultural Heritage** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | No |
| 4.2 significant excavations, demolitions, movement of earth, flooding or other environmental changes? | No |
| 4.3 adverse impacts to sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts) | No |
| 4.4 alterations to landscapes and natural features with cultural significance? | No |
| 4.5 utilization of tangible and/or intangible forms (e.g. practices, traditional knowledge) of Cultural Heritage for commercial or other purposes? | No |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 5.1 temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement (including people without legally recognizable claims to land)? | No |
| 5.2 economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)? | No |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[4]](#footnote-5) | 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? | No |
| 7.2 working conditions that may deny freedom of association and collective bargaining? | No |
| 7.3 use of child labour? | No |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | No |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | No |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? | No |
| **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 8.1 the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or [transboundary impacts](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | No |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 8.3 the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous materials and/or chemicals? | No |
| 8.4 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) | No |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | No |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |

Annex 2: Potential locations of TBI based on the criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State | % of COVID-19 Cases over Total National Cases | Core Industry Affected by COVID-19 | Informal Employment Rate, 2017 | GDP  Contribution | Ethnic Composition | Population &  Number of households (’000) | District (Urban, Rural) | District Population (’000) | District Citizen | B40 income group |
| Selangor | 32.20% | Manufacturing, Services | 23.60% | 24.20% | Malay 53.56%, Chinese 25.52%, Indian 12.12%, Others 8.8% | 6,614.0 &  1,623.1 | Petaling | 2,190.7 | 89.2% | 29.6% |
| Klang | 1,040.9 | 88.5% | 35.8% |
| Sabah | 11.02% | Tourism | 9.60% | 6.00% | Kadazan-Dusun 17%, Bajau 14%, Chinese 9%, Malay 5%, Murut 3%, Iban 2%, Others 50% | 3,983.6 &  513.2 | Kota Kinabalu | 572.6 | 75.1% | 18.0% |
| Tawau | 514.0 | 56.9% | 28.4% |
| Pahang | 1.59% | Tourism,  Logistics | 4.50% | 4.10% | Malay 70%, Chinese 15%, Indian 4%, Others 11% | 1,726.6 &  348.8 | Kuantan | 529.5 | 95.7% | 17.7% |
| Cameron Highlands | 43.7 | 83.1% | 16.7% |
| Melaka | 2.01% | Tourism,  Logistics | 2.80% | 3.10% | Malay 66.8%, Chinese 26%, Indian 6.2%, Others 1% | 947.6 &  227.9 | Central Melaka | 579.0 | 94.4% | 30.5% |
| Alor Gajah | 212.1 | 95.4% | 38.1% |
| Negeri Sembilan | 4.42% | Manufacturing, Services | 3.40% | 2.40% | Malay 56.6%, Chinese 21.3%, Indian 14%, Others 8.1% | 1,152.0 & 270.8 | Seremban | 625.2 | 90.9% | 25.2% |
| Port Dickson | 130.5 | 94.1% | 34.9% |

Source: Department of Statistics Malaysia (DOSM), Ministry of Health Malaysia (MOH) – national case as of June 2021.

1. 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-2)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. 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-4)
4. 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-5)