# Social and Environmental Screening Template (PIMS 6377)

*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 | Promote Wildlife Conservation and Responsible Nature Based Tourism for Sustainable Development in Vietnam |
| 1. Project Number (i.e., Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | PIMS+ 6377 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | Vietnam |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | PPG |
| 1. Date | 14 June 2022 |

**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 will uphold human rights principles, by ensuring inclusiveness and equitable distribution of development opportunities and benefits, including to women, ethnic minorities (EMs) and marginalized groups. The development of nature-based tourism ventures and public-private partnerships at protected areas will be built around greater participation and inclusion of local communities (including EMs) and aim to generate meaningful economic and ‘green’ employment benefits for them, in keeping with their traditional resource use, cultural and social values. The project’s efforts to mainstream sustainable tourism standards across the government’s tourism growth agenda will help mitigate environmental and social impacts from excessive tourism growth and conserve environmental resources on which tourism is based for the long-term benefit of local communities. Project design and implementation has, and will continue to be built around meaningful engagement, participation and inclusion of stakeholders, at national level and at project demonstration PA sites. The project will promote accountability and transparency and develop a grievance redress process to address any conflicts in resource use and benefit sharing. The project interventions would ultimately sustain the livelihoods of local communities that would result in poverty alleviation, improvement of living conditions of beneficiaries and sustainable development of natural resources through non-consumptive use. In this way it will improve the economic and social rights of the local communities and support retention of cultural values and practices.  The project will bring into sharper focus the rights and responsibilities of the two groups of human rights stakeholders (i.e., primary duty bearers, and rights holders) that are major implementers of the project as follows:   * **Rights holders**, who are Vietnamese rural women and men. Amongst the population of women and men, a greater number belongs to the poor and marginalized sector such as ethnic minorities, rural women, farmers, and forest and marine resource dependents. This project will ensure that their rights are exercised by facilitating their own capacity to think, act, organize, and advocate these rights; and * **Primary duty-bearers**, which comprise the State, with all its agencies and instrumentalities. This project will ensure their mandate will respect, protect, promote and fulfill the rights of the poor and marginalized sectors/groups (such as ethnic minorities, rural women, farmers, and forest and marine resource dependents) in all spheres of life.   Across Components, demonstration activities of the project will be designed to include greater participation of local communities (particularly EMs, rural women, farmers’ cooperatives, NGOs/CSOs, etc.) through various capacity building strategies related to policy, program, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management on nature-based tourism and biodiversity conservation, human rights, gender equality, and EM’s perspectives so that the provisions of the project are carried out and the intended results are achieved at the end of the project implementation period and beyond. A series of gender, biodiversity and nature-based tourism capacity building programs will be developed for local communities and EMs at all levels (with equal representation of women and men).  Following UNDP SES 6 requirements, an Indigenous People (/Ethnic Minorities) Planning Framework (IPPF) has been developed at PPG stage, with the purpose of identifying potential impacts to EMs and helping in the design of project components that are able to reduce and mitigate any such impacts, promote greater participation and benefit sharing for EMs, ensure that their cultural and traditional lifestyles are protected and these groups are represented in key decision-making bodies at the PA level and beyond. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| A gender specialist was recruited to undertake a gender analysis at the PPG stage, in accordance with standard UNDP procedure, to identify the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men as they relate to engagement in activities in the nature-based tourism and related sectors.  The results of the gender analysis conducted during the PPG have been integrated into the project design to ensure that gender-based differences are built into project activities as appropriate, and gender-disaggregated targets developed as indicators of project’s success. An evaluation was undertaken during project preparation in order to assess opportunities to enhance the status of women in respect to nature-based tourism, agriculture and land management and conservation activities, livelihood improvements, to address the gender gap in the nature-based tourism sector and to help design project activities and indicators that will ensure women’s full participation as beneficiaries (and deliverers) of technical cooperation and knowledge building efforts. During project inception, consultation sessions was held to obtain views and inputs of a wide range of local stakeholders, including women (including ethnic minority women) and vulnerable women, to further refine project activities and to inform a robust stakeholder involvement plan with full gender considerations. A corresponding gender mainstreaming plan for the project has been completed and submitted with the project document at time of CEO Endorsement. Gender-disaggregated targets and indicators have been included within the project results framework. