## Annex 8: Social and Environmental Screening Template

## Project Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Reducing Climate Vulnerability of Coastal Communities of Myanmar through an Ecosystem-based approach |
| 1. Project Number | 5101 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Rakhine State, Myanmar |

## Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

|  |
| --- |
| **QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?** |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach*** |
| * The project envisages adequate opportunities for equal participation by all members of the community in the design and implementation of its interventions. Principles for participation and inclusion will be integrated into the guidance on planning, mapping and management of key ecological infrastructure in the region including also ensuring respect for local land tenure and access arrangements; * The project includes measures that uphold the principles of participation and inclusion, through the establishment of a cross-sectoral institutional coordination mechanism that will serve as the framework for coordinating planning, funding and management activities related to coastal adaptation plans and activities. This coordination mechanism includes government agencies, representatives of NGOs / CSOs and local communities. * A focus on community level participation and inclusive governance will be achieved with the setting up of multi-stake holder platforms such as livelihood forums, community level disaster management committees and related structures with well-defined criteria for inclusion and representation. This will also ensure participation from minorities and other groups. The community structures are expected to ensure that local community perspectives and priorities are adequately captured in project level activities including disaster preparedness and management activities. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| * The project recognizes that the impact of climate change and adaptations responses will be different between women and men. Accordingly, the project has designed appropriate measures to integrate concerns of women and men into all activities including vulnerability and risks assessments. * The primary objective of the project is to reduce vulnerabilities of coastal communities from predicted impacts of climate change by safeguarding and restoring ecosystem functionality and connectivity. One of the key strategies to reduce vulnerability will be to identify and focus on members of communities that are most vulnerable – women, poor and marginalized groups. * The project incorporated lessons from UNDP’s past initiatives in the country on gender and women’s empowerment, for example from the Human Development Initiative (HDI) and the ongoing Rakhine Area Based Programme (RABP) being implemented by UNDP, UN Women and UNHCR. * In addition, project preparation will ensure a detailed gender analysis that will inform the development of final project interventions such that they appropriately integrate gender concerns, issues and needs. * It is expected that 60% of the direct beneficiaries will be women. In particular, support on resilient livelihoods will be delivered to community groups which include women’s groups. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| * The project objective “to strengthen the protection of vulnerable coastal areas and communities against adverse impacts of climate change” is geared towards ensuring environment sustainability. * By emplacing capacities to mainstream climate change impacts and adaptation needs into local development planning frameworks, the project will not only reduce risks to existing community infrastructure and lives but will inform proper placement, planning and management of future infrastructure and productive sector activities. Targeted trainings and other capacity building for key national and local stakeholders will enable them to be better able to identify, manage, monitor and integrate climate risks into their development planning decision making. * Existing natural ecological infrastructure such as mangrove forests will be protected and improved to ensure sustained delivery of ecosystem services including protection against extreme weather events induced by climate change. In addition, the project incorporates a long-term program for monitoring of key ecosystem functions and conditions including health and status of mangroves and wetlands; information from this will inform future development planning in the area. * In light of extensive experience across countries in the region, on the need to link ecosystem improvement and restoration efforts with that of disaster management to ensure environmental sustainability and resilience of communities, the project made sure these connections are made in the afforestation/reforestation programs, climate resilient agriculture practice promotion activities. |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *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.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6* | | | **QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?** | |
| ***Risk Description*** | ***Impact and Probability (1-5)*** | ***Significance***  ***(Low, Moderate, High)*** | ***Comments*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.*** | |
| Risk 1: There is a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them. | I = 4  P =3 | **High** | Ethnic minority and religious minorities entrenched feelings of marginalization in terms of social, economic and political life.  Given this, the project needs to pay attention to ensure that minorities and marginalized groups are not being excluded from fully participating in the project. | As the project is High risk, an ESIA and ESMP will be prepared during the early stages of implementation, per the project’s ESMF. This risk and all others will be covered by the ESIA/ESMP.  Further community consultations will be required during project inception, as part of an ESIA, to ensure that ethnic minority communities are fully consulted and involved in development of all project interventions and plans at the target sites (with application of FPIC principles throughout).  The ESMP will provide specific protocols for managing this continued involvement during project implementation, as well as monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and project budget will be allocated for these purposes.  