

Government of the Republic of Malaŵi Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development Agriculture Commercialization Project

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SCREENING FORM

INTRODUCTION

This Environmental and Social Screening Form (ESSF) has been designed to assist in the evaluation of planned construction and rehabilitation activities under Malawi Agriculture Commercialization Project. The form will assist the sub-project implementers and reviewers to identify environmental and social impacts and their mitigation and enhancement measures, if any. It will also assist in the determination of requirements for further environmental work (such as environmental and social Impact Assessment) if necessary.

The ESSF will also assist in identifying potential socio-economic impacts that will require mitigation/enhancement measures and/or resettlement and compensation.

PRERIQUISITE FOR SCREENING

The evaluator should undertake the assignment after:

- 1. Gaining adequate knowledge of baseline information of the area.
- 2. Gaining knowledge of proposed project activities for the area.
- 3. Having been briefed / trained in environmental and social screening.

4. The form is to be completed by consensus of at least three people, knowledgeable of the screening process.

| Project Name: | Estimated Cost (MK): |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Nature/Size: | Funding Agency: |
| Project Location | Date of Field Appraisal: |
| District: | |
| TA : | |
| EPA: | Coordinates: |
| GVH: | |
| Proposed Main Project Activities | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Name, Signature & Designation of Evaluator(s): | |
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| | |
| Sketch Map of the site | |
| (include geographical features and public features a | round the site; where necessary) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

1.0 SCREENING CRITERIA FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DURING IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION

Will the implementation and operation of the project activities within the selected site generate the following impacts?

| | | | 5 | SCREE | DLOGY OF ENING | PROPOSED MITIGATION | |
|-------|--|-------|----|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------|
| | | Appra | | Significance of the | | | MEASURES |
| | SCOPE AND FOCUS | of Im | | Impac | | | - |
| | OF SCREENING | Yes | No | Low | Medium | High | |
| 1.1 | Loss of trees/vegetation | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | Soil erosion and siltation of water courses | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Damage of wildlife species and habitat | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | Increased exposure to agro-chemical pollutant | | | | | | |
| 1.5 | Chemical pollution | | | | | | |
| 1.6 | Nuisance from dust emission, bad smell or noise emission or noise or vibrations | | | | | | |
| 1.7 | Reduced water quality | | | | | | |
| 1.8 | Increase in costs of water treatment | | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Soil contamination | | | | | | |
| 1.10 | Loss of soil fertility | | | | | | |
| 1.11 | Reduced flow and availability of water for users | | | | | | |
| 1.12 | Long term depletion of water resources | | | | | | |
| 1.13 | Increased incidence of flooding | | | | | | |
| 1.14 | Salinisation or alkalinisation of soils | | | | | | |
| 1.15 | Changes in migration patterns of animals | | | | | | |
| 1.16 | Introduce alien plants and animals in the area | | | | | | |
| 1. 17 | Increased incidences of plant and animal diseases | | | | | | |
| 1.18 | Poor waste disposal | | | | | | |
| 1.19 | Increased cases of open defecation | | | | | | |

| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
|------|-----------------------------|------------|------------|---------|----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| 1.20 | Disturbalization of river | | | | | | |
| | banks and or drainage | | | | | | |
| | systems due to sand | | | | | | |
| | mining | | | | | | |
| 1.21 | Creation of borrow pits | | | | | | |
| | arising from extracting of | | | | | | |
| | construction materials | | | | | | |
| 1.22 | Rubble or heaps of | | | | | | |
| | excavated soils | | | | | | |
| 2.0 | SCREENING CRITERIA | FOR N | EGA | TIVE S | SOCIAL AN | ND ECO | DNOMIC IMPACTS |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Will the implementation and | l operat | ion of | the pro | ject activitie | s within | the selected site generate the |
| | following socio-economic co | osts/imp | pacts? | | | | - |
| | | _ | | | | | |
| | SCOPE AND FOCUS | MET | HOD | OLOG | Y OF | | PROPOSED |
| | OF SCREENING | SCR | EENIN | NG | | | MITIGATION MEASURES |
| | | Appr | aisal | Signi | ficance of tl | he | |
| | | of impacts | | impacts | | | |
| | | | | _ | | - | |
| | | Yes | No | Low | Medium | High | |
| 2.1 | Loss of land for human | | | | | | |
| | settlement, farming, | | | | | | |
| | grazing | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Loss of property – houses, | | | | | | |
| | agricultural produce, etc. | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Loss of cultural sites – | | | | | | |
| | graveyards, monuments, | | | | | | |
| | etc. | | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Interference in marriages | | | | | | |
| | for local people | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Loss of income generating | | | | | | |
| | capacity | | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Spread of HIV and AIDS, | | | | | | |
| | STIs | | | | | | |
| 2.7 | Changes in human | | | | | | |
| | settlement patterns of | | | | | | |
| | villages | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | Conflicts over use of | | | | | | |
| | natural resources such as | | | | | | |
| | water and forest resources | | | | | | |
| 2.9 | Population influx | | 1 | | | | |
| 2.10 | Conflicts over land use | | | | | | |
| | and ownership | | | | | | |
| 2.11 | Disruption of important | | | | | | |
| | pathways, roads | | | | | | |
| | 1 1 1 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |

