

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISK SCREENING CHECKLIST

Darma Rural Municipality, Salyan

## Annex 1: Screening tool - simplified L1 and L2 questions for community consultation

To be used during the participatory planning process or similar community level consultations, using the following tools: community mapping, community transect walk, community planning, and/or ad-hoc focus group discussions.

E&S	E&S Standard 1: Sustainable Natural Resources Management		Level	Annotations
1	Could the intervention alter the land cover of forests, wetlands, farming land, grazing land, or other landscapes of ecological or economic importance?	N	Low	The intervention could not degrade the natural vegetation like forest, wetlands, farming/grazing land or other landscapes of ecological of more than 8.1 ha. With the implementation of this intervention, mostly agricultural lands will be directly benefited.
2	Could the intervention alter the quantity or quality of groundwater, surface water, or sea water?	N	Low	The intervention could not make different in the quantity or quality of groundwater, surface water, or sea water. The available source for this scheme is stream source.
3	Could the intervention degrade soils, increase soil erosion, or increase sediment load in surface water flows?	N	Low	No
E&S	E&S Standard 2: Ecosystems and Biodiversity		Level	Annotations
4	Could the intervention negatively affect natural habitats, ecosystems, or biodiversity?	N	Low	The intervention has no negative impacts on natural habitats, endangered or protected animals or species, ecosystem/biodiversity.  With the implementation of this interventions, dry land gets irrigated and farmland area will be expanded which will directly and indirectly support in people's livelihood regarding in food security as well.
5	Could the intervention lead to negative impacts in protected areas?	N	Low	No negative Impact in protected areas.
	Standard 3: Resource Efficiency and Waste and Pollution agement	Y/N	Level	Annotations
6	Could the intervention increase the consumption of fuel (wood, charcoal, fossil fuel) or water?	N	Low	The intervention will be basically implemented with the use of local materials like sand, stone,

				aggregate, water, and wood. Hence, the chance of
			_	consumption of fuel will be very less.
7	Does the intervention involve substances or activities that	N	Low	The intervention will be implemented through
	could pollute the air, soil, or water?			beneficiary with the use of local materials and
				hand tools and safety gears. Likewise, the use of
				chemicals on soil or in water is very minimal.
				Thus, the interventions involve no activities that
				could pollute the air, soil, or water.
8	Could the intervention generate waste (hazardous or non-	N	Low	No.
	hazardous) that cannot be reused, recycled, or adequately			
	disposed of by the beneficiaries, WFP, or partners?			
9	Could the intervention lead to increased use of agrochemicals?	N	Low	No
E&S	Standard 4: Climate Change	Y/N	Level	Annotations
10	Could the intervention increase greenhouse gas emissions from	N	Low	The intervention itself is a climate resilient and
	fuel combustion, changes in land cover, or other sources?			heavy machine use is avoided too. Thus, the
	, ,			intervention could not increase greenhouse gas
				emissions.
11	Could the intervention expose more people to natural hazards	N	Low	No
	or make some people more vulnerable to natural hazards?			
E&S	Standard 5: Protection and Human rights	Y/N	Level	Annotations
12	Could the intervention violate the rights of some people	N	Low	The beneficiaries are selected from
	(whether beneficiaries or not) or discriminate them?			unemployment data (PMEP Source) and verified
				that the involved workers have no regular income
				source. The daily wage payment will be through
				banking system as well.
13	Could the intervention lead to the involuntary resettlement	N	Low	The intervention is implemented to provide green
	(either physical or economic) of people resettlement?			job recovery. Hence, there would be not any
				involuntary resettlement.
14	Could the intervention lead to child labour?			Definition of child labour: ILO Convention 138 or
				the national legislation, whichever of the two is the
				strictest. Use of child labour is strictly prohibited.