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| This project aims to address the adverse impacts of unsustainable tourism development practices by trying to establish and operationalize a comprehensive planning and management approach to tourism development that integrates sustainable management of natural resources and conservation of biodiversity in major high biodiversity tourism destinations. The project’s intervention is to ensure that existing protected areas and high conservation value areas in tourism destinations are managed to support viable populations of globally threatened species and maintain natural ecosystems and processes and help maintain, improve and recovery of these natural systems, including the ability to adapt to potential external developments and climatic shocks.  During the PPG stage, analysis was undertaken to help design governance structures that promote a holistic, multi-sectoral and integrated approach to nature-based tourism that facilitates the maintenance of the ecological integrity of the high biodiversity tourism destinations. The design process of the project also sought means to strengthen the role of communities (including EMs), local provincial and local government institutions, community-based organizations and non-governmental organizations in sustainable nature-based tourism management, climate risk management and biodiversity conservation.  At PPG stage, analysis was undertaken to identify appropriate measures (guidelines, protocols and regulations) for establishing tourism carrying capacity, impact assessment, adaptive monitoring and enforcement of measures to deter illegal and unsustainable harvest and removal of forest and marine resources, and wildlife and wildlife products, along with activities that can help change behaviors of tourists and tour providers.  The ESMF (that was developed at PPG stage) has helped identify potential environmental threats and measures to mitigate such threats. The design of the project has also included establishing a monitoring framework to help measure the impacts of tourism related activities on key species and habitats (e.g., coral reefs, sea grass beds, mangroves and sensitive habitats) that could inform adaptive measures to resource management. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| At PPG stage consultations were undertaken with communities, ethnic minorities and other stakeholders to better understand their interaction and dependencies with the landscape (natural resources such as land, forests and marine resources), their rights and interests, territories, traditional livelihoods and determine when FPIC applies in accordance with national contexts and preferences. This has led to the development of a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan that identifies culturally appropriate means of participation of stakeholders in project design, management and monitoring and ensure that such measures are inclusive, participatory and transparent. As part of the project’s design, a participatory framework was developed to ensure that stakeholders (mainly communities, EMs, vulnerable groups and women) have free and fair access to information in a timely manner, can actively participate as equal partners in the design and implementation of activities, ensure transparency, inclusiveness and equity in resource and benefit sharing, and development of a grievance redressal systems to resolve and manage conflict. |

**Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?**  *Note: Complete SESP Attachment 1 before responding to Question 2.* | **QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?**  *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5below before proceeding to Question 5* | | | | | **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: Given the presence of ethnic minorities in both PA sites, certain key project outputs/components will require the informed consent (FPIC) of ethnic minorities before the implementation of these activities. This is particularly the case for project supported activities on the development of local nature-based tourism products and experiences, as well as participation during project design and the implementation.*  *Ethnic m*inority *communities might not be aware of the consent-giving process or be fully capacitated to give FPIC in accordance with international and national policies. Consultation and engagement with local communities has been limited during the design of the project (due to national Covid-19 restrictions) which has further exacerbated issues surrounding PAPs ability to give consent in line with the requirements of UNDP SES 6.*  Principle (Human Rights): P.3, P.4, P.5.  Principle (Accountability): P.13  Standard 6: 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.7  Outputs:, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5,, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 | I = 4  L = 3 | **Substantial** | Ethnic minorities are present at the two PA sites. Although consultations were carried out with some communities and ethnic minorities during the PIF phase, there has not yet been consent obtained from these communities on nature-based tourism development (and potential products and services). The two PA sites are already subject to tourism with tourism-related impacts emerging from unsustainable use. | | **Assessment:** During the PPG initial consultations were undertaken with local communities and ethnic minorities. These initial consultations enabled the project to consult with potentially affected Ems, and to devise an FPIC precure that was culturally appropriate and agreeable to the EMs. The indicative FPIC procedure had been included within the project’s IPPF , and shall be followed during project implementation.  