

Social and Environmental Screening

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Social Cohesion Through Youth Participation
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	00129289
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Kyiv, Ukraine
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Implementation
5. Date	08.07.2021

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?
<i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams the human rights-based approach</i>
<p>UNDP Ukraine has been following the so-called “Danish Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) model” since 2014¹, which rests on four pillars: “participation and inclusion”, “accountability”, “non-discrimination” and “transparency”. In terms of incorporating HRBA principles into the designed project, the project aims at strengthening social cohesion and promoting a national unity dialogue in Ukraine through youth inclusion in decision making, civic participation and engagement (participation and inclusion).</p> <p>The training programme for the youth centres as key youth policy implementation infrastructure actor on the subnational level is focusing on the four areas identified by the key partners, namely: 1. Diversity, non-discrimination and counteracting hate speech (non-discrimination); 2. Participation in decision making and advocacy (participation); 3. Media literacy, key approaches and tools for misinformation awareness and counteraction 4. Constructive / non-constructive communication in the modern, approaches to conflict transformation.</p>
<i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment</i>
<p>While the project is not explicitly designed to target gender equality (hence, its Gender marker: GEN 2), the project will ensure gender mainstreaming by supporting the efforts of young Ukrainian women in promoting greater social cohesion and a sense of national unity through dialogue at the local, regional and national levels. The project ensures equal involvement of young men and women both in educational and training activities and collects sex-dis-aggregated data.</p>
<i>Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience</i>

¹ Please see: http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/evaluation_study_november_2016/Pdf/evaluation_study_november_2016.pdf

The project is not explicitly designed to target environmental sustainability as a standalone objective. As far as resilience is concerned, the project contributes to promotion of tolerance and inclusivity, building strong community identities, strengthening trust and relationship between peers and building confidence between young men and women and the authorities, promotion of consensus building and maintaining contacts and dialogues among different regions of Ukraine.

The sustainability of the project approach was reinforced as the “social cohesion among youth” theme was identified as one of the key priorities in recently adopted State Target Social Programme “Youth of Ukraine 2025”.

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

The project performs its activities in partnership with the Ministry of Youth and Sport and the All-Ukrainian Youth Centre (AUYC), which serves as a knowledge hub for subnational youth centres and subnational authorities. As such, the project makes sure that its target Ministry and AUYC are using their regular channels for information disclosure and proactive citizen awareness-raising in line with Ukraine's laws and regulations on freedom of information. The project also proactively uses platforms of its sister-projects (conferences, seminars, online public events) to share information with broader constituencies and call onto the stakeholders to explore the progress made towards strengthened social cohesion through youth inclusion in decision making, civic participation and engagement. UNDP Ukraine, as a country office, also proactively informs the public about the project, its progress, the government partners involved and expected results to be achieved.

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
No Risks identified as per SESP Attachment 1				
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?			
	Low Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low impact and probability	
	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>Status? (completed, planned)</i>
<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"/>		

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

Final Sign Off

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

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor <u>Olena Kulikovska</u> Olena Kulikovska, Programme Analyst, Governance	22-Jul-2021	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. The final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver <u>Manal Fouani</u> Manal Fouani, Deputy Resident Representative	22-Jul-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. The final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP before submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair <u>Manal Fouani</u> Manal Fouani, Deputy Resident Representative	22-Jul-2021	UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases, PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. The 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 the 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?	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?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
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?	No
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?	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		
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?	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?	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 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?	No
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)?	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 labour 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)?	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?	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
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	No

	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)?	
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 the use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs?	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