# Annex 4. Social and Environmental Screening*.*

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information*** |  |
| 1. Project Title | Sustainable Forest and Forest Land Management in Viet Nam’s Ba River Basin Landscape |
| 1. Project Number (i.e. Atlas project ID, PIMS+) | 5887 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country) | The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam |
| 1. Project stage (Design or Implementation) | Design |
| 1. Date |  |

**Part A. Integrating Programming 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 Constitution of Vietnam (2013) Article 14 states that human rights and citizen’s rights in the political, civic, economic, cultural and social fields us recognized, respected, protected and guaranteed in accordance with the Constitution. In accordance with Article 16 all citizens are equal before the law and no one shall be discriminated based on their individual political, civic, economic, cultural or social life.  During the PPG phase, a consultant with expertise in safeguards and gender issues was hired as part of the PPG team. Consultation and meetings were held in the Ba river basin to engage both ethnic minorities and local communities in order to (i) provide them an understanding of the purpise of the project; and (ii) fully understand the challenges, barriers and risks related to the project, and how these can be addressed through the project design and implementation. These consultations enabled the PPG team to get a good understanding of community perceptions and needs and consultations were conducted in a transparent way. The intent of the consultations was to ensure that slo project activities would be adapted to ensure that the human rights of stakeholders (and in particular ethnic minorities) are preserved and/or reinforced. In line with national law and UNDP principles. Project design sought to uphold the centrality of human rights to sustainable development, poverty alleviation and ensuring fair distribution of development opportunities and benefits, specifically those related to sustainable livelihood development and access to forest and other natural resources. The project will project will work to support the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam to conserve forest biodiversity and supporting a coordinated landscape level approach in the Ba River basin landscapes. The project will uphold human rights principles, by ensuring inclusiveness and equitable distribution of the development opportunities and the project benefits. It will be ensured through a participatory approach that will include the women groups, the ethnic minority communities and indigenous people during the project design, development and implementation phases for inputs. The project will interface with a cross section of Viet Nam’s the most vulnerable groups of people (i.e. women, children, ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, elderly, differently abled, and extremely poor) in rural areas that depend heavily on the health of the forests and the effective management of natural resources to meet the basic necessities (food, clean drinking water, shelter, and basic income). Fundamentally, the project will aim to mainstream the human-rights approach by ensuring a participatory and inclusive approach to project development and implementation, with capacity support as needed to assist duty bearers to fulfil project roles, ensuring the meaningful participation of stakeholders and not discriminating on any grounds including race, gender, minority status, age, religion etc. In addition, the project will adhere to UNDP policies on monitoring, evaluation, audits and transparency in project implementation. A project-specific grievance response mechanism has been developed during the PPG consultation. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| Women’s roles in forestry value chains in Viet Nam tend to be those associated with the economic well‐being, food and energy security, of their rural households. But women are often disadvantaged in terms of their access to, and control over, the forest resourcesand in the availability of associated economic opportunities along those value chains (processing, marketing, etc.). In spite of the Government of Viet Nam’s several laws and policies to promote women’s rights, women are still systematically disadvantaged in areas like access to line of credit, land and information, and the studies indicate that Viet Nam is also grappling with the gender pay gap.  In support of the government’s effort to tackle the gender issues, the project will provide targeted support to empower women in the forestry sector, including support to women entrepreneurs, access to finance, etc. And it has been achieved by undertaking a gender analysis during the development phase. The Gender analysis has assessed opportunities to enhance the status of women in respect to forestry sector activities, to address the gender opportunities, and the sector specific gender pay gap. The analysis has also provided valuable insight that would help design the project activities and the indicators that would ensure women’s full participation as beneficiaries of technical cooperation and knowledge building efforts. Consultation sessions have been conducted to obtain the views and the inputs from a wide range of local stakeholders, including women, to develop the project activities and to inform a robust stakeholder involvement plan with a full gender consideration. A corresponding gender mainstreaming plan for the project has also been developed and submitted with the project document at time of the CEO Endorsement. Gender-disaggregated targets and indicators will be included within the project results framework, along with specific activities to support women’s participation and benefit sharing from the project. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams sustainability and resilience*** |
| The project supports creating a continuous biodiversity corridor in the Central Highlands region, which has been prioritized in the biodiversity action plan (NBSAP) to support the UNCBD targets. The project will also yield climate co-benefits to support the overall mandate of UNFCCC. Specifically, the project will help to ensure that Ba River Basin forests and globally significant biodiversity in the forest ecosystem and the surrounding key protected areas are managed with an enhanced participation of the forest-dependent communities. Existing incentive mechanisms will be better deployed and linked to performance. The conservation, the forest restoration investments and other actions will be based at a landscape-level understanding of the ecological and other trends. The lessons learned in target landscapes will be shared with the managers and the decision makers across two provinces, in turn, enabling necessary regulatory and policy changes for scaling up of the project. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the project strengthens accountability to stakeholders*** |
| At PPG stage consultation were undertaken with communities, Ethnic Minorities (EMs) and other stakeholders (to the extent this was feasible given the Covid19 situation) to better understand their interaction and dependencies with the landscape (natural resources such as land, forests and wetland resources), their rights and interests, territories, traditional livelihoods and obtain general consensus in accordance with national contexts and preferences. This has led to the development of a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan and IP Framework that identifies culturally appropriate means of participation of stakeholders, management and monitoring and ensure that such measures are inclusive, participatory and transparent. The project design includes activities that support strengthening of stakeholders to enhance their participation, decision-making and benefit sharing. At PPG stage, a participatory framework was developed to ensure that stakeholders (mainly local communities, EMs, women, and other marginalized groups) 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, provide feedbacks on the project impacts, promote inclusiveness and equity in resource and benefit sharing. The project has also developed a grievance redressal system to mitigate and manage potential conflicts. |

**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, High)*** | ***Comments (optional)*** | | ***Description of assessment and management measures for risks rated as Moderate, Substantial or High*** | |
|  |  |  |  | |  | |
| Risk 1: The Forest Management Units in the project area might not effectively engage and ensure participation of all stakeholders in particular in sharing of forest products, livelihood benefits and other benefits and thereby impact on the rights and interests, lands, territories, resources, and/or traditional livelihoods of ethnic minorities resulting in violation of human rights. They might also not effectively apply FPIC procedures thus posing significant risks to achieving project outcomes.  Principle P.2, P.3, P.4, and P.5  Principle P.13 and P.14  Standard 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7 and 6.8 | I= 4  L = 3 | **SUBSTANTIAL** | Viet Nam is considered a multi-ethnic country with 54 recognized ethnic groups. The major ethnic groups in Gia Lai province are Kinh, Banar and Jarai, while the major groups in Phu Yen province are the Ede, Cham and Banar. Other ethnic minorities found in Lhu Yen province are the Tay, Nung and Dao. These groups ‘economic well-being is linked to access to land and natural resources on them. Inadequate consultation with the local communities, including women, and ethnic minority groups may pose a significant risk to human rights violation. | | Following consultations with local communities and ethnic minorities (in particular with the Ba Na and Ede groups), an assessment was undertaken to determine the potential impacts of rights and interests, lands, territories, resources, and traditional livelihoods of local communities, including preliminary use of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) procedures (refer Annex 2 of Ethnic Minorities Plannig Framework). The consultations were in the form of focus group discussions, to the extent feasible under the current Covid19 restrictions. Based on these, and other discussions with other stakeholders, the following management plans/frameworks were prepared at PPG stage to effectively engage all stakeholders, including ethnic minorities applying FPIC procedures so as to ensure their participation and partake of benefits from the project. These included the following:   * A **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 9)** that defines the clear role and responsibilities of each stakeholder, including local communities and EMs in the implementation of the project that will be used during project implementation * **An Ethnic Minorities Planning Framework (Annex 11) w**ith guidelines of FPIC to ensure FPIC to be secured multiple times during the project timeline, ensure that EMs are actively engaged in project activities, their cultural, social and traditional practices are recognized, maintained and enhanced, that they share equitable benefits from the project (livelihoods, resource use and ABS benefits), that there are special investments focused on these groups. * A **grievanc**e r**edress mechanism for the project (refer Section 6.2 of Annex 10),** based on the existing government and UNDP mechanisms to provide an avenue to articulate any project specific grievances and have a transparent