During project inception and implementation. further consultations will be undertaken with communities and ethnic minorities to better understand their interaction and dependencies with the landscape (natural resources such as land, forests, and marine resources), their rights and interests, territories, traditional livelihoods. During these consultations, efforts will be made to assess their understanding and capacity to give consent and to further tailor the proposed FPIC procedure based on community preferences and practices.  **Management:** An Indigenous People/Ethnic Minorities Planning Framework (IPPF/EMPF) with FPIC procedures has been developed during the PPG, following consultations with EMs in the two proposed PA sites. The framework outlines measures for issues such as appropriate nature-based tourism and livelihood activities that are culturally appropriate, how to ensure appropriate resource use and benefit sharing and recognize ethnic community rights to ecosystem-based forest, marine and land management, etc. A GRM has also been developed during the PPG phase that serves as a mechanism to ensure that ethnic minority concerns are heard during project implementation and conflict is resolved. As per UNDP policy, guidelines, and toolkit on SES, the IPPF and the GRM are included in the ESMF.  The development of a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been undertaken at PPG stage. The SEP identifies culturally appropriate means of participation of stakeholders in project design, management and monitoring and ensures that such measures are inclusive, participatory, and transparent. | | | | |
| *Risk 2:* Project-related policy changes could lead to new tourism activities and potential cessation/reduction of existing operations.  *This in-turn could lead to conflicts with local communities in and surrounding the PA sites.*  *Conflicts could arise as a result of project components 1, 2, and 3 . Potential conflicts could include disagreements between local governments and local communities or tourism operators or communities depending on particular views and interests in tourism development.*  Principle (Human Rights): P.7  Principle (Accountability): P.14  Standard 6: 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.7  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.2, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Community members could have differing views on the development of nature-based tourism and their respective roles. Project-related policy changes could lead to new tourism activities and potential cessation/reduction of existing operations. This could lead to conflict within communities if there are differing views and/or conflict between government that affects their current practices. There could also be conflicts across stakeholders including with PA staff on cessation of community activities, stricter rules and enforcement etc. Private sector interests in tourism development and operation might not align with those of community, etc. causing additional conflicts. | | **Assessment:** Further assessment during PPG phase was undertaken to assess the potential for exacerbation of conflict (see the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, IPPF/EMPF, and project’s ESMF). The potential for conflicts will be an issue that must be continually assessed/screened throughout the implementation of the project, as certain activities are initiated. Consultations will be held with affected communities, local governments, and tourism operators at proposed demonstration sites to also seek views and inputs on tourism development/ management and appropriate conflict resolution mechanisms.  **Management:**  E&S risks associated with upstream/policy changes will be assessed through the conduct of a SESA. The SESA will include specific requirements and guidance on management and control measures for risks that may emanate from upstream project supported activities, including conflicts with local ethnic minorities within the project’s area of influence.  The ESMF includes a project specific GRM to address and manage any conflict situations that may arise during implementation.  At the national level, the project will support preparation of standards and guidelines for community consultation, governance and benefit sharing for tourism within high biodiversity destinations during the project.  Based on discussions and confirmations during the PPG phase, a SESA approach will be required to be applied to development of the standards and guidelines during project implementation. | | | | |
| *Risk 3: Nature-based tourism development might not fully incorporate or reflect views of women and girls and ensure equitable opportunities for their involvement and benefit as well in decision-making on resource use and management.*  Principle (Gender): P.8, P.9, P.10, P.11 and P.12  Standard 7: 7.5  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Compared to men, women have less access to, and control over the resources that they depend upon for food and income. Over 50% of poor and near-poor farmers in the project’s target areas are women. There is also differing natural resource use roles for men and women and different potential economic opportunities linked to nature-based tourism development. Further, because of traditional family roles, most women have little time available to travel or attend meetings. In addition, the planning process at the local level does not fully recognize the role of women as agents of positive change. As a result, there might likely be fewer opportunities for women’s participation. | | **Assessment:** A gender specialist was recruited to undertake a gender analysis during the PPG stage. This analysis included specific consultations with women and girls in the demonstration PAs.  **Management:** A gender mainstreaming action plan was prepared at PPG stage which identifies specific measures on gender mainstreaming within both national-level (upstream) activities and demonstration activities to ensure nature-based tourism opportunities and economic benefits also flow to women and girls. Additionally, specific livelihood options have been identified for women. The gender action plan includes specific indicators to measure women’s participation in decision-making, nature-based tourism activities and benefit sharing.  The comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan also includes identification of women’s engagement in project related activities. | | | | |
