

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	Creating Conditions for Peace in PNG Highlands
2. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+)	00104494
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Papua New Guinea
4. Project stage (Design or Implementation)	Design
5. Date	1 October 2020

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

Peacebuilding should be commensurate with access to human rights and justice. Therefore, a human rights-based and people-centred approach underpins the project that seeks to reach the most vulnerable to address inequalities, promote rights-holders' participation and enhance accountability, which lie at the heart of conflict and underdevelopment in both provinces. It is however recognized that efforts to increasing access to basic rights of one group may bring about an increase in social conflict, or efforts to prevent social conflict may inadvertently reinforce an unjust status quo and as such would require very deliberate consideration of and preventing unintended negative consequences.

The interventions have been selected based on the human-rights based behavioural change approach of the UN's Highlands Joint Programme. Outcome 1 is based on the theory that if the project is successful, we will see sustainable local peacebuilding mechanisms underpinned by women and youth empowerment and improved gender equality. This is one aspect of institutional behaviour change the project is seeking. Outcome 2 focuses on both local and government duty bearers while Outcome 3 is aimed at behaviour change within local government institutions.

Project include activities which supports sub-national governments in integrated development planning focus on strengthening conflict-sensitive service delivery by both government and private sector based on the National Medium Term Development Plan III as well as inclusive development planning which aims to involve communities and marginalized segments of communities in local development planning.

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

A human rights-based approach to development and gender mainstreaming are complementary and mutually reinforcing. Gender equality and women's empowerment permeates all the project activities, in addition to the specific women's and youth empowerment activities. The situation of both women and youth, and the structural causes of conflict, exclusion and poverty, cannot be addressed without providing these distinct target groups with a voice and space to participate in decisions affecting them uniquely.

- Design is informed by gender-sensitive context analysis based on feedback from women's focus group discussions including an analysis of gender inequalities in the project's rationale section
- Directly complements parallel work implemented by SPOTLIGHT project.
- Unique cultural and social barriers to women's potential participation have been identified in the project design and interventions designed to support them in overcoming them.
- Project specifically targets women as key beneficiaries with the intent of both empowering women with the necessary skills to engage in peacebuilding but also to create the space for women to exercise their rights and participate meaningfully in community decision-making and local peacebuilding efforts as peace agents.
- Incorporates age and sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics and specific, measurable indicators related to gender equality and women's empowerment
- Ensures the results framework includes outputs, and indicators to address gender inequality.

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

- Aims to create enabling conditions for planned complementary activities within the Highlands Joint Programme which directly support strengthening of community resilience including through alternative livelihoods and community-based disaster risk management.
- Promotes risk-informed interventions with actionable information from conflict mapping, conflict tracking and monitoring (as early warning systems) while strengthening local capacity to undertake conflict management and local government to exercise good governance.
- Contributes to the UNDAF outcomes:
 - Outcome 4.1 - By 2022, government agencies and non-government organizations working on good governance, peace and security have capacity and leadership to undertake measures to combat corruption, prevent violence and provide access to justice
 - Outcome 4.2 - By 2022, government agencies have a results-based, transparent and accountable governance system and equitable delivery of services.

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

- At the project management level, through oversight by the Highland Joint Programme Steering Committee to ensure continued alignment with programme objectives and delivery of results.
- At the field-level, planned accountability mechanisms including regular project interfacing/coordination (particularly through respective provincial coordination and monitoring committees) and regular community engagement planned (including community response mapping which helps track and analyze the feedback being collected and regular monitoring activities).
- Planned conduct of peace conferences are also platforms which will close accountability loop by having government, development (including the UN) and private sector actors present progress against development and peacebuilding priorities.

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

<p>Duty-bearers (i.e. community leaders; government officials) may not be able to meaningfully engage in the Project due to a combination of capacity gaps as well as lack of buy-in.</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 3</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The inability to engage in the project would result in the short-term to prevent improvements in the practice of good community leadership and local governance and limit the space for rights-holders to participate while in the longer-term lead to lack of institutionalization and sustainability of planned interventions.</p>	<p><u>Project design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-level political support has been received for project activities. • Seeking and receiving provincial financing of complementary activities. • Multifaceted stakeholder engagement plan has been conducted since the pre-design phase underpinned by a listening effort where community leaders and government officials' feedback (including focus-group discussions) were sought on specific areas of need in line with project's objectives. • Specific activities have been designed to capacitate engaged local leaders and government officials to exercise good community leadership and local governance. <p><u>Inception/Implementation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued stakeholder engagement through implementation of capacity building activities. • Strengthening of good practice through facilitation by specific project activities. • Regular engagement through planned accountability mechanisms including regular project interfacing/coordination (particularly through provincial coordination and monitoring committees).
<p>Rights-holders (i.e. community members, women, youth) may not be able to fully engage in the Project due to a combination of capacity gaps and social barriers.</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 3</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Due to extant social norms, rights holders (particularly women and youth) would be excluded from meaningfully participating in targeted interventions in the short-time while entrenching discriminatory social norms in the longer-term.</p>	<p><u>Project design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multifaceted stakeholder engagement plan has been conducted since the pre-design phase underpinned by a listening exercise where community members' feedback (including key informant interviews and focus-group discussions) was sought on specific areas of need in line with project's objectives. • Specific activities have been designed to capacitate and empower specific groups of community members (i.e. women and youth) to participate meaningfully. • Community powerholders/gatekeepers have also been engaged to ensure support and buy-in. <p><u>Inception/Implementation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued stakeholder engagement through implementation of capacity building activities. • Regular community engagement planned as well as through accountability mechanisms to be established including community response mapping and regular monitoring activities.
<p>Project interventions may exacerbate conflicts among and/or increase the risk of violence to communities and individuals within the project target locations.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Targeting specific communities may lead to or heighten pre-existing jealousies by adjacent communities leading to disruption of project implementation and trigger inter-communal conflicts.</p>	<p><u>Project design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community identification criteria was developed based on participatory approaches while community selection was done through broad-based stakeholder consultations including target and adjacent communities. • Peacebuilding interventions were consciously designed to not target beneficiary communities in isolation but create shared

				<p>value for target and adjacent communities including joint-community projects to foster increased inter-communal trust, co-ownership as confidence building measure.</p> <p><u>Inception/Implementation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balanced site selection based on assessed need while engaging with adjacent communities on shared value. Deliberate programme to initiate all UN personnel deployed in the Highlands on maintaining neutrality and impartiality including individually signing a code-of-conduct.
QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?				
	Low Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Moderate Risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(Table 5: 'SESP identifies risks and straightforward management measures and Incorporate management measures into ProDoc')	
	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>			

	Human Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Accountability	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Community Health, Safety and Security	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Displacement and Resettlement	<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 <i>Momenat Al-Khatib</i>	18-Dec-2020	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 <i>S. Vok</i>	21-Dec-2020	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.
PAC Chair <i>S. Vok</i>	21-Dec-2020	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?	Yes
<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?	Yes
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