The stakeholder process includes political parties and civil society from the ethnic minority such as Asho Chin community and religious minority groups such as Kamein community, as well as the State Ethnic Affairs Minister, who represents the ethnic minority. Such groups and individuals will be able to provide guidance on project design/implementation and verification of activities at state-level validation workshops and other relevant validation procedures.  For interventions that involve both inter- and intra-village tract mechanisms on resources and land associated with conservation activities through joint activities, careful attention must be paid to include marginalised groups and to ensure the voices of minorities in affected areas are included. This can be achieved by:   * Following the experience of the Rakhine Area Based Programme which used the multi-stakeholder Livelihood Forum * Grounding these interventions in step-by-step planning and problem-solving exercises * Working through local partners with a strong understanding of local context when planning and conducting community consultations on project interventions. This will also act to empower and learn from local level orgs who have strong contextual knowledge. * The project will design interventions with flexibility in mind so that adaptations to changes in circumstances can take place. * A transparent and accessible feedback and grievance mechanism and communication line which ensures these can be accessed by women and marginalized groups will be established.   No project activities involving land titling and/or demarcation will be implemented without carrying out on the ground assessments with relevant stakeholders and undertaking FPIC.  The project will learn the lessons on the conflict sensitive and do no harm approach and build on the UN’s joint Rakhine Area Based Programme which is in its second year of successful implementation. | |
| Risk 2: There a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals. | I = 5  P = 2 | High | There is a history of inter-community conflicts between ethnic Rakhine community and other religious minority groups in parts of Rakhine.  In addition, in some villages of the potential project township areas, there are historical records of inter-community tensions between community forest user groups and non CF user groups.  Improvement of mangrove area managed by community-based institutions and promoting diversified, climate-resilient coastal livelihoods may potentially increase existing inter-community tensions and conflicts.  Furthermore, while most communities may benefit from obtaining written verification and formal title over plots of land or mangrove forests, the process of land titling in some areas can weaken security in others and may entrench and exacerbate existing inequalities in access to land. If not implemented carefully, the project’s activities could exacerbate existing tensions. This risk includes how the project is perceived by stakeholders; any impression of favouritism could be detrimental. | An ESIA and ESMP will be prepared during the early stages of implementation, per the project’s ESMF. This risk and all others will be covered by the ESIA/ESMP.  The project will learn the lessons on the conflict sensitivity and “do no harm” approach and build on the UN’s joint Rakhine Area Based Programme which is in its second year of successful implementation.  The RABP project looks to enhance livelihoods and lay the foundations for inter-community cooperation. By establishing an inter-village tract approach to economic interests, it is expected that communities will perceive tangible, concrete benefits from co-operation and will place a higher value on cooperation than conflict with other ethnic groups.  The project will be implemented in line with a conflict sensitive, “do no harm” approach. Therefore, interventions that provide assistance to village tract authorities will integrate the principle of strengthening accountability to communities, including meaningful participation of women.  The following steps will be required to achieve such a goal:  Before implementation and during the participatory consultations with local communities to define any interventions, the teams implementing the project will analyze the context in which the project will be implemented to minimize the risk that intervention may result in conflict or escalate an existing conflict in that particular area. This analysis should enable project teams to understand the interaction between the intervention and the context in a particular area. The steps will be as follows:   * Understanding the context in which the project will be implemented * Carrying out a conflict analysis investing in detailed micro-level conflict and gender analysis * Understanding the interaction between the intervention and the Context * Linking conflict analysis with the programming cycle of the Intervention * Using this understanding to avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts * Implement, monitor and evaluate the intervention under a conflict-sensitive approach (including redesign when necessary) | |
| Risk 3: The Project may 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.  The knock-on effect of this may be to reinforce gender inequalities such as restrictions on women’s mobility or gendered divisions of labour preventing opportunities for gender norms transformation and women’s meaningful participation and empowerment. | I = 3  P = 2 | **Moderate** | Women and men use mangroves ecosystem differently. While men are largely engaged in fishing and limited harvesting of trees and timber from mangrove forest, women are mostly responsible for gathering firewood and other resources from the mangrove forest. Men and women may also use different areas of the mangrove forest (women may rely more areas closer to homesteads). The project will support mangrove restoration and management. While this is expected to improve access and availability resources, careful attention should be paid so that access to women is not denied or made difficult under new community evolved management regimes.  Rakhine has the highest rate of female unemployment in Myanmar. Rakhine State also has the lowest overall labour force participation rates in the country; these are much lower for women (38.1%). Women have lower literacy rates than men.[[1]](#footnote-1) Positions of authority and decision making tend to be male-dominated and participation of women in decision making is minimal.  Due to Farmland Law 2012 provisions that formal legal title need only be named by the head of household, usually male, like in most other areas of Myanmar, men generally have a much higher rate of formal land tenure than women.