ANNEX 1: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SCREENING FORM FOR SCREENING OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACTS OF GESD PROJECT ACTIVITIES



Government of Republic of Malawi

## GOVERNANCE TO ENABLE SERVICE DELIVERY PROJECT (GESD)

## Environmental & Social Screening Form

(Guidelines: Site inspection of project site. The evaluation results to be a consensus of at least two officials)

Project Name: Kalanga Murket Shed	District: MWanza
Project Location TA: Govati GVH: Kalanga Coordinates:	Name of Zone Tham borni
Name of Village: Kalanga	Nature/Size: 14kw
Name, Signature & Designation of Evaluator(s):	Date of Field Evaluation:
1 Nelson Kadzalenmanta AL EDO	17/02/22
2	Sector

	Impact	Appraisal		Significance			Proposed Mitigation Measures
		Yes	No	Low	Medium	high	
1.0	Environmental Screening						
	Will the project generate the following negative impacts			,			2 6 12 3 4 4 4 4
1.1	Loss of trees/vegetation	xV		V			tree planting
1.2	Soil erosion	V		V			yeurthing cons
1.3	Siltation of water courses		V.				· •.
1.4	Loss of habitat to wildlife		V				· Softward
1.5	Dust emissions	V		, V			Walland
1.6	Generation of solid wastes		V				
1.7	Increased incidences of open defecation		V				CHARLES LAND

-	Impact	App	raisal	Signi	ficance		Proposed Mitigation Measures
		Yes	No	Low	Medium	high	1 roposed Miliguion Measures
1.8	Borrow pits and pools of stagnant water		V		112CUIUM	mgn	
1.9	Rubble/heaps of excavated soils		1/	,			
1.10			1	,			
1.11	Destabilisation of river banks and or drainage		. /				
1.12	system due to sand mining		V				
1.13	Spread of water related diseases e.g. Diarrhoea Loss of soil fertility		V			5	
1.14	Contamination from agrochemicals and pesticides						12 2 2 2 2
1.14	Salinisation or alkalisation of soils						
1.15	Reduced water quality and quantity			Table 1			
1.16	Incidence of flooding		V				
1.17	Removal of native tree species		1				
	and of native tree species	30,839	V				
2.0	Social and Economic Screening						
	Will the project generate the following negative social and economic impacts?			1 J. ( )		r cop	102
2.1	Disruption of marriages	1/		1			6 - 0 - A - A - A - A - A - A - A - A - A
2.2	Risk of injuries to workers and communities	V		V	4 3 1 2 2 7 1		sensetatization aw
2.3	Spread of HIV/Aids and STIs	/		V			Sign past of danger
	Risk of child labour	V		V			Conton Juty buto
2.4	Increase in cases of gender based violence	1/	V	. /			and a Muss s
2.5	Increase in risk of theft and crime	V	1 /	V	17 St. 74	for n	MURINES, Gunder +
2.6	Loss of or impacts on private land/gardens		1				p. 40.00 - 3 -
2.7	Loss of or impacts on private residential premises	02	V				
2.8	Loss of or impacts on private commercial premises		V				<u> </u>
2.9	Loss of or impacts on crops for a person/persons		1/				
2.10	Loss of or impacts on forest trees for a		/				
	person/persons						
2.11	Loss of or impacts on fruit trees for a person/persons		1				
2.12	Eviction of squatters		1				
2.13	Eviction of vendors						
2.14	Loss of or impacts on rental accommodation		V				\$7 (1899) (1970)
.16	Closure/blockage of public footpath/road		/				
.17	Blockage of pathways for livestock			/			101
.18	Loss of or impacts on grazing land	V		1/			V L LOCA TON
.19	Loss of or impacts on cultural sites – graveyards, ritual sites	,0	V				relocation
	Loss of or impacts on public facilities – church, borehole, water kiosks,	V	V				
.21	Loss of or impacts on access to public water resources/facilities		1				
.22	Loss of or impacts on access to natural resources		1				

	Impact		aisal	Signif	icance		Proposed Mitigation Mea
		Yes	No	Low	Medium	high	
	Conflicts over use of natural resources e.g. water and forest resources		N				
	Loss or impact on communal facilities e.g. playground,		/				
		<b>Y</b>					
3.0	SCREENING CRITERIA FOR POSITIVE IMPACTS	Yes	No	Lo w	Medium	High	Proposed Enhar Measures
	Will the project generate the following positive social and economic impacts?						
3.1	Creation of job opportunities	1/					INTOVMING com.
3.2	Promotion of local skills and knowledge	V				V	committeent and
3.3	Asset creation						Trains 6th evs
3.4	Improved transportation						
3.5	Improved food security						
3.6	Increased household income	V	,			V	encounge busines 5kil
3.7	Improved standards of living/social status	V				V	paying tax
3.8	Creation of business opportunities	1/				U	1/15
3.9	Restoration of vegetative cover	V				V	planting ground colle
3.10	Reduced soil erosion	V				V	planting trues 2
Cons	ficiaries). Comments from ficiaries). Comments from	Sh	Jnc	do	own	ursh	ip who during
0	would the man	lent	··············	to	arec	or d	mony winds

Significance

Appraisal

Proposed Mitigation Mea

## 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	/	1. The project is cleared. No serious social impact.	
impacts. (When all scores are "No" in	\/	(Where scores are all "No", "few" in form)	
form)	O		
2. There is need for further assessment.		2. There is need for resettlement/compensation.	
(when some score is "Yes, High" in form)		(When some score is "Yes, High" in form	
3. Need to prepare ESMP	$\vee$	3. Need to prepare RAP	

<b>Endorsement by Environmental District Officer</b>	Endorsement by Director of Planning and Develop
Name Nyson Kadzakumanja	Name: T. Katzavoy G
Signature: Date 17/02/77	Signature: Date:

The DPD shall ensure that a completed form is filed within project file immediately after endorsement. EDO should keep a duplicate.
 Project Management Committee will maintain a copy of completed form