system address such grievances * **An ESMF (Annex 10)** has been prepared. The ESMF lays out procedures and actions to identify and assess potential impacts of project activities, including in particular activities that have still not been fully designed (and likely to be better defined in early implementation of the project) following the community planning process. The ESMF includes procedures for screening investments as and when these are identified, on the basis of which these activities will be excluded (if these fall within the category of restricted activities) and for others, appropriate impacts, mitigation and monitoring measures, will be instituted before these are financed. The ESMF includes list of potential impacts and mitigation/management actions for each potential impact. An oversight and monitoring mechanism is instituted to ensure that management actions are effective. * For those activities that present a significant risk (or where SES review indicates additional risks or upgrade of existing risks), additional consultations will be made as part undertaking a scoped ESIA(s) to address these specific risks and development of appropriately scoped ESMP(s). * During the project‘s implementation phase, participatory approach will be mainstreamed in the project activities. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan and FPIC will guide such consultations, ensuring the full and effective participation of all stakeholders, including women and ethnic minorities. * CO is committed to monitoring sub-projects proposals to ensure that these comply with FPIC processes during the implementation phase of the project as part of their responsibilities for project oversight   Further meaningful engagement and consultations will be carried out with project affected peoples (including ethnic minorities) in the conduct of SES-assessments that will be conducted during project implementation. This includes the development of a SESA and scoped ESIA(s) .  As a complement to the above measures, the project will apply participatory processes and approaches to all activities relevant to local communities where principles of FPIC will be further emphasized and demonstrated through providing timely information related to opportunities and risk of the proposed interventions for the beneficiaries to enable them to make decisions. In case community concern or inability to secure FPIC emerge the following mechanisms would be applied as adaptive management:  • Additional stakeholder consultations/workshops will be conducted using technical support to further refine project activities and approaches to address any concerns. Any such changes would be captured in the annual work planning process and summarized in PIRs;  • In a situation were to arise where FPIC could not be obtained or whatever reason, any activities requiring FPIC such as expansion of existing PAs, forest restoration, ecotourism will not take place. | |
| Risk 2: Project activities related to sustainable forest management, community forest management and livelihood might not fully incorporate the views and needs of women  Principle P.9, P.10 and P.11 | I=3  L=2 | **MODERATE** | Existing assessments indicate that there is relatively balanced division of labor and both men and women are engaged in household income, although the distribution and roles are different. Women carry more of the burden associated with human-wildlife conflict, such as more time spent guarding crops and livestock from potential impacts. This adds to their existing unpaid work burden. Further existing gender biases, especially in the gender pay gap, may unintentionally discriminate against women, limiting or adversely impacting their possibilities for accessing opportunities and/or influence on project activities. | | During the PPG phase, a comprehensive Gender Analysis (GA) (Refer Annex 12) has been developed to clarify relevant gender concerns and determine how mainstreaming of women into the project interventions can be ensured. It focuses on specific measures to ensure gender discrimination is avoided and provides a means to improve women’s participation in decision-making, have access to natural resources and other benefits from the project and that there are specific capacity building and training that are specifically targeted at women, as well as special livelihood investments that benefit women.  The Gender Action Plan (GAP) has specific actions targeted to women (and in particular EM women), including:   1. Specific awareness and training sensitize central and local level SFM, PA and Management Board staff on gender related issues and opportunities to improving women roles in decision making and access to benefits; 2. Ensuring adequate representation and active participation of women in relevant decision-making bodies (Forest Management Boards, community forest management units, commune/village development funds); 3. Involving women in sustainable forest management and livelihood development activities at the Project site; 4. Provide technical trainings for women on organic farming, sustainable tourism, medicinal plantation, non-timber forest product collection, handicraft production, start up and business development and support commune’s women union to promote women’s participation in all livelihood activities. These activities have been also presented under Output 2.5: Livelihoods development for women, including training in forest value chains and entrepreneurship, and establishment of women’s groups in forest-dependent communities. Refer Annex 17 of UNDP Project Document that focuses on livelihood opportunities for women) 5. Strengthening women groups and their institutions | |