| *Risk 4: The project interventions could cause/support activities that lead (either directly or indirectly) to impacts of changed amount/type of tourism and/or nature-based tourism and increasing demand for nature-based products on sensitive habitats or ecosystems (e.g., soil/vegetation erosion, waste, sewage, IAS spread) or threatened or harvested species*  Standard 1: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, and 1.10  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Proposed interventions on nature-based tourism products and livelihood improvements could have impacts on sensitive habitats/species if not carefully planned and executed. Additionally, poorly managed application of carrying capacity and standards could fail to stem tourism’s environmental impacts or inadvertently increase them. | | **Assessment:** At PPG, the existing standards, guidelines, and procedures being applied to the tourism sector were evaluated to assess their adequacy to manage impacts on critical ecosystems and identify measures to strengthen nature-based tourism guidelines and standards (for adherence to the UNDP SES), and their application (i.e., the need for assessing capacity of PA staff to implement such guidelines and associated capacity strengthening measures).  The project’s ESMF (developed during the PPG phase) outlines the requirements/procedures that demonstration activities must follow, including provisions for guidance on the inclusion of appropriately scoped SESA, ESIA, and ESMP during project implementation.  **Management:** Under Component 1, national policies, guidelines, and standards for nature-based tourism will be updated or new guidelines developed (fulfilling or exceeding SES requirements) to reflect use of EIA/ESIA for placement and management of nature-based tourism activities to avoid impacts on sensitive habitats, ensure such operations are within carrying capacity of habitats, and identify and manage social impacts of changed tourism (including potential restrictions). Project-developed standards for nature-based tourism development and operations will be designed to reflect best practices to avoid, mitigate and manage the range of potential environmental impacts. | | | | |
| *Risk 5: The Project may involve the harvesting of NTFP from natural forests and marine resources for proposed livelihoods and small-scale community enterprises, which could inadvertently adversely affect critical habitats.*  Standard 1: 1.8  Outputs: 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, | I = 3  L =3 | **Moderate** | All the livelihood and community enterprises will need to be managed within permissible sustainable harvest limits to ensure that these activities do not inadvertently adversely affect critical habitats. | | **Assessment:** As part of the IPPF/EMPF (and more broadly the development of the project’s ESMF**)** , a preliminary assessment was undertaken to understand what natural resources are likely to be used for livelihood and small-scale enterprise development, ascertain the status and availability of these resources and if these can be sustainably harvested for use, any concerns regarding use of these resources, measures needed to ensure sustainable use, monitoring protocols to ascertain the status of these species, needed management measures/safeguards, etc. Specific procedures (for fully screening, assessing and managing activities related to harvesting of NTFPs and marine resources during implementation) have been prepared during the PPG, as part of the ESMF. This includes the requirement for scoped ESIA’s to be undertaken, which will further asses impacts relating to harvesting of NTFP.  **Management:** The ensuing ESMP that will be developed in early project implementation period will indicate measures and tools that would be used to manage and monitor sub-project activities that include harvest of natural resources and small-scale community enterprises that depend on these resources. | | | | |
| *Risk 6: Nature-based tourism development could result in damage to sacred sites and cultural sites, including through inappropriate tourist behavior (e.g., desecration of cultural site), and/or could harm/change intangible cultural heritage (e.g., traditional knowledge) through its commercialization and use in ecotourism*  Standard 4: 4.1, 4.3 and 4.5  Standard 6: 6.8, 6.9  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | Most project sites are already subject to some level of tourism, although there is the chance that the project could develop new products or experiences that have inadvertent negative impacts on cultural sites or heritage, including culturally inappropriate use or appropriation of traditional knowledge or practices of ethnic minorities, e.g., the caves at Phong Nha Ke Bang NP. There is possibility that the project could inadvertently encourage tourists that are culturally insensitive/likely to offend local ethnic minority communities, although this is generally not the type of tourist targeted by nature-based tourism. | | **Assessment:** Initial assessment of ethnic minorities in project sites and potential impacts on their cultural sites/heritage, as well as start of FPIC processes to inform project design, has been undertaken during the development of the project’s ESMF  **Management:** National standards and guidelines for nature-based tourism to be developed by the project are expected to reflect use of SESA/ESIA for placement of ecotourism activities to avoid culturally significant sites. Demonstration of nature-based tourism activities to be sequenced to follow adoption of project-developed standards to ensure adherence to project-developed nature-based tourism standards for all demonstration activities supported by the project to avoid placement of tourism activities in culturally significant sites.  