| 2.12 | Loss of access to public facilities e.g. churches, schools | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------|-------|-----|---------------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| 2.13 | Increase in cases of theft | | | | | | |
| 2.13 | and crime | | | | | | |
| 2.14 | Risk of child labour | | | | | | |
| 2.14 | Increase in cases of | | | | | | |
| | gender based violence | | | | | | |
| 2.16 | Risk of injuries to workers and communities | | | | | | |
| 2.17 | Increasing incidences of | | | | | | |
| | diseases | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | SCREENING CRITERIA FOR POSITIVE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS Will the implementation and operation of the project activities within the selected site generate the | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | jeci activiti | es wunn | t the selected site generate the |
| | following positive socio-eco | onomic | impac | ts? | | | |
| | 1 | | | | Medium | High | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT MEASURES |
| 3.1 | following positive socio-eco SCOPE AND FOCUS | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.1 | following positive socio-eco SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.1 | <i>following positive socio-eco</i> SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| | <i>following positive socio-eco</i> SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job opportunities | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| | <i>following positive socio-eco</i> SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job opportunities Promotion of local skills | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 | <i>following positive socio-eco</i> SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job opportunities Promotion of local skills and knowledge | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 3.3 | <i>following positive socio-eco</i> SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job opportunities Promotion of local skills and knowledge Improved transportation | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 3.3 | following positive socio-ecoSCOPE AND FOCUSOF SCREENINGCreation of jobopportunitiesPromotion of local skillsand knowledgeImproved transportationImproved standards of | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 3.3 3.4 | following positive socio-eco SCOPE AND FOCUS OF SCREENING Creation of job opportunities Promotion of local skills and knowledge Improved transportation Improved standards of living/social status | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 | following positive socio-ecoSCOPE AND FOCUSOF SCREENINGCreation of jobopportunitiesPromotion of local skillsand knowledgeImproved transportationImproved standards ofliving/social statusImproved food securityCreation of business | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |
| 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 | following positive socio-ecoSCOPE AND FOCUSOF SCREENINGCreation of jobopportunitiesPromotion of local skillsand knowledgeImproved transportationImproved standards ofliving/social statusImproved food security | onomic | impac | ts? | | | PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT |

Consultation (comments from beneficiaries)

Chairperson's Signature:

Overall evaluation of Environmental and Socioeconomic Screening Exercises

The results of the screening process would be either the proposed sub - projects would be exempted or subjected to further environmental and resettlement assessment. The basis of these options is listed in the table below:

| Review of Environmental Screening | Tick | Review of Socioeconomic Screening | Tick |
|--|------|--|------|
| 1. The project is cleared. No serious impacts. | | 1. The project is cleared. No serious social impact. | |
| 2. There is need for further assessment. | | 2. There is need for resettlement/compensation. | |
| 3. Need to prepare ESMP | | 3. Need to prepare RAP | |

| Endorsement by Environmental Officer | District | Endorsement by Director of Planning and Development | |
|---|----------|--|-------|
| Name | | Name: | |
| Signature: | Date | Signature: | Date: |