| Risk 3: Enhanced management of PAs/FMUs, PA expansion, targeted forest restoration and SFM activities could result in changes or restrictions in access to forestlands and forest resources.  Principle P.6  Standard 5.2 and 5.4  Standard 6.6 | I = 4  L = 3 | **SUBTANTIAL** | Project activities could result in short-term restrictions in local communities’ access to forest resources, including of ethnic minority communities. Allocation of forestlands to communities could have also unintended negative impacts on neighboring community access and use of forest resources. Project activities could also affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources. | | An initial assessment was undertaken at PPG stage to better understand the potential impacts of restrictions of access to resources for conservation activities in the PAs, Production and Protection forests and the extension of existing PAs. Consultations with local stakeholders (Tram Lap, Dak Rong Forest Companies, local authorities) and ethnic minorities communities guaranteed that there will not be physical relocation, but there could be a possibility for inadvertent economic (e.g. NTFP collection) restriction. The allocation of forest for community forest management, while a positive development can have potential to exclude other neighboring communities from access to these resources.  Issues pertaining to access restriction induced risks/adverse impacts will be identified , assessed and managed through two distinct elements, i.e. (i) scoped ESIA(s) at the project site level, (ii) a process framework. In addition to the above, the conduct of a SESA for “upstream:” project elements has been proposed. This will also screen and assess potential future/indirect risks relating to access restriction.  In addition, the ESMF recognizes this as a potential risk, and suggests that specific actions, including scoped ESIA(s) be defined following screening and assessments undertaken to mitigate and manage any such potential risk. This will entail the preparation of scoped management plans/ESMP(s) developed with local communities and stakeholders. Should there is an inadvertent possibility of a manifestation of the risks, the management measures as outlined in Risk 1 will be instituted, including the GRM process, livelihood action plan(s) and other related prescriptions that might emerge from the targeted assessment. | |
| Risk 4: Long-term sustainability of the positive project outcomes could be negatively impacted by climate change, including community forest management, livelihood and small-scale enterprise activities. In the short-term climate induced natural hazards and weather events could impede smooth implementation of the project.  Standard 2.2 | I=3  L=2 | **MODERATE** | There could be potential climate change risks including precipitation and temperature changes that could have an impact on people’s livelihoods as well as on ecological systems (refer project document for further details). | | During the community livelihood investment planning process, specific focus will be taken on selection of agricultural and livelihood practices that are likely to be less vulnerable to climate change that include climate sensitive crop varieties and cropping patterns. The selection of species in sustainable forest and forest land management will focus on species that are more resistant to large fluctuations in climatic conditions.  In addition, small enterprise development activities will be assessed for the potential impact of climate change on the availability of raw materials, making sure to identify investments that are dependent of raw materials that are readily available or not vulnerable to climate impacts. As part of the enterprise development, cost benefit analysis will be undertaken to ascertain the viability of these investments taking into consideration a number of parameters such as supply, demand, market potential, climate change, etc.  Enhanced management and conservation practices would improve protection and management of critical ecosystems services as well as wildlife habitat, which should help to increase the overall resilience of the natural systems to climate risks in the areas compared to business as usual.  In terms of the Monitoring Plan, the condition of the natural ecosystems would be monitored to ensure that activities do not damage these sensitive ecosystems so that it is in a better overall situation to adapt to climate changes.  The Management Knowledge and Communications outputs is key to improve awareness of climate and ensuring measures to improve climate resilience | |
| Risk 5: Poorly designed or executed forest management, NTFP usage, ecotourism, livelihood and small-scale rural enterprise activities, could unintentionally damage critical or sensitive habitats and ecosystems  Standard 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6 | I=3  L=2 | **MODERATE** | There is the risk that these activities could result in perverse ecological impacts if they are not planned wisely and carried out effectively, e.g. potential re-vegetation with non-native species, over-exploitation of NTFPs, over-demand of raw materials for livelihood and small rural enterprise development could impact on species and habitats | | The sites selected for project investment conformed to the project’s objective of ‘enhancing the conservation of biodiversity through mainstreaming of biodiversity into planning policies and practices into the Ba River landscapes.  The project intends to have interventions that will benefit improved conservation, support environmentally friendly agricultural and land use practices to reduce impacts on species and ecosystems, improved monitoring of species and ecosystem health, participation of forest management boards in environmentally-friendly practices (including reduced clearing and improved management of corridor and forest areas), rehabilitation of degraded areas with native species or through natural regeneration processes, and enhanced environmental stewardship of landscape resources by local communities.  