In addition, component 3 of the project will include the design of specific measures to sensitize and change behavior of tourists to PA sites, as well as special programs supported by hotels and tour enterprises to bring about behavior change that can help mitigate this risk.  Where project cultural heritage of EMs may be impacted/utilised by the project, FPIC shall be sought in-line with UNDP SES -6 requirements | | | | |
| *Risk 7: The development of nature-based tourism could change current access to PAs and their resources, including by unintentional restricting access to local communities.*  Principle (Human Rights): P.6  Standard 5: 5.2 and 5.4;  Standard 6: 6.6  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, | I = 2  L = 3 | **Moderate** | The project could change current access to natural resources at the PAs. | | **Assessment:** Consultations with potential project-affected communities at PA sites during have been undertaken during PPG to assess potential resource access impacts of shift to nature-based tourism on local communities and ethnic minorities.  **Management**: Communities will be engaged in all stages of project design and management at demonstration sites, including use of FPIC as needed (see Risk 1) to ensure that development has a positive impact and that any restriction on resource access and use will be managed and mitigated. The ESMF identifies measures to be instituted in case there is potential economic displacement, following consultation with affected groups, including the potential need for developing a Livelihoods Action Plan. | | | | |
| *Risk 8: Local communities, governments and tour operators may not have the capacity to manage and oversee tourism development and operations to adhere to established standards and benchmarks for sustainable tourism planning, development and operations and therefore impinge on human rights*  Principle (Human Rights): P.2, P.3  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 | I = 3  L = 3 | **Moderate** | The lack of capacity among key government staff (PA, and provincial sector entities) will likely prevent them from ensuring adequate mitigation of human rights concerns if they are unable to identify such potential triggers and how to effectively manage these problems. Similarly, local tour operators and institutions may not have the capacity to interpret and guide the adherence to these guidelines and standards or monitor and enforce compliance with them.  This risk exacerbates the probability of other identified risks such as environmental impacts of tourism and impacts to cultural sites/heritage | | **Assessment:** Capacity needs assessment was undertaken at PPG stage. The capacity assessment was undertaken using the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, and was targeted at project partners at both a national level (i.e. MONRE and MOCST) and at a landscape level (i.e. the two NP sites).  **Management:** The ESMF has preliminarily identified specific capacity constraints to enable key government agencies (PA staff, provincial agencies, etc.) and private tour operations to adhere to sustainable nature-based tourism guidelines and standards (in line with UNDP SES requirements), and to oversee compliance and enforcement of them. The ensuing ESMP will identify specific capacity building and training programs and compliance monitoring and enforcement mechanisms for promoting the implementation of nature-based tourism standards. | | | | |
| *Risk 9: The operation of nature-based tourism adventure activities could pose safety risks to communities, local tourism operators and tourists during operation. Project supported NBT activities could include activities with heightened safety risks such as cave expeditions etc.*  Standard 2: 2.2, 2.3;  Standard 3: 3.1 and 3.4;  Standard 7: 7.6  Outputs: 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | One of the project sites is known for its cave complex and ecotourism built around caving. The project could support more caving-based tourism with associated safety risks or it could develop other adventurous nature-based tourism products at demonstration sites that do not pose a safety risk during their development or their operation. | | **Assessment:** The ESMF outlines procedures for the future screening and assessment of potential safety risks due to tourism development at project sites as activities are defined in detail (i.e. During project inception).  **Management:** Minimum standards for safety of relevant activities have been integrated into project design and the requirements for development/management of operations at project sites. These will be further developed in the ESMP during early project implementation. | | | | |
