

ANNEX IV. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Stakeholder Engagement for Uranium Legacy Remediation in Central Asia. Phase II
2. Project Number	
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan

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 mainstreams a human rights-based approach by designing project interventions (e.g. Socio-economic development projects and models of integrated local actions and mechanisms for people participation into local decision-making process, to reduce radiological risks in the Legacy Sites) which are inclusive and gender sensitive. The project promotes bottom up approaches local socio-economic remediation measures to be implemented by the national/local authorities which will empower local communities and will create a sense of ownership, building their trust in local and national government decision makers. Activities are aligned with the people-centered “leaving no one behind” approach of the Sustainable Development 2030 Agenda, which calls for increased inclusiveness and participation of the governance processes.

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

The project will, through both its hard and soft interventions, safeguard local communities and their assets from radiological risks in ULS with attention promoting gender equitable participation in decision-making processes, as well as ensuring that information-sharing, awareness raising, and training and capacity building activities are also implemented in a gender responsive manner. Project activities will include more in depth analysis of the gender and social inclusion dimensions of uranium risk management, while ensuring that all activities are implemented in a manner that accounts for the differential needs of women, girls, men and boys, as well as the elderly, disabled, and the extremely marginalized: some examples are: (i) the model of socio-economic interventions will include recommendations to national authorities on ways of integrating gender-sensitive disaster risk management and resilience measures into the social-economic interventions at community level; (ii) this phase of the project is designed to ensure that the needs and concerns of gender and youth are identified, addressed to generate a strong demand within local communities to engage women, youth and disadvantaged groups in the governance of ULSs. Gender equality and women and youth empowerment will be a distinct part of the project’s strategy, thus ensuring that all necessary preconditions for equal engagement of men and women, girls and

boys in the ULSs governance, are created. Targeted and simple interventions in these directions could also contribute to more conducive environment for the remediation activities to be implemented under the SMP.

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

The project has mainstreamed environmental sustainability by including environmental safeguards issues in the project design including the results of previous phase of the project (in terms of sustainable environmental solutions in the ULS) and by designing carefully tailored environmental safeguards against radiological risks in the project sites.

Furthermore, the project builds the capacity of all participating countries to take an integrated approach against the degrading quality of environment and natural risk hazards and have provided very concrete suggestions for improvement of the resilience to natural hazards which may spread the uranium on large surfaces. Integrated DRR gender sensitive policy planning will be undertaken and ensure sustainability. Integrated socio-economic models for local ULS governance and the awareness raising and capacity building activities on environmental risks will ensure that local population and local decision makers are increasingly aware of the necessity to mainstream environmental safeguards into local policies, programmes and plans in an inclusive participatory manner, while local population will be increasingly aware of their rights to participate. Concrete local actions against the risks of radiological risks, through sustainable environment-friendly measures, will be undertaken (e.g.: socio-economic measures resulting in increased livelihoods by support to income generating activities and small businesses; environmental measures; improve the resilience of local communities to manage shocks, such as natural disasters, through disaster risk mitigation; awareness raising activities related to potential health risks associated with the Uranium Legacy Sites, etc.).

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks




<p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p>	<p>Risk Description</p>	<p>Impact and Probability (1-5)</p>	<p>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Risk 1: The project could exclude potentially affected social groups, from fully participating in decision making, that may affect them and decrease social impact of project implementation.</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>According to the Risk Perception and Capacity Building Assessment conducted under the Phase I project, the local communities, although largely unaware of the risks associated with radiological waste have provided very concrete suggestions for improvement of the resilience to natural hazards which may spread</p>	<p>The project will work with local NGOs and CSOs, and local authorities to include the most disadvantage social groups to benefit from the concrete local remediation actions (some taken in synergy with other inclusive demo and small grants programme) implemented, through participatory approaches entailing rigorous screening and appraisal processes involving local regional/oblast and rural coordination committees and rayon’s commissions.</p>			