As an effort to support conservation outcomes, all community agriculture and production systems and livelihood activities will take place outside the high value biodiversity areas (including in buffer zones) to the extent feasible through appropriate mapping and zoning arrangements.  The Preparation of a screening checklist developed (refer ESMF) will be applied to screen all investments to ensure that they comply with sound social and environmental principles and are sustainable. Such a checklist would also include the identification of investment location in relation to protected areas and biologically important areas and critical wildlife corridors. . Refer Annex 16 of UNDP Project Document for sustainable approaches to forest management and restoration has been developed at PPG stage in accordance with the government (MARD) approved rules. As part of the screening process, the MARD rules will be assessed for the compliance with SES guidelines  Setting acceptable sustainable limits on harvest of non-timber forest products based on status and health of such populations and establishment of monitoring protocols. These considerations have positioned the project into a framework of synergy between the natural environment and the actors within it.  Technically qualified biodiversity and SFM specialists of Provincial DARDs will support the Provincial PMUs and/or Forest Management Units to monitor and coordinate the risk management strategies. | |
| Risk 6: Alien Invasive Species (IAS) could inadvertently be introduced to project demonstration sites, in particular during forest restoration activities.  Standard 1.6 | I =3  L =2 | **MODERATE** | There is a potential risk of accidental introduction of IAS as a consequence of forest restoration, agricultural and enterprise development activities | | Project activities will be carefully planned in consultation with relevant DARD experts in forest restoration and local communities. These restoration management plans will be based on MARD forest restoration guidelines (and assessed with their compliance with SES standards) and would be completed prior to any technical demonstration activities taking place and potential perverse impacts and safeguards will be considered as part of this process, along with required standards and guidelines such as mandating use of native species for plantings, measures for IAS control and management, adherence with established SOPs and guidelines of national/local authorities. As part of the effort to manage IAS, this would entail training to key development partners on the project to identify potential IAS and institute measures, along with the local community to eliminate, control and/or manage these species.  Technically qualified biodiversity and SFM specialists of Provincial DARDs will support the Provincial PMUs and/or Forest Management Units to monitor and coordinate the risk management strategies | |
| Risk 7: The project sites could potentially intersect with globally and locally important sites with cultural, historical, religious, artistic and traditional values. It is unlikely that the project activities will have structural adverse impacts on these sites but may adversely impact traditional knowledge and practices that are part of the communities for centuries and that are deep-rooted in their cultural practices.  Standard 4.1 and 4.3  Standard 6.9 | I =3  L =2 | **MODERATE** | Ethnic minorities in the project sites have their culture deep-rooted in cultural heritage sites that are centuries old. The way life and local communities’ ancestral culture links to the land and the forest within the project sites. The communities’ have vital connection with the natural resources both culturally and economically, and therefore, they have managed and protected these natural resources for centuries. Due to the close dependency on the land and the forest, the communities have garnered traditional knowledge and their cultures have co-evolved. Therefore I would be important to ensure that SFM, SLM and any livelihood and ecotourism activities do not damage the ecological and cultural values of such sites | | The implementation of the EMPF prepared during PPG implementation will form the basis for dealing with the interests of the EMs and other special interest groups. Any project related economic development initiatives proposed by communities and EMs will rest on the maintenance of the integrity of their culture and defined through the use of FPIC procedures.  The use of a screening checklist (refer ESMF) to screen all project activities from an environmental, social and cultural perspective will help to ensure that these take into consideration all potential impacts and implementation would be monitored to ensure that there is no impacts on cultural heritage of EMs or special interest groups, including on TK practices. Safeguard consideration would be an integral part of any activities that take place in cultural sensitive sites, including the use of FPIC procedures.  Although the potential for ecotourism is low in the project sites, any potential ecotourism activities will take into consideration the following:   * Appropriate waste management measures * Location of campsites, washing areas, grazing areas in locations that are not ecologically sensitive and of cultural significance * Train Community tour guides to manage tourist in order to avoid and minimize adverse impacts of visitation on the biodiversity and cultural sites. * Ensure that the tour guides brief visitors on “DOs and DONTs” in the project area and adhere to it. * Visitations to cultural heritage sites to fulfill local cultural requirements based on cultural appropriate visitation. * Capacity development training and awareness-raising for local stakeholders, communities and tour operators on the guidelines and their application of culturallu sensitive ecotourism principles | |