| *Risk 10: The nature-based tourism activities could potentially enhance release of pollutants and waste (from increased tourist numbers and inadequate waste management practices at PA sites) into natural ecosystems resulting in localized impacts*  Standard 3: 3.6  Standard 7: 7.6  Standard 8: 8.1 and 8,2  Outputs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, | I =3  L=2 | **Moderate** | Unregulated pollution from tourism and associated activities can cause generation of waste that could have impacts on natural ecosystems, species and human health and well-being unless these wastes are safely disposed of. | | **Assessment:** The ESMF stipulates that during project inception, anassessment will be made of the current pollutants and wastes that are produced by nature-based tourism activities to assess what the potential impacts can be on natural ecosystem and species and assess options for management of these in a safe way during project implementation.  **Management:**  The ESMP (i.e. to be developed later at early project implementation) will identify specific mitigation measures and plans to avoid, reduce, or mitigate such impacts. Component 1 will include the development of relevant tools for nature-based tourism activities and will include specific criteria and procedures that will be used to assess potential environmental impacts related to pollution, resource use, and the generation of waste.  Additionally, project design includes an output that envisages working with hotels and tourism facilities to test appropriate measures for ensuring environmentally sustainable operations, including management of wastes and effluents, improving hotel staff capacity to address environmental concerns, etc. | | | | |
| *Risk 11: Project support for site-based management effectiveness such as law enforcement or awareness-raising could bring safety risks for PA staff due to increased interaction with poachers. Conversely, support to PA staff/security personnel may also pose risks to local communities.*  Principle (Accountability): P.15  Outputs: 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, | I = 4  L = 3 | **Substantial** | Project support to increase PA management effectiveness could include support to strengthen site-based law enforcement (e.g., capacity, equipment) and/or awareness raising and behavior change of local communities to reduce their engagement in poaching and trafficking of illegal wildlife products. These activities could bring PA staff into closer interaction with poachers, which could pose a safety risk for staff if they react violently. Activities to change the behaviors of illegal wildlife purchasers and users could also result in conflict, although the chance of this being a safety risk to PA staff is lower. | | **Assessment:** Further assessment during PPG as part of the ESMF preparation will be undertaken to assess extent to which illegal activities are happening in the two PAs, and what the existing relationship is between PA staff and local communities. Assessment of PA staff capacity to address conflict will also be assessed  **Management:** As part of the ESMF development, the capacity needs of PA staff were assessed to understand to what extent they have the skills to address conflict and potentially violent situations. Establishment and implementation of a Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for management of illegal activities, that will specifically include safety and security-related procedures will be defined as part of the ESMPs during project implementation. These ESMP will be developed based on UNDP SES requirements (most notably those of the Accountability principle, and SES 3). | | | | |
| *Risk 12: Unintended negative consequences from upstream policy changes that result in changes to tourism development in Vietnam (for example new nature-based tourism standards and guidelines) could lead to adverse impacts on cultural heritage or could restrict access of local communities to PAs and the resources therein.*  Outputs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, 4.1, | I = 3  L = 2 | **Moderate** | The project will develop national policies and standards, guidelines, and protocols for managing tourism in Vietnam that may result in upstream environmental and social impacts. Potential impacts could include change in current access to sites for tourism operators (increased access or restricted access) including community-based tourism operators or change the level of tourism standards that need to be met to continue operation or set up a new tourist enterprise (making costs of establishing and maintaining tourism operations higher). These could have social impacts on current/potential tourism operators. Environmental impacts are likely to be positive although some impacts may occur if these leads to tourism development in new areas. | | **Assessment:** Further assessment of the proposed standards, guidelines and carrying capacity for nature-based tourism to be developed under the project was undertaken during the PPG stage to determine the potential upstream environmental and social impacts.  **Management:** Based on the assessment of social and environmental impacts of policy changes, the ESMF includes direct precrural reequipments for the integration of a SESA approach as part of the development of these policies, guidelines and standards. | | | | |
| *Risk 13: Covid-19 and other potential zoonotic disease outbreaks that remain prevalent in the project sites could pose the risk of infection and exposure of persons involved in implementing project activities to these diseases*  Standard 3: 3.4  Outputs: 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, | I = 4  L = 3 | **Substantial** | The infection rates are currently low but will have to be monitored in case of an uptick in infection. The Covid-19 situation has brought social and economic impacts on tour businesses, local communities and vulnerable populations (including ethnic minorities). However, in 2020 a national campaign was led by MOCST on “Vietnamese travel Viet Nam” to encourage open-spaced and natural destinations for tourism and this has considerably contributed to tourism green recovery. | | **Assessment:** During the PPG phase, the prevalence of Covid-19 in project sites was assessed, as was the risks of exposure that may be associated with in-person project activities. As such, during the PPG phase, the majority of design activities were conducted virtually to limit potential exposure to Covid-19.  **Management:** In the remote location of the PAs, in particular where ethnic minorities are predominant, these communities are not equipped with remote means of communication. The project will look at options to use local NGOs, local community mobilizers and local staff to carry out consultations, fieldwork and local level planning. If the Covid situation deteriorates to the extent that safety concerns prevail, this will entail application of national and local Covid-19 health protocols (in consultation with the Provincial governments) in outreach to the vulnerable groups, such as use of masks, hand sanitizer, and social distancing, giving the option to communities to decide if they are comfortable with participating. | | | | |
