

2. **Social and Environmental Screening Template**

[English][French][Spanish], including additional Social and Environmental Assessments or Management Plans as relevant. (NOTE: The SES Screening is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences, preparation of communication materials, strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences, partnership coordination and management of networks, or global/regional projects with no country level activities).

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) and [Toolkit](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Graduation-Based Social Protection (GBSP)
2. Project Number	TBA
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Cambodia

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's rationale is to promote the rights of the extreme poor, who suffer from considerable social and economic exclusion. As a pilot, its goal is the adoption by the national government at scale, of an asset-transfer social protection model, as opposed to the distinct delivery impacts. At core it is a human rights-based intervention, seeking to ensure participants, and beneficiaries of future schemes enjoy, permanent graduation from poverty and other forms of deprivation.

It adopts a randomized selection approach which aims to ensure the inclusion of all household groups (male and female headed, land-holding and landless, and from differing ethnicities). Its asset packages are also tailored to ensure all households can be included – with the final choice over the asset given to the participating households themselves. Efforts are made to ensure full transparency in project processes at the localities at which it will operate, and especially during selection. This includes oversight and consultation with local governments and communities. These arrangements will also include rights of access to information and (household) appeal.

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

While the project is household focussed (as poverty status is non-gender disaggregated), key features are embedded to promote gender quality within delivery. Notably:

1. A requirement that all cash payments are made to the most senior woman within the household;
2. Asset packages are tailored to meet the needs of female-headed households, and promote women's active participation within income generating activities (in all households), and field teams will seek to ensure women's engagement;
3. Randomized selection will also serve to remove any systemic gender biases in selection;
4. During the follow-on round, female-headed households can be prioritized more explicitly;
5. Training inputs will be sensitive to gender issues, and to the specifics of other disadvantaged households

Where possible, the project's M&E metrics are gender disaggregated, and end reporting required to evidence gender issues and mechanisms through which the (the follow on) round might be made more gender responsive.

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

The Project recognizes that its pilot activities, involving the transfer of agricultural assets (including livestock) to poor households, present certain environmental challenges.

Foremost, it is underlined that all asset bundles have been selected (in concert with expert partners) to provide a good fit with existing farming practices in Cambodia. They also aim to use neutral inputs, which are field tested.

Throughout the project, efforts will be made to ensure effective management and oversight of disease and sanitary risks. Qualified partner organizations, notably FAO will be involved in these efforts.

Additionally, environmental screening will take place at two stages:

1. Thoroughgoing assessments (at various sites) as part of the locality selection process having explicit regard to 7 challenges set out within the guidance, specifically bio-diversity impacts.
2. Rapid checks on screening and allocation of the assts to participant households.

These will be followed up during the trial. The major assessment will be revisited after the RCT and household practices will be monitored throughout the trial.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

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>		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>		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: The Project could 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.	I = N/A P =	No risks		
Risk 2: There is 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.	I = 2 P = 3	Low/ Moderate	Some issues re: RCT selection & use of nil control group	Inequality may result within communities, given use of RCT & a nil intervention group. Can be counteracted by undertaking trial arms at different locations & providing a possible route to inclusion within (later) treatment group (without any guarantee).
Risk 3: The Project could potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 4: 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 = 1 P = 3	Low	Systemic exclusion from ID poor possible	Weaknesses in the national poverty identification system may need to be corrected via additional screening processes.
Risk 5: There is a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project.	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 6: Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights	I = N/A P =	No risk		

Risk 7: There is a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 8: The Project would potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits	I = 1 P = 3	Low	Potential for HH decisions to be led by male head	Danger that gender biases are replicated in project supported livelihood activities. Use of staff advice/ guidance as countermeasure, with BCC inputs.
Risk 9: The Project would 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 = N/A P =			
Risk 10: The Project could potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Dangers of poor animal husbandry / cropping practices	Danger that HH farmers lack capacity to manage impacts of livelihood activities. Effective training & support is key counter measure. Important HH environmental assessment also guides management of assets.
Risk 11: The Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Ditto	Ditto
Risk 12: The Project activities would pose risks to endangered species	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 13: The Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species	I = 2 P = 5	Moderate	Project includes fishing option for poor HHs	Risk (in question) is not clear. Is there a prohibition on fishing per se? If so, this asset bundle can be removed. Harvesting impact is not strong however, given these are small-scale activities.
Risk 14: The Project would generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 15: The Project would 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	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 16: The potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 17: 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 = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 18: The elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning would pose potential safety risks to local communities?	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 19: The Project would pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Some potential sanitary issues around animal husbandry	Sanitary control & HH support are effective counter measures
Risk 20: The failure of structural elements of the Project would pose	I = N/A	No risk		

risks to communities (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	P =			
Risk 21: The proposed Project would be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 22: The Project would 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	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 23: 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)	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Informal worker status not changed	HHs would be engaged in informal work, which already not a desired end-state is preferred over poverty.
Risk 24: The proposed Project will 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)	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 25: The Project would 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)	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 26: There is a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 27: The proposed project would possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 28: The project would 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	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Some potential for release of fertilizer	Will be limited by use of low impact fertilizer & HH training/ support.
Risk 29: The proposed project would potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)	I = N/A P =	No risk		
Risk 30: The proposed project will 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>	I = N/A P =	No risk		

QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?		
Select one (see SESP for guidance)		Comments
<i>Low Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Moderate Risk</i>	X	Rights challenges given by RCT method; specifically, potential equity/ community cohesion issues. Some further (environmental) issues associated with livestock assets, and arable farming. However, all can successfully be countered by the existing project design.
<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
Check all that apply		Comments
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>	X	Some questions over use 2 treatment and a (nil) control group, and potential inequities. Needs some review and ongoing management, but effective counters are specified in the project design.
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>	X	Need to avoid embedded male bias. Counter measures in place.
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>	X	Danger of animal impacts, and fertiliser contamination. Support and oversight provide adequate counters
<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>	X	Minor issue over informality of work. Cannot be avoided in this connect however.
<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. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	X	Danger of fertilizer escape. Effectively countered, however.

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor:		Richard Marshall, Country Economist, UNDP KH
QA Approver:		
PAC Chair		