

SOCIAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST

Portfolio name/ Loan	
Agreement Component:	
Project name:	
Project number:	
Project Officer:	
Date:	

Instruction: This checklist is to be completed as part of the appraisal process and presented to the Social Review Committee along with the Project Appraisal Report.

1. GENERAL

1.1. Are the objectives of the project clearly stated?	Yes No
1.2 Are the components clearly identified and consistent with problem?	Yes No
1.3. Are the project components relevant to the project objectives?	Yes No
1.4 Are the project components (outputs) adequate to achieve the objectives stated?	Yes No

2. PARTICIPATION

2.1 Are the direct beneficiaries of the project clearly identified?	Yes No
2.2 Is there evidence of consultation with direct beneficiaries?	Yes No No
2.3. Does the project design facilitate the access of project benefits (goods, services, information) by vulnerable groups (elderly, disabled, etc.)?	Yes No
2.4 Was a stakeholder analysis completed for the project (public, private, civil society etc.)?	Yes No No
2.5 Are the mechanisms for stakeholder engagement in the project clearly defined?	Yes No



3. GENDER

3.1. Is the project concept relevant for the practical and strategic gender needs and priorities of both men and women?	Yes No N/A
and priorities of both men and women:	
3.2 Is the target population described adequately? Data to be disaggregated by gender, age, etc.	Yes No N/A
3.3 Were both men and women consulted and involved in the project design?	Yes No N/A
3.4 Are the roles, status, of both men and women in the community documented?	Yes No N/A
3.5 Are the needs, demands and priorities of men and women in relation to the project clearly documented?	Yes No N/A
3.6 Were the risks and possible adverse impact of the project in relation to both men and women considered?	Yes No N/A
3.7 Was a gender-appropriate communication strategy developed for the project?	Yes No N/A
3.8 Will there be gender balanced recruitment of project personnel?	Yes No N/A
3.9 Are specific roles for men and women on the Project Committee pre-assigned?	Yes No N/A
3.10 Could the project have an adverse impact on the target population?	Yes No N/A



4.1 Does the project involve involuntary land acquisition resulting in physical and economic displacement?	Yes	No	N/A
4.2 Has an action plan been developed to address involuntary land acquisition?	Yes	No	N/A
4.3 Does the project require payment compensation to affected persons (PAPs) as a result of project activities.	Yes	No	N/A
4.4 Does the project involve indigenous or culturally indigenous groups (Rastafarian, Maroon, Tainos etc.)	Yes	No	N/A
4.5 Will the project have an adverse impact on the groups mentioned in 4.3?	Yes	No	N/A

5. MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL RISKS

5.1 Is there any risk of the project being opposed or undermined by powerful interest groups/individuals?	Yes No N/A
5.2 Will the project result in loss of employment/livelihood as a result of project activities?	Yes No N/A
5.3 Will the project result in loss of access or increased difficulty to access basic services (health, education, transportation, religion, recreation etc.)?	Yes No N/A
5.4 Does the project present significant risk for leakages of project benefits to unintended beneficiaries?	Yes No N/A
5.5 Are the lists of social and other risks adequately identified and assessed?	Yes No N/A
5.6 Are there any political, religious or social risks that may occur?	Yes No N/A
5.7 Are the risk mitigation activities listed and adequate?	Yes No N/A



6.1 Does the Appraisal report adequately outline the milestones for activities in the Implementation plan and are they adequate and realistic?	Yes No
6.1 Does the implementation plan identify all the inputs i.e. contracts for Goods, Works and Services that will contribute to the objective being met?	Yes No
6.2 Did the Officer sufficiently convince the Committee of the procurement methodology and the availability within the market?	Yes No
6.3 Which procurement methodology was selected?	Traditional JSIF Procured CBC Methodology
6.3 Did the Officer provide evidence of and/or readiness to transfer Terms of References and/or specifications etc. to allow for Transfer to Procurement within 3 days of Board approval?	Yes No No

TO BE COMPLETED BY SOCIAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Date of review by SRC			
Decision:			
Comments:			
Level of Social Risk		High Me	dium Low
Reasons for Rejection (list table above)	ref. number from		
SRC Chairperson	SRC Deputy	Chairperson	SRC Convener
Name:	Name:		Name:
Signature:	_ Signature: _		Signature:
Date:	Date:		Date:
High – Risks identified excee	ds project's capacity for	mitigation.	

Medium – Risks identified can be mitigated but requires resources / actions outside of project scope/control.

Low – Risks identified acceptable and mitigation measures within project scope.