

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 annex 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	Mayors for Economic Growth Facility
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	00133169
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Istanbul Regional Hub – project to be implemented in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Inception phase/implementation
5. Date	April 2021

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

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Programming Principles in Order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach

The project has an ‘up-stream’ component as it seeks to support local authorities/municipalities/cities with their local development planning for a more green, prosperous, and inclusive societies. Hence, the SES 5 principles and 8 standards will be considered for each new generation local economic development plan (LEDP) that the project will support to devise. The other key component of the project constitutes a so-called down-stream small scale activities (approx. 40% of the project budget) of grants/investment from two funding mechanisms. Here, each call for proposal Guidance Note will include reference to the SES and its screening procure (e.g. a light version of this form) in order to best manage any risks (both threats and opportunities).

The National Steering Mechanisms, which will act as learning and exchange platforms, and feed-back mechanism to ensure the project is delivering in line with relevant priorities, as described in the Description of Action. A National Steering Group and National Forum will be set up in each country per guidelines drafted in the inception phase of the project. The NSG will conduct and maintain the national stakeholder mapping, and national risk assessments and monitoring.

The project team intends to apply a duty bearer/right holder lens, i.e. see how international human rights instruments (e.g. CEDAW, ICCPR, ICESCR etc.) can be brought in as frame and entry point for policy and programming. This could for example be in the updated guidance doc on developing a Local Economic Development Plan 2.0, and as a module or similar in the Urban Learning Center which the project will devise for municipalities part of the M4EG Network.

Additionally, the project will promote the inclusion of voices and engagement of ‘unusual suspects’ in local economic planning, e.g. youth activists, grass root organizations and other civil society groups that traditionally do not ‘reach’ the decision-makers at the local level. This will be done through inter alia applying ‘deep listening’ exercises and tools as part of the portfolio approach.

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

The GEWE principle is featured in the Project Document and the team wishes to ensure that gender mainstreaming is embedded in all activities. Beyond ensuring gender parity in people trained, staff, panel and events, this would entail including a module on GEWE as part of the Local Economic Development Plans planning, and a separate training module on GEWE in urban transformation and planning, and potentially SDG and/or gender-based budgeting, the latter where UNDP has good experience and tools (in partnership with UN Women). It is also the aim that the members of the regional Project Team and country offices project staff have sound experience in gender mainstreaming and/or will undergo training and learning session on GEWE as well as applying the UN/DP framework of Leaving No One Behind (LNOB).

The project will explore how a LNOB lens, i.e. the intersection between various identities, including marginalization etc., can/will play in and be addressed in order to devise plans and initiatives (through the grants) to ensure that inequalities and marginalization are not reproduced through the project activities but rather challenged and the lived experience for all regardless identity affiliation is improved.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience

The entire project is about promoting sustainability and resilience. Quoted from the DoA: “The program will focus on the medium and long-term needs of local authorities & building their capacities to withstand shocks, as well as diversifying financing to support economic development results in Eastern Partnership countries” (pg. 3)

“The action will seek to develop portfolios that enable better distribution of resources to meet needs, and cut across governance (i.e. creating spaces for enhanced participation of citizens, improving transparency & accountability, transitioning to digital, open & inclusive governance models), economy (i.e. strengthening local economies, entrepreneurs & innovators, testing new & green business models) & environment (i.e. green retrofitting, renewal of public spaces, transition to more sustainable services, and climate resilient infrastructure).” (pg. 4)

“From the local authority perspective, the project will seek to build cross-cutting teams between the Mayors office, the civil servants, private sector and civil society, around shared objectives. Through the different learning mechanisms, the project will build capabilities of constituencies within local authorities and enable sustainability.” (pg. 25)

The project was designed and continues to be shaped by the uncertainty and complexity of a global pandemic. Resilience and bouncing back from the pandemic will be a key feature and consideration in both the LEDP, the portfolio development and activation, and the many learning and exchanges between the Mayor/municipalities planned.

Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders

The National Steering Mechanism will support meaningful participation and inclusion of stakeholders, including a variety of citizens/residents’ groups as relevant to country context. The NSM acts as a feedback mechanism for country and regional level implementation.

The revised LEDP methodology will ensure a strong focus on actively including voices from marginalized individuals and groups.

Cities that will undergo portfolio development and activation, and the relevant activities to enhance capabilities at local level, will include participation of ‘unusual’ suspects, grassroots, women’s organization, youth activist, diaspora/migrants’ voices and others are relevant to the local context. It is the aim that for example deep listening tools will ensure that voices often not heard in a city context are captured.