| Risk 8: The use of pesticides, herbicides or insecticides in forestry operations could potentially pose risk to community health and biodiversity  Standard 3.4  Standard 7.6  Standard 8.5 | I = 4  L =2 | **MODERATE** | Pesticides, herbicides and insecticides, though permitted (MARD forest restoration guidelines) potentially could be applied during the project activities to forest restoration activities. | | To avoid or minimize the use of chemicals, the forest restoration activities will largely focus on assisted natural restoration methods that do not qualify for extensive use of chemicals. During project implmentataion, the project will follow a strict SOP for the application of any pest management substances/activities. This will include adhering to the following:   * The project will ensure that it would follow the list of prohibited pesticides, herbicides and insecticides. * The storage, transport, disposal and use of pesticides will follow standard and acceptable standards * Communities and staff using pesticides will be provided training of the safe use and application of pesticides * The use of any chemicals will be prohibited within 25 meters from waterways, settlements and high biodiversity value forests | |
| Risk 9: Surveillance and patrolling activities on PAs could lead to escalated conflict or safety-related risks if rangers have contact with poachers. These activities could also have safety risks for local communities if rangers are not properly trained, managed and overseen with a human-right based approach to law enforcement taken.  Anti-poaching patrols could pose safety risks to local communities if they are not properly trained, managed or overseen.  Principle P.7  Standard 1.5  Standard 3: 3.10 | I = 4 L = 3 | **SUBSTANTIAL** | Project activities will support enhanced patrolling and surveillance activities at protected areas. As these protected areas are subject to wildlife poaching/snaring, illegal encroachment and logging, these activities could lead to safety-related risks – either to rangers if they came into contact with organized poaching/logging groups; or to local communities if rangers were not properly trained and managed. | | As part of project design, the capacity needs of PA staff have been 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 is defined as part of the ESMF. * The project intents to embed local community members within the patrols so that they can help build better relationships between PA staff and communities. * In addition, a grievance redress mechanism has been prepared and a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan has been developed and implemented in the project cycle as well. | |
| Risk 10: Forest management institutions and local communities may have inadequate capacity to sufficiently uptake SFM practices without impact on biodiversity and natural resources  Standard 1.8 and 1.13 | I = 3 L = 2 | **MODERATE** | Capacity assessment and needs of local communities, local governments and national authorities were identified during numerous PPG consultation meetings and capacity development scorecard assessment. The assessments revealed that the capacity to manage and oversee forest management activities is limited.  Local communities do not always have the capacity to undertake SFM and forest co-management activities and FMUs night have the capacity to oversee compliance with guidelines and standards.  This risk exacerbates the probability of other identified risks such as environmental impacts of forest restoration, livelihoods and small scale enterprises and impacts on cultural aspects | | An initial assessment undertaken as part of the PPG indicated that based on the requirement of Decree 156/2019, all forest owners (Forest Management Boards) are required to prepare SFM plans. Most forest owners have already prepared their SFM plans. However, the capacity of the forest owner is limited in both human resources and budget allocation to ensure that appropriate SFM practices are introduced.  The findings from the initial capacity assessment during PPG have informed project design. A key aspect of this project focuses on capacity building for local communities with regards to SFM. As such, this risk will primarily be managed through the activities associated with Component 2:   * + 1. Provide technical support to FMUs to conduct resource and biodiversity monitoring and inventory in engagement with their sustainable forest management plans     2. Develop guidelines and standards for information collection, indicators, and templates on forest and biodiversity assets at local scale, focusing on forest tree species and density, forest status and forest quality, forest biomass assessment, and wildlife species. Based on lessons learned at local scale, develop recommendations for application of forest, biodiversity resource monitoring and inventory at a larger scale.     3. Build the capacity for relevant agencies and staffs at local levels and FMUs (PA and forest managers) in design and implementation of forest and biodiversity assets monitoring and inventory activity in their institutions through training activity.   In addition to the above, capacity building will not only be provided for the forest owners and staff but also extended to relevant communities if needed during the project implementation. | |