15	Could the intervention negatively affect any cultural heritage (either tangible or intangible)?	N	Low	Not Applicable
16	Could the intervention involve or affect indigenous peoples or their territories?	N	Low	Not Applicable
E&S	6: Gender Equality	Y/N	Level	Annotations
17	Could the intervention lead to gender-based inequalities, discrimination, exclusion, unwanted workload and/or violence?	N	Low	The scheme has been formed based on reconfigured UC guideline and the worker to implement this intervention are the beneficiary who have no regular income source. These interventions include those people who are marginalized. Thus, the intervention does not lead such gender-based inequalities, discrimination, exclusion, unwanted workload and/or violence.
E&S sensit	Standard 7: Community Health, Security, and Conflict	Y/N	Level	Annotations
18	Could the intervention increase tension or conflicts within the community, between neighbouring communities, or between refugees/IDPs and host communities?	N	Low	No such conflicts arise with the implementation of this intervention.
19	Could the intervention become caught up in a war economy?	N	Low	No war economy
20	Could the work arrangements in the intervention pose a risk to the health or safety of the people involved in the intervention?	N	Low	No risk
21	Could the intervention have a negative impact on the health of the community as a whole?	N	Low	No impact
E&S	Standard 8: Accountability to Affected Populations	Y/N	Level	Annotations
22	Is there a risk that the voice of some key stakeholders would not be heard in the design, implementation or monitoring of the intervention?	N	Low	The schemes have been selected as per the standard format based on National Planning Policy.

## Annex 2: Attestation of screening

Name and location of activity:	Jhyaribang Irrigation Canal Construction Scheme			
Responsible LG unit or office:	Darma Rural Municipality			
Implementing Organizations, if any):	Darma Rural Municipality			
Expected timing & duration of activity:	50 Days			
Brief summary and main elements of the active (e.g. from activity brief or similar):	The Scheme is located 5 km far from Darma Rural Municipality headquarters which lies in the range of 1082 m from mean sea level. Total 93 households will be benefitted from the construction of this facility. The source of canal is a perennial stream. The total length of irrigation canal is 2400 meters. The new Construction of RCC canal lining is 528 metres, and pipeline length is 252 metres. It bears the abundant capacity to irrigate targeted cultivation land of around 8.51 ha. The direct benefitted households are 93.			
Result of screening:  Category A / High degree of concern  Category B concern	/ Medium degree of Category C / Low degree of concern ✓			
I hereby attest that the screening has been carried out by a person or persons with suitable knowledge and experience, who has/have given undertakings that the work has been done diligently, objectively, and without known biases. The assessment is to the best of our knowledge complete and reflects a professional, evidence- and context-based assessment. Where in doubt, specialist advice and supplementary expertise has been sought.  Name, position and signature of LG personnel signing this attestation:  Resham Oli,, Darma Rural Municipality, Chief Administrative Officer				
Names, affiliation, and positions of personnel who did screening for environmental issues:	Bhupendra Pun Magar, Darma Rural Municipality, Sub-Engineer			
Names, affiliation, and positions of personnel who did screening for social issues:	the Sarki Khatri Darma Rural Municipality-2, Ward Chairperson			

Screening was done as team/group work (Yes/No)	Yes
Was additional specialist advice/support used? (Yes/No) If yes, indicate name, affiliation, and specialisation.	No
Was advice sought from Government Ministry? (Yes/No)	No
Did screening lead to changes in activity design? (Yes/No) If yes, please briefly describe how.	No

Please write any observations, uncertainties, or other factors of importance here. Positive co-benefits of the activity can also be described here. If the activity is categorised of Low Concern/Cat. C, please provide a short description explaining why.

Purposed activity jhyaribang irrigation canal construction scheme is going to be construct in Darma rural municipality-2, Pharulachaur salyan, under the LISP, Karnali Pilot project. The LISP Karnali Pilot aims to support inclusive planning and delivery of local infrastructure and green recovery job creation in local LG level. The LISP Karnali Pilot also aims to enhance the capacity building of local governments. 40 HHs beneficiaries from the locality will be benefitted through the short term employment and around 93 HHs people from community will be directly benefited after construction of this irrigation system. Some community people were irrigating the land by using pipe and some command area was left out due to lack of year-round irrigation. The project will show good results in terms of meeting the project objective of increasing agricultural productivity, as well as improving water use efficiency and enabling water user to manage irrigation system. After the completion of this project, people will yield the crops, fruits, vegetables and increase the productivity of land via continuous flow of water in both seasons. This project will increase the economic and living standard of this community people & it will increase adapting capacity of Local people and control adverse climatic condition. It creates the employment generation to the caretaker, for the sustainability of the scheme. Also, there is nothing to suspect of any alternation in existing environmental and social aspects due to this project. Hence falls under category-C.