| *Risk 14: Child labor remains a pertinent issue in Vietnam, and may occur in surrounding project areas,* especially since ethnic minorities are at particular risk of being affected[[1]](#footnote-1).  Standard 6: 6.1  Standard 7: 7.3  Outputs:2.2, | I = 4  L = 1 | **Low** | Child labor has been identified as occurring particularly in the production of goods related to the forestry and agricultural sectors, such as sugarcane, tobacco and timber. These types of products may be related to nature-based tourism activities that are promote in project areas[[2]](#footnote-2). | | **Assessment:** During the PPG phase this risk was assessed as ‘low’ as the majority of child labor in Vietnam occurs in the garment sector and most child laborers are located in and around Ho Chi Minh City. Throughout the project, there will be continued assessment of any increased risks of occurrence of child labor in the project areas and measures will be taken to avoid it.  **Management:** Relevant measures will be taken at project level to prevent and avoid child labor:   * comply with minimum age requirements set out in International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions or national legislation (whichever offers the greatest protection to young people under the age of 18) and keep records of the dates of birth of all employees verified by official documentation * check the activities carried out by young workers and ensure that children under 18 are not employed in hazardous work, including in contractor workforces. Hazardous work will normally be defined in national legislation and will be likely to include most tasks in construction and several in agriculture. * assess the safety risks relating to any work by children under 18 and carry out regular monitoring of their health, working conditions and hours of work * ensure that any workers aged 13-15 are only doing light work outside school hours, in accordance with national legislation, or working in a government-approved training programme * ensure that contractors have adequate systems in place to check workers’ ages, identify workers under the age of 18 and to ensure that they are not engaged in hazardous work, and that their work is subject to appropriate risk assessment and health monitoring * assess the risk of child labour occurring in the primary supply chain and, where identified, take steps to remedy or mitigate the problem | | | | |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| ***Low Risk*** | | | **☐** | | |  | | |
| ***Moderate Risk*** | | | **☐** | | |  | | |
| ***Substantial Risk*** | | | ☒**X** | | | The overall risk for the project is classified as **‘Substantial’**. The identified risks will be revised based on further assessment and information during the project inception/implementation. To meet the SES requirements, the following will (or have been) be prepared:  (i) ESMF prepared following the completion of SESP, and ESMP at implementation phase and a decision made at PPG regarding requirements for an ESIA and SESA; (ii) Stakeholder analysis and comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan; (iii) Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan; (iv) Indigenous People/ Ethnic Minorities Planning Framework (IPPF); (v) KM and communication plan (vi) project specific GRM; and (vii) design of incentives and other investments that support environmentally friendly nature-based tourism investments and measures to reduce illegal exploitation of wildlife and wildlife products; and (viii) design and implementation of the project in close collaboration private sector and local communities | | |
| ***High Risk*** | | | **☐** | | |  | | |
|  | **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 | | | | | | | | |
| ***Is assessment required? (check if “yes”)*** | | | ☒ | | |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* | | |  | | | ☒ | Targeted assessments: Gender Analysis, Climate and Disaster Risk Screening, Stakeholder analysis,Covid-19 Analysis | Completed (PPG) |
|  | | | ☒ | ESIA (Scoped Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) | Planned at Implementation |
|  | | | ☒ | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Planned at Implementation |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | | | ☒ | | |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* | | |  | | | ☒ | Targeted management plans: Gender Action Plan, Stakeholder Engagement Plan | Completed (PPG) |
|  | | | ☒ | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) | Planned |
|  | | | ☒ | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) with Covid-19 Action Framework, Indigenous People/ Ethnic Minorities Planning Framework | Completed (PPG) |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** | | |  | | | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** | | |  | | |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***Accountability*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***7. Labor and Working Conditions*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | | | ☒ | | |  | | |