| Risk 11: The COVID19 outbreak could accelerate resource exploitation due to economic disruptions in other livelihoods as a result of reduced demand for certain products and services (refer Project Document for additional information on Covid risks) and delay project implementation  Standard 7.6 | I = 3 L = 3 | **MODERATE** | Unless the COVID19 outbreak is contained and managed it could accelerate deforestation, resource exploitation and associated biodiversity loss due to reduced demand for certain crop products and services provided by local people and hence a increased demand on forest products for subsistence (conversion to agriculture, and other informal and at times illegal activities. It would also result in shift of government priorities and this affect co-financing and project implementation (Refer Separate section in Project Document that discuss Covid-19 risks in more detail) | | During the early part of project implementation particularly during the preparation of livelihood and small business enterprise planning, a rapid assessment of the current social and economic impacts of ongoing Covid-19 (likely as part of IPP), in particular on vulnerable populations in to assess the options for provision of income generation opportunities. The gender actions will also specifically focus on vulnerable women population in high Covid-19 risk areas. The livelihood and enterprise planning exercises will help develop suitable investment plans for responding to and ensuring income recovery for affected vulnerable populations. Special efforts would be made to enhance technical support, extension services and materials to enable the successful implementation of such activities.  The Government of Vietnam has certain measures in place for staff, particularly at the provincial and local levels to ensure that they continue to perform their official duties. Meetings can be conducted in small groups and via other communication methods, to the extent these are feasible in given situations. The Provincial Governments have now become more effective with dealing with their responsibilities and ensuring that staff response times are normal, as much as possible. Provincial Governments were fully engaged with this proposal at PPG stage, and expect UNDP and GEF to move forward with the work. At the Provincial levels, governments are functioning at normal, or near normal with precautions in place. However, engagement of communities and private sector will likely require precautions if there is an outbreak of infection, including following government Covid19 protocols, meeting at the community levels will be restricted to smaller numbers of staff and community members, using precautions of masks and social distancing.  Convening discussions with financial institutions, particularly the green funding programs available in the country to catalyze interactions and increase options for direct financing for these livelihood activities, including grant support for tiding over the initial difficult period of recovery. Efforts will be made to increase awareness of local communities on measures to reduce the infection rates | |
|  | | | | | | |
|  | **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’**. Based on the assessment undertaken at the PPG stage the following safeguard tools have been developed:  (i) ESMF has been prepared following the completion of SESP. The ESMF identifies a framework for recognizing potential risks from the project activities, a methodology for applying at project implementation for managing and monitoring these risks, including those investments that are still not fully known. Based on the ESMF, scoped ESIA(s) will be undertaken for activities that might pose a substantial risk to help define specific mitigation and management activities to address these threats (ii) Stakeholder analysis and comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan that identifies the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders and the means by which they will participate in the project; (iii) A Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan that identifies specific actions to improve participation of women (including EM women) in decision-making, access to project investments and sharing of benefits; (iv) EMPF( IPF) that recognizes potential impacts on EMs and means for their mitigation and enhanced opportunities for EM participation. Based on the EMPF, an (EMP) IPP will be developed at early project implementation with full FPIC application that defines specific measures that ensure that EMs are actively engaged in project activities, their cultural, social and traditional practices are recognized, maintained and enhanced, that they share equitable benefits from the project (livelihoods, resource use and ABS benefits), that there are special investments focused on these groups . (iv) KM and communication plan (v) project specific GRM; and (vi) 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 (vii) design and implementation of the project in close collaboration private sector and local communities; (viii) SESA for review for conservation and restoration strategy for Ba river basin or any new PFES activities |
| ***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”)*** | **X** |  |  | ***Status? (completed, planned)*** |
| *if yes, indicate overall type and status* |  | **X** | Targeted assessment(s) | Completed: Gender analysis, Stakeholder analysis |
|  | **X** | ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) | Planned: Scoped ESIA(s) |
|  | **X** | SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment) | Planned During Implementation |
| ***Are management plans required? (check if “yes)*** | **X** |  |  | |
| *If yes, indicate overall type* |  | **X** | Targeted management plans (e.g. Gender Action Plan, Emergency Response Plan, Waste Management Plan, others) | Completed GAP, SEP, Process Framework |
|  | **X** | ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan which may include range of targeted plans) | During implementation to accompany scoped ESIA |