The Guidance Documents for the application and implementation of the Innovation Projects and Portfolio Call for Proposal, will include a stand alone section on the SES and its screening, and information on UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? <i>Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.</i>	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 5</i>			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: Grants/investments/pilots implemented by Local Authorities cause harm <u>Event:</u> Push-back, critique of the initiative and its activities <u>Cause:</u> on-the-group initiatives do not adequately consider and monitor risks <u>Impact:</u> Negative consequences for people and planet	I = 2 L = 1	Low	The grants/investments are low-scale in nature, i.e. up to USD 70k per intervention.	All applications for accessing grants/investments for pilots will include a SE screening procedure based on the UNDP SES policy. Depending on the nature of the suggested grant, further action, including possibly targeted assessments will be conducted. The Country Office teams will monitor the implementation, including assess the ability of the Responsible Party/Municipality/Local Authority, to adequately monitor risks.									
Risk 2: risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project <u>Event:</u> groups/residents are left out, do not benefit from the project activities. <u>Cause:</u> lack of participatory planning and execution of pilots and similar activities. learning initiatives <u>Impact:</u> reproducing/exacerbating stereotypes, inequalities, discrimination [add additional rows as needed]	I:2 L:1	Low		The aim of the project is to introduce new tools to manage complexity in development challenges, including tools around listening, collective intelligence and co-creation and approaches to ensure that no one is left behind, nor that inequalities are reproduced. Cities/municipalities part of the Mayors' Facility, when applying for the funding calls, will have to put forward plans on engaging the various stakeholders, including facilitating inclusion and voices from unusual suspects in local development, as well as reflect on current capacities to ensure such implementation.									
QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Low Risk</td> <td style="width: 5%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 35%;">As of the time of the inception phase, the project is rated as low. This will be revisited once the grants (low-scale interventions) are allocated (end 2021 or beginning of 2022) as these will involve on-the-ground activities around urban transformations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moderate Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Substantial Risk</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>					Low Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As of the time of the inception phase, the project is rated as low. This will be revisited once the grants (low-scale interventions) are allocated (end 2021 or beginning of 2022) as these will involve on-the-ground activities around urban transformations.	Moderate Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>		Substantial Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Low Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	As of the time of the inception phase, the project is rated as low. This will be revisited once the grants (low-scale interventions) are allocated (end 2021 or beginning of 2022) as these will involve on-the-ground activities around urban transformations.											
Moderate Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Substantial Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>												

High Risk <input type="checkbox"/>	
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	
<i>Is assessment required? (check if "yes")</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>if yes, indicate overall type and status</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted assessment(s) <input type="checkbox"/> ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) <input type="checkbox"/> SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment)
<i>Are management plans required? (check if "yes")</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>if yes, indicate overall type</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) <input type="checkbox"/> ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) <input type="checkbox"/> ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework)
<i>Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?</i>	Comments (not required)
<i>Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind</i>	
<i>Human Rights</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Accountability</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Security</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>7. Labour and Working Conditions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Final Sign Off

Final Screening at the design-stage is not complete until the following signatures are included

Signature	Date	Description
<p>QA Assessor Tina Maria Saeteraas Stoum, Programme Specialist/ Project Manager a.i.</p> <p><i>Tina Stoum</i></p>	31-May-2021	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.
<p>QA Approver Ekaterina Paniklova, Chief, Country Solutions and Regional Programme Coordination</p> <p><i>Ekaterina Paniklova</i></p>	31-May-2021	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.
<p>PAC Chair Agi Veres, Deputy Regional Director, RBEC</p> <p><i>Agi Veres</i></p>	31-May-2021	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 for further guidance on addressing screening questions.		
Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind		Answer (Yes/No)
Human Rights		
P.1	Have local communities or individuals raised human rights concerns regarding the project (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
P.2	Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project?	Yes
P.3	Is there a risk that rights-holders (e.g. project-affected persons) do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.4	adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
P.5	inequitable or discriminatory impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups, including persons with disabilities? ¹	No
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
P.7	exacerbation of conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
P.8	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project, (e.g. during the stakeholder engagement process, grievance processes, public statements)?	No
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
P.9	adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
P.10	reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
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? <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
P.12	exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence? <i>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.</i>	No
Sustainability and Resilience: Screening questions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below		

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.

Accountability		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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?	No
P.14	grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders?	No
P.15	risks of retaliation or reprisals against stakeholders who express concerns or grievances, or who seek to participate in or to obtain information on the project?	No
Project-Level Standards		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
1.1	adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2	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? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.12	handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms? ²	No
1.13	utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development) ³	No
1.14	adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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?	No

² See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#).

³ See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](#) and its [Nagoya Protocol](#) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources.

	<i>For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes</i>	
2.3	increases in vulnerability to climate change impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping 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
2.4	increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change?	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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	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		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		
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)? <i>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</i>	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? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above</i>	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? <i>Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.</i>	No
Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)</i>		
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		
<i>Would the project potentially involve or lead to:</i>		

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.

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?	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? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Montreal Protocol, Minamata Convention, Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, Stockholm Convention</i>	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