**Final Sign Off**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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. |

### 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](about:blank) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| 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)? | N |
| 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 |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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? [[3]](#footnote-3) | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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)? | Y es |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| P.9 adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls? | Yes |
| P.10 reproducing discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | Yes |
| 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?  *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* | Yes |
| P.12 exacerbation of risks of gender-based violence?  *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*. | Yes |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding risks associated with sustainability and resilience are encompassed by the Standard-specific questions below |  |
| **Accountability** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| P.14 grievances or objections from potentially affected stakeholders? | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| **Project-Level Standards** |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **Resource Management** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 1.1 adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services?  *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes* | Yes. |
| 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? | Yes. |
| 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) | Yes |
| 1.4 risks to endangered species (e.g. reduction, encroachment on habitat)? | Yes |
| 1.5 exacerbation of illegal wildlife trade? | Yes |
| 1.6 introductions of invasive alien species? | Yes. |
| 1.7 adverse impacts on soils? | No |
| 1.8 harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation? | Yes |
| 1.9 significant agricultural productions? | No |
| 1.10 animal husbandry or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species? | Yes |
| 1.11 significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[4]](#footnote-4) | No |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[5]](#footnote-5) | No |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events, earthquakes* | Yes |
| 2.3 increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disaster risks now or in the future (also known as maladaptive or negative coping practices)?  *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population’s vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding* | Yes |
| 2.4 increases of greenhouse gas emissions, black carbon emissions or other drivers of climate change? | No |
| **Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Security** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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)? | Yes |
| 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** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 4.1 activities adjacent to or within a Cultural Heritage site? | Yes |
| 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) | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| **Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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)? | Yes |
| 5.3 risk of forced evictions?[[6]](#footnote-6) | 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? | Yes |
| **Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 6.1 areas where indigenous peoples are present (including project area of influence)? | Yes |
| 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)?  *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* | Yes |
| 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? | Yes |
| 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?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 5 above* | Yes |
| 6.7 adverse impacts on the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them? | Yes |
| 6.8 risks to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | Yes |
| 6.9 impacts on the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?  *Consider, and where appropriate ensure, consistency with the answers under Standard 4 above.* | Yes |
| **Standard 7: Labour and Working Conditions** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to: (note: applies to project and contractor workers)* |  |
| 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? | Yes |
| 7.4 use of forced labour? | No |
| 7.5 discriminatory working conditions and/or lack of equal opportunity? | Yes |
| 7.6 occupational health and safety risks due to physical, chemical, biological and psychosocial hazards (including violence and harassment) throughout the project life-cycle? | Yes |
| **Standard 8: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)? | Yes |
| 8.2 the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)? | Yes |
| 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?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](about:blank)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](about:blank)*,* [*Basel Convention*](about:blank)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](about:blank)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](about:blank) | 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 |

1. <https://www.ilo.org/hanoi/Areasofwork/child-labour/lang--en/index.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/reports/child-labor/list-of-goods?tid=5543&field_exp_good_target_id=All&field_exp_exploitation_type_target_id_1=All&items_per_page=10&combine=&page=1> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](about:blank) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](about:blank). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](about:blank) and its [Nagoya Protocol](about:blank) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)