[[2]](#footnote-2) | A comprehensive gender action plan has been drafted during the PPG phase and will guide proactive women’s empowerment efforts during implementation. Please see this plan for further detail of specific project gender mainstreaming actions and targets.  The ESIA/ESMP completed in accordance with the ESMF will also look at gender angles, including how gender intersects with the multiple risks in this SESP. The gender mainstreaming plan will be updated as required after the completion of the ESIA. Gender mainstreaming actions will also be incorporated into the ESMP and the Gender Action Plan updated as required  For participation in decision making activities and/or FPIC considerations related to project activities, women's schedules and care duties will be factored into programming.  Additional information and enhanced support for women's meaningful participation should be provided  Assessment of potential partner organisations and businesses (for procurement) on gender, sexual harassment and SEA policies  The community forestry provisions, if engaged with, provide a requirement for women’s inclusion into Village committees. Any and all project related committees or technical working groups will require quotas on women’s inclusion. | |
| Risk 4: The potential outcomes of the Project will be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change and/or natural disaster. The project area is vulnerable to natural disasters, which could restrict the project’s success and long-term outcomes.  . | I = 3  P =2 | **Moderate** | Climate change induced extreme events such as floods and storms may damage mangrove plantations and other community level disaster risk reduction installations such as cyclone shelters. In addition, climate change impacts will adversely affect agriculture and other livelihood sources of local communities. Furthermore, the project area is prone to cyclones. | The current project is designed to build capacities to adapt to adverse impacts of climate change in particular by improving and enhancing the protective and provisioning functions of the mangrove ecosystem. Climate change information and climate risks will be integrated into the design of project interventions, for example selection of drought tolerant agricultural crops to promote, construction of higher cyclone shelters, selection of mangrove species and planting techniques that are better adapted.  This risk will be considered by the ESIA and management measures detailed in the ESMP as required.  Promotion of climate-resilient livelihoods strategies in combination with income diversification and capacity building initiatives for planning and improved risk management will include the following:   * Disaster risk reduction strategies to reduce the impact of hazards, particularly on vulnerable households and individuals. * Capacity development for local civil society and governmental institutions so that they can provide better support to communities, households and individuals in their adaptation efforts; and – * Advocacy and social mobilization to address the underlying causes of vulnerability, such as poor governance, lack of control over resources, or limited access to basic services. | |
| Risk 5: Project activities such as establishment of community managed mangrove forest conservation areas and buffer zones may potentially affect existing land use practice, land ownership, tenure and right to access land of communities including indigenous peoples and other ethnic or religious minority groups | I=3  P=3 | **Moderate** | This risk is related to Standard 1 (Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource) and Standard 6 (Indigenous Peoples).  For the establishment of existing mangrove forest as community-managed conservation areas, most communities may benefit from obtaining written verification and formal title over plots of land or mangrove forests, however, the process of land titling in some areas can weaken security in others and may entrench and exacerbate existing inequalities with regard to access to land. Initial field surveys also observed customary land ownership practice in this region. There can be some potential issues regarding land ownership, land tenure changes of communities including ethnic minority in this region. | This risk will be considered by the ESIA and management measures detailed in the ESMP as required. Potential risks related to land ownership, land tenure changes shall be further assessed in ESIA. Per the ESMF, an IPPF and site-specific IPPs (as appropriate) will be prepared during implementation. FPIC procedures will be developed and applied throughout implementation.  Participatory resource mapping and the formation at the community level can inform establishment of mutually agreeable regulations and benefit sharing mechanisms, by supporting community members to inventory existing resources and project future growth.  Project activities should be linked to DRR programmes where awareness raising initiatives are to share and understand benefits associated with ecosystem-based approaches to DRR.  The project activities will ensure Stakeholder consultations to identify participants in community forestry activities, to agree on terms and conditions for participation, and to present the Grievance Redress Mechanism | |
| Risk 6: Project activities related to restoration and conservation of mangrove forest unintentionally cause economic displacement of community who relies on mangrove forest resource for their livelihood activities | I=3  P=3 | **Moderate** | This risk relates to Standard 5 Principles on displacement and resettlement.  Mangrove restoration projects activities may result in areas in close vicinity becoming more vulnerable and/or risking market increase for deforestation drivers. Some communities rely on mangrove as fuel wood for charcoal and brick making. Other livelihoods activities such as expansion of fish/shrimp pond expansion normally happen in mangrove area. Hence, indicative project activities for mangrove restoration and conservation may cause unintentional economic displacement for households who rely on mangrove related resources for their livelihoods. In addition, mangrove-supportive livelihood options due to, perceived risks to their income stability, and/or uncertainties over the market demand, may continue with activities which degrade mangrove areas. | This risk will be considered by the ESIA and management measures detailed in the ESMP as required.  As the project is based primarily on increased/sustainable livelihoods through community-based tourism and community forestry provisions, a robust economic analysis and livelihood action plans will be required prior to project implementation. Targeted livelihood analysis and participatory action plan will be linked to conflict analysis.   * The project will look primarily to understand and build on existing mangrove restoration activities. In all communities assessed in the PPG phase, commonalities have been present in relation to problems associated with mangrove depletion, saline intrusion for example damages crops and there is common fear that sea levels are rising. * The project will incorporate capacity building initiatives, setting village level livelihood actions plans using robust economic analysis and providing market linkage which promote resilient livelihood strategies * Rather than conventional approach to protected areas which often result in loss of livelihoods, the project will be designed to provide platforms and impetus for community controlled areas and locally managed tourism operations. | |