|  | **X** | ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) | Completed (with Ethnic Minorities Planning Framework) |
|  |  | **X** | Ethnic Minority Planning framework (EMPF) – equivalent IPPF | Completed during PPG |
| ***Based on identified risks, which Principles/Project-level Standards triggered?*** |  | **Comments (not required)** | | |
| ***Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind*** |  |  | | |
| ***Human Rights*** | **x** | See Risk 1 and 9 | | |
| ***Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **x** | See Risk 2 | | |
| ***Accountability*** | **x** | See Risks 1 | | |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | **x** | See Risks 5, 6 and 9 | | |
| ***2. Climate Change and Disaster Risks*** | **x** | See Risk 4 | | |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Security*** | **X** | See Risk 9 | | |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **x** | See Risk 7 | | |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **x** | See Risk 3 | | |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **x** | See Risk 3 | | |
| ***7. Labour and Working Conditions*** | **x** | See Risks 10 and 11 | | |
| ***8. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **x** | See Risk 8 | | |

**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](https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/ses_toolkit/default.aspx) for further guidance on addressing screening questions. |  |
| **Overarching Principle: Leave No One Behind**  **Human Rights** | **Answer  (Yes/No)** |
| P1. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process? | No |
| P2. Is there a risk that duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project? | Yes |
| P3. 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? [[1]](#footnote-1) | 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)? | No |
| *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*. | No |
| **Sustainability and Resilience:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related 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? | No |
| **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 introduction 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 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?  *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction* | No |
| 1.12 handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms/living modified organisms?[[2]](#footnote-2) | Yes |
| 1.13 utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)[[3]](#footnote-3) | No |
| 1.14 adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks** |  |
| *Would the 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?  *For example, through increased precipitation, drought, temperature, salinity, extreme events* | Yes |
| 2.3 direct or indirect increases in [vulnerability to climate change](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) impacts or disasters now or in the future (also known as maladaptive 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* | 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** |  |
| *Would the 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 non-communicable diseases, nutritional disorders, mental health? | No |
| 3.4 transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)? | Yes |
| 3.8 adverse impacts on ecosystems and ecosystem services relevant to communities’ health (e.g. food, surface water purification, natural buffers from flooding)? | No |
| 3.9 influx of project workers to project areas? | No |
| 3.10 engagement of security personnel to protect facilities and property or to support project activities? | Yes |
| **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 |
| 4.1 adverse impact 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 |
| 4.2 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** |  |
| *Would the project potentially involve or lead to:* |  |
| 5.1 temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement? | Yes |
| 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?[[4]](#footnote-4) | No |
| 5.4 impact 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 area Where indigenous peoples are present (including Project area of influence)? | Yes |
| 6.2 activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples? | Yes |
| 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 the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical 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? | Yes |
| 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 risk to the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples? | Yes |
| 6.9 impact 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:* |  |
| 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? | 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)? | 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?  *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the* [*Montreal Protocol*](http://ozone.unep.org/montreal-protocol-substances-deplete-ozone-layer/32506)*,* [*Minamata Convention*](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/)*,* [*Basel Convention*](http://www.basel.int/)*,* [*Rotterdam Convention*](http://www.pic.int/)*,* [*Stockholm Convention*](http://chm.pops.int/) | No |
| 8.5 the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health? | Yes |
| 8.6 significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water? | No |

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. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](https://bch.cbd.int/protocol). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See the [Convention on Biological Diversity](https://www.cbd.int/) and its [Nagoya Protocol](https://www.cbd.int/abs/) on access and benefit sharing from use of genetic resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)