			<p>the uranium on large surfaces. This highlighted the critical importance of increasing the local community's awareness on the radiological risks and enhancing their participation into the ULS' management, especially the representatives of small vulnerable groups (minorities, women, youth, poor households etc) through concrete pilot demonstration projects, which are expected to increase resilience and strengthen livelihoods, to building ownership and civic engagement on the ground.</p>	
<p>Risk 2: The Project could potentially reproduce discriminations against women, especially regarding participation in design and implementation of pilot social-environmental projects or limit their access to opportunities and benefits.</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Given the existing conditions regarding gender equality in existing related institutions in ULS management, project interventions will have to be designed in a sensitive manner to avoid reinforcing existing inequalities.</p>	<p>Gender mainstreaming in project design and carefully tailored capacity building and awareness resigning activities will be implemented, mainstream gender considerations, principally regarding the capacity building, training and decision-making aspects of the project, development and implementation of pilot social-environmental projects.</p>
<p>Risk 3: National and local partners do not have the enough capacity to meet their obligations over the maintenance of risk reduction</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The project requires that national and local authorities will implement the proposed inclusive</p>	<p>The stakeholder consultations which took place in the project preparation phase-built buy-in among both national and local govt. counterparts (as well as local communities) to both provide adequate (in</p>

<p>infrastructure and social and environmental sustainability requirements for the project.</p>			<p>decision-making processes and socio-economic models in the ULS, including reinforcement of laws and regulations, and access to data, pertaining to remediation measures. The current data base with publicly available information is relatively insufficient, and capacities of national and local authorities needs strengthening. Capacity of local govt. officers to monitor the radiological risks compounded by climate change induced risks of natural hazards, remain low.</p>	<p>kind) support, man-power and capacity for the implementation of the local measures and proposed socio-economic models as well as awareness and capacity building/training activities. By leveraging technical environmental co-operation as an entry point to promote co-operation and build confidence, and its value added as a neutral dialogue broker and convener, UNDP has been implementing successful multi stakeholders' participatory approaches that has built trust and awareness in the benefits of the whole-of-government, inclusive approaches.</p>
<p>Risk 4: Potential outcomes of the project will be sensitive to impacts of climate change, which can compound radiological risks and impacting social and environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 2</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Local measures piloted in the selected ULS may not account for future projections of floods, storms exacerbated by climate change and may not accurately assess the existing radiological risks and raise social and environmental risks.</p>	<p>The project activities aiming at implementing pilot demo projects at local level, will involve design of contingency plans (if necessary) prefeasibility studies etc and/or will take into consideration recorded radiological data; environment and hydrological meteorological data to make informed decisions regarding the local measures and pilot projects (e.g. to prevent any construction work in flood prone areas). In addition, the project will lay the foundation for designing, resourcing and implementing gender sensitive disaster risk reduction policies plans and programmes to be implemented synergically with remediation measures.</p>

	6. Indigenous Peoples	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
Stanislav Kim, DRR programme specialist, 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.
Armen Grigoryan, CDT team leader, 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.
Gerd Trogemann, IRH manager, 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.

QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?			Comments
Select one (see <u>SESP</u> for guidance)			
<i>Low Risk</i>	X		Reluctance of national /local authorities to promote open and inclusive multi stakeholders' dialogues and insufficient capacities to implement proposed measures.
<i>Moderate Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?			Comments
Check all that apply			
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	X		Risks of inadvertent exclusion of most vulnerable groups, to which the project will respond by actively seeking to promote inclusiveness of local engagements.
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	X		Tailored gender sensitive M&E Plan will be devised at the Inception Phase, including cooperation with local NGOs.
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	X		The project will design local pilot demonstration projects in coordination with other small grants programmes (UNDP and of ENVSEC partners) based on solid environmental sustainability principles.
<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks	
Principles 1: Human Rights	Answer (Yes/No)
1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ¹¹	No
3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	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?	No
7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	
1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	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?	No
4. Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	

¹¹ 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.

1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?	No
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	No
1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area?	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ¹² 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 now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No

¹² In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.2	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)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ¹³	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No

¹³ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3	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)?	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	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? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	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