

**MOORE STEPHENS**

---

## **Progress Report**

### **Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) Consultation Survey for Yemen Emergency Crises Responsiveness Project (YECRP)**

**11 Mar 2019**

**The data in this report represents the progress so far and it is not the final result, so it is subject to change**

## Introduction

As per request of the client this is only summary report of the progress of the environmental and social survey that conducted by MSY to obtain feedback, concerns and experiences of 3 key stakeholder's groups of the YECRP interventions in 14 sup-projects in 7 governorates.

This summary only represents data and information that collected from 9 sup-projects sites in 6 governorates. As the rest of the site visits results are under processing and will be included in the final report.

The following table summarize the progress of deferent activity for this assignment:

Activity	Target	Achieved	%
Field visits	14	13	64%
Collected data	280	241	86%
Data cleaning	280	177	63%
Data analysis	280	108	39%
Reporting	280	108	39%

## Environmental and Social Survey Results

The following sections include results of survey activities of the ECRP in the seven governorates where fourteen sup-projects have been visited.

### Survey Indicators Analysis

MSY conducted 9 (up to the time of reporting) site visits to obtain feedback and assess the environmental and social aspects in 9 subprojects in 6 governorates that involve some ESMF related issues such like water, roads and agriculture. which are implemented by PWP (3 sup-projects) and by RMF (6 sup-projects), where the local community, local authority and IPs feedback, experiences and concerns about the potential environmental and social impacts of the ECRP projects were shared. Additionally, the extent of awareness of Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) by direct and indirect beneficiaries of subprojects in the governorates where the sup-projects are implemented was assessed. Details of analysis results are provided below.

### *Community Environmental, Health and Safety*

Environmental, Social, Health and Safety aspects were surveyed and assessed through five main indicators:

- *Community Health and Safety*
- *Occupational Health and Safety*
- *General Environmental Impact*
- *Grievances Redress Mechanism GRM*
- *Gender challenges*
- *Community Engagement*

Three key stakeholders groups have been targeted in the selected sampling sub-projects in the survey to obtain feedback, concerns and inputs regarding the potential impacts of ECRP interventions through the above five main indicators.

- Beneficiaries, Community Committee Members and Local Authority
- Project Implementation Partners
- Direct Project Implementer (contractors/sub-contractors)

### *Community Health and Safety*

The community health and safety aspects were assessed throughout obtaining the interviewees feedback on the potential impacts of the subprojects and the mitigation measures which have to be applied by the contractors to mitigate and control the impacts on the health and safety of the community.

#### **Beneficiaries, Community Committee Members and Local Authority:**

It was observed that there were variances in this stakeholder group experiences in the ECRP sub-projects as 24% has experience with the ECRP interventions, while 76% they don't. About 68% they think there are no potential social and environmental risks of the sub-projects, while only 4% think there are potential E&S risk and these risks include (Sewage under the houses, paving is not enough and some work is not completed in some places, concerns of leaks or explosion of the water reservoirs), while 29% they have no idea. There are about 12% have concerns about how the ECRP sub-projects are being implemented and 11% have seen some activities taking place that made them concerned (In some places the water network and sewers have not been

well restored, Leaks of manholes, Children and animals fall in excavations). Meanwhile, there were only (6%) think the project has effects on the population health (The pit, located in the middle of the area, causes water leaks especially during rain and sewage that lead to citizens movement obstruction (Project No. 300-13467), while 94% think that the project has no effect on the population health. In 100% sup-projects there were no explosives or hazardous materials been used during project implementation.

### **Project Implementation Partners:**

This stakeholder group represents the KIIs (Key informant Individuals) as they represent the implementation partners in the sup-projects sites and supposed to be aware about all the sup-project details. It is noticed that their experiences in the ECRP sup-projects and their opinion if there are potential social and environmental risks of the sup-project are similar as 100% confirmed that there is no potential risk. Meanwhile, 100% of the questioned persons have no concerns about how the ECRP sup-projects are being implemented and they are 100% agreed that the project has no effects on the population health. Moreover, It has been confirmed by 100% that there were no explosives or hazardous materials been used during project implementation.

### **Direct Project Implementer (contractors/sub-contractors)**

This stakeholder group represents the direct contractor (independent or from the local community) this include project's engineers, supervisors and workers who is responsible on manage and supervise the sup-projects site and implement the sup-project activities. It is noticed that there are variances in this stakeholder group experiences in the ECRP sup-projects as 19% has experience with the ECRP interventions, while 81% they don't. About 84% they think there are no potential social and environmental risks of the sup-projects, while only 16% they don't know if there are potential E&S risk. Only 3% have concerns about how the ECRP sup-projects are being implemented and only 8% think the project has effects on the population health. In only 3% sup-projects there were explosives or hazardous materials been used during project implementation.

### ***Occupational Health and Safety***

Occupational Health and Safety aspects were assessed throughout collecting the feedback on the health and safety awareness and practices of the contractors and to what extent the ESMF requirements are applied and followed.

### **Beneficiaries, Community Committee Members and Local Authority:**

In general, it has been observed that there was accepted awareness in the occupational health and safety performances of the contractors in the surveyed sub-projects. The ECRP activities negative effects on workers' health conditions were questioned and 97% agreed that there is no effect. While only 19% agreed on the safety practices in the work sites and training of the workers, meanwhile 81% confirmed the availability and use of the PPEs (Personal Protective Equipment) on sites. In all sub-projects sites there were no observation of accidents due to the ECRP activities as 100% confirmed that. There were 76% of the interviewees confirmed that the working hours are 8hrs, while 24% indicated more than 8 hours. The prohibition of child labour was applied and observed in all subprojects (100% in compliance), while the awareness of the child labour prohibition was 59%.