| Risk 7: The project activities which envisaged regeneration and restoration of mangrove forest area in terms of community managed protected area and buffer zone unintentionally may cause land displacement and potential risk of land dispute | I=4  P=3 | **High** | Land may come under various different authorities within the project areas for example. Some of the land acquired for conservation purposes may come under GAD jurisdiction as unclassified forest or land designated for protected forest under MONREC. It can cause unintentional land displacement in case if unclassified forest land under specific department may potentially not align with customary/traditionally owned land. According to Myanmar Country Analysis, 2019 (World Bank), most of the remaining forests are located outside PFE (Permanent Forest Estate) on vacant, Fallow and Virgin (VFV) lands and large part of those forest is still under customary management. | Per the ESMF, ESIA shall be required to further assess this risk and the project’s subsequent ESMP will be disseminated widely to all the key stakeholders including government counterparts and targeted trainings will be carried out on a range of requited thematic areas including the local CSO partners.  Such thematic training may include social inclusion, protection and recognition of the rights of customary tenure, rights of ethnic groups and local communities, religious/ethnic minority. In the event that it is required, resettlement and economic displacement action plan will be initiated in line with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, international best practices and in accordance with FPIC principles wherever needed with affected communities.  Participatory resource mapping and the formation at the community level. This process can inform establishment of mutually agreeable regulations and benefit sharing mechanisms, by supporting community members to inventory existing resources and project future growth.  Project activities should be linked to DRR programmes where awareness raising initiatives are to share and understand benefits associated with ecosystem-based approaches to DRR.  Participatory resource mapping and transect walks.  The project activities will include Township and village tract level multi-stakeholder consultations to identify specific areas (with geo-referencing). In addition, project activities will ensure Stakeholder consultations to identify participants in community forestry activities, to agree on terms and conditions for participation, and to present the Grievance Redress Mechanism  To avoid potential risk of land dispute. It will need proper documentation to demonstrate land ownership status whether Government Property, Community land or Private property. For the case of voluntary land donation, then there must be written consent /or voluntary land donation form. | |
| Risk 8: State-level conflict de-stabilizes the project areas potentially leading to project delays. As the project looks to partner at village and village tract level administration, project activities could be delayed or hampered. | I=3  P=3 | **Moderate** | The evolving security situation in Rakhine may render project implementation particularly challenging..    . | The project will adopt a phased approach to project implementation as there are no one size fits all procedures.  The project’s stakeholder engagement process will look to build relationships with and seek the views of a wide variety of actors at the local level, including governing authorities, civil society, religious institutions, and women’s organizations.  Project staff safety will need to be considered and may restrict access to some project sites  The project will undertake a continuous assessment of the risk context, working closely with the UN Department for Safety and Security. The project will be flexible in planning, implementation and budgeting to allow for mid-stream modifications. All stakeholders will be sensitized and all channels of communication with the key stakeholders will be kept open with a view to monitoring of the risks and to adjust the implementation of activities in line with Project principles | |
| Risk 9: Project appointed duty-bearers at the county and township level (e.g. community mobilisers) lack the capacity to implement the project according to UNDP standards regarding human rights, public participation, gender mainstreaming and attention to social and environmental safeguards. | I=3  P=3 | **Moderate** | There are significant overlaps in law, jurisdiction, maps and access to justice for competing land interests or claims to land. Rule of law is weak, corruption remains high and competing interests in land by government departments remain.  Land may come under various different authorities within the project areas for example. Some of the land that is acquired for conservation purposes may come under GAD jurisdiction as unclassified forest or land designated for protected forest under MONREC. For mangrove restoration purposes, some of the land may have been converted into shrimp or fish ponds and owned privately. In other areas, long term logging contracts between the FD and business may exist.  Areas designated for protected public forests are governed under the Nature Wildlife and Conservation Division (NWCD), a division within the Forest Department. Very often they restrict traditional livelihood activities, such as agriculture, hunting, or harvesting timber and non-timber forest products as buffer zones are difficult to comprehend and resulting in the criminalization of local communities. | Per the ESMF, the project’s subsequent ESMP will be disseminated widely to all the key stakeholders including government counterparts and targeted trainings will be carried out on a range of requited thematic areas including the local CSO partners. Such thematic training can include social inclusion, protection and recognition of the rights of customary tenure, rights of ethnic groups and local communities, religious/ethnic minority. In the event that it is required, resettlement and economic displacement action plan will be initiated in line with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, international best practice and in accordance with FPIC principles wherever needed with affected communities.  . | |