### **Project Implementation Partners:**

The ECRP activities negative effects on workers' health conditions were questioned and 100% confirmed that there is no effect in workers' health conditions. While 48% confirmed that they get training on occupational health and safety by the project, meanwhile 96% confirmed the availability and use of the PPEs (Personal Protective Equipment) on sites. Meanwhile, they indicated that they ensure the use of PPE (Through the monitoring of the technical resident representative of the project during the period of work and through periodic reports on safety and health). In all sub-projects sites there were no observation of accidents due to the ECRP activities as 100% confirmed that. The safety and security difficulties were not experienced in all sub-projects sites as it has been confirmed by the IPs representatives. There were 89% confirmed that the working hours are 8hrs, while 11% indicated more than 8 hours. Moreover, there were 41% confirmed the availability of incident register and log book in the sites.

### **Direct Project Implementer (contractors/sub-contractors)**

The ECRP activities negative effects on workers' health conditions were questioned and 97% agreed that there is no effect. While 78% confirmed the safety practices in the work sites and training of the workers, meanwhile 92% confirmed the availability and use of the PPEs (Personal Protective Equipment) on sites. In most sub-projects sites there were no observation of accidents due to the ECRP activities as 92% confirmed that. About 92% of the contractors believe they have

the proper training in safety to conduct their jobs and 95% they confirmed that they have the proper equipment. There were 78% confirmed that the working hours are 8hrs, while 22% indicated more than 8 hours. The prohibition of child labour was applied and observed in all subprojects (100% in compliance), while the awareness of the child labour prohibition was 86%.

### *General Environmental Preservation*

It was observed that in 92% the contractor disposes the construction debris and waste materials at designated permitted sites, while in 75% change in runoff water patterns and effluent was avoided during the sup-projects implementation. Moreover, it has been confirmed by most interviewees 74% that the vegetative cover has been restored and 19% not applicable. While 53% of the implementer contractors has basic knowledge on how to deal with cultural and archaeological findings.

### **Grievances Redress Mechanism GRM**

Results from the collected feedback of the sampling stakeholder's groups in the targeted interventions sites for the GRM awareness and availability revealed that:

#### **Beneficiaries, Community Committee Members and Local Authority:**

66% of subproject's local beneficiaries and community members are aware of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), while 52% have confirmed the availability of the GRM in the sup-projects sites. About 76% are aware of the system especially, the complaint submission process and to whom it submits and how. Moreover, only 10% have experience on complaints or grievances.

#### **Project Implementation Partners:**

It has been observed that 59% of the project implementation partners ensure that community and workers are aware of the GRM Grievances Redress Mechanism. About 56% of the questioned persons have confirmed the availability of the GRM in sup-projects locations, while 44% confirmed the non-availability of the GRM in sites. The awareness of the GRM process where measured throughout direct question to the IPs representatives and 52% confirmed that they are aware of the system especially, the complaint submission process and to whom it submits and how.

#### **Direct Project Implementer (contractors/sub-contractors)**

92% of the subproject's workers are aware of GRM. Furthermore, it was noted that 89% of subprojects have GRM system applied on site, while only 11% of subprojects don't have GRM system on site. About 92% are aware of the system especially, the complaint submission process and to whom it submits and how. Moreover, only 14% have experience on complaints or grievances.

## Gender challenges

Results from the collected feedback of the sampling stakeholder's groups in the targeted interventions sites for the women challenges in the ECRP interventions:

### **Beneficiaries, Community Committee Members and Local Authority:**

Only 24% of subproject's local beneficiaries and community members think that the nature of activities of ECRP is suitable for female workers, while 76% think it is not, while 13% think that female workers/beneficiaries faced challenges directly or indirectly from their family, relatives or community because of their involvement, while 87% they don't think so. It has been noticed that 100% confirmed that female workers were not exposed to any kind of violence or mistreatment during the project.

### **Project Implementation Partners:**

It has been observed that 22% of the project implementation partners believe on that the nature of activities of ECRP is suitable for female workers, while 78% think it is not. while 4% think that female workers/beneficiaries faced challenges directly or indirectly from their family, relatives or community because of their involvement, while 96% they don't think so. It has been noticed that 100% of the interviewees confirmed that female workers were not exposed to any kind of violence or mistreatment during the project.

### **Direct Project Implementer (contractors/sub-contractors)**

54% of subproject's workers and local waged beneficiaries think that the nature of activities of ECRP is suitable for female workers, while 46% think it is not, while 3% think that female workers/beneficiaries faced challenges directly or indirectly from their family, relatives or community because of their involvement, while 97% they don't think so. It has been noticed that 100% confirmed that female workers were not exposed to any kind of violence or mistreatment during the project.

## Community Engagement

The general evaluation of the community engagement was verified throughout obtaining the key stakeholders inputs and feedback on the level of their engagement in the sub-projects in their areas and the amount of information they have about them. It has been observed that 65% have been actively engaged in the project and have enough information about the project. Meanwhile, 99% of the questioned persons don't have any concerns about the level of engagement or information that they have available. Eventually, 100% have confirmed that this project did not create any conflict of any kind in their community.