| Risk 10: Risks linked to Leakage, Permanence and Additionality in community development of blue carbon systems. | I=  P= | **High** | This risk relates to SES Standard 2 on climate change and Standard 6 on Indigenous Peoples.  Leakage refers to the movement of destructive economic activities to another location because of a forest carbon project. Permanence refers to the risk that carbon is just temporarily stored in the forests. There is no guarantee that this stored carbon will not be emitted in the future because of destructive economic activities or natural disasters. Additionality is a concept that is used in forest carbon markets, which accounts for the possibility that emission reductions might have occurred without the activities implemented through a forest carbon project.  Research has demonstrated that dead mangrove forests can emit 8 times more methane than live ones. Therefore, in a project dealing specifically with blue carbon, future mortality of mangroves may offset the positive benefits from project activities. As the development of carbon based initiatives, benefits to local communities should be assured by a solid and transparent mechanism safeguarding against corruption. | Per the ESMF, an IPPF and site-specific IPPs (as appropriate) will be prepared during implementation. FPIC procedures will be developed and applied throughout implementation.  In the event that it is required, resettlement and economic displacement action plan will be initiated in line with international best practice and in accordance with FPIC principles wherever needed with affected communities. | |
| [add additional rows as needed] |  |  |  |  | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?** | | | | |
| **Select one (see** [**SESP**](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | | | **Comments** | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | | **☐** |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | | **☐** |
| ***High Risk*** | | | | **X** |
|  | **QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?** | | |  | |
| Check all that apply | | | **Comments** | |
| ***Principle 1: Human Rights*** | | | | **X** |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | | **X** |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | | | | **X** |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | | | | **X** |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | | | | **X** |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | | **☐** |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | | **X** |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | | **X** |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | | **☐** |

## Final Sign Off

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor |  | UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted. |
| QA Approver |  | UNDP senior manager, typically the Programme Unit Head, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (DRD), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC. |
| PAC Chair |  | UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC. |

## SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks** |  |
| **Principles 1: Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| 1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups? | Yes |
| 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? [[3]](#footnote-3) | Yes |
| 3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? | Yes |
| **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? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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?  *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 |
| **Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **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?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | No |
| 1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities? | Yes |
| 1.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (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? | Yes |
| 1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | Yes |
| 1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | 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?  *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.* | Yes |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |
| 2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[[4]](#footnote-4) greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change? | No |
| 2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change? | Yes |
| 2.3 Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) now or in the future (also known as maladaptive 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 |
| **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 |
| 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)? | Yes |
| **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? | Yes |
| 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)? | Yes |
| 5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[[5]](#footnote-5) | 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? | Yes |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| 6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)? | Yes |
| 6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | Yes |
| 6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)?  *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.* | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | No |
| 7.2 Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | No |
| 7.3 Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol* | 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 |

1. Oxfam: Kyauk Phyu: a Baseline socio-economic assessment,” 2016. (Not retrievable) see however, <https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Myanmar-SEZ-assessment-Publications-Reports-Thematic-reports-2017-ENG.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See namati for background on women and barriers to land ownership. <https://namati.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Namati-Gender-policy-brief-FINAL-1.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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.] [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)