

ESMS Questionnaire and ESMS Clearance Report

I. Project Data

Project Title:	Mano River Ecosystem Conservation and International Water Resources Management (IWRM) Project		
Project proponent:	IUCN PACO		
Country:	Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Ivory Coast	Project number:	
Estimated start date and duration:		Budget (CHF):	
ESMS Screening is	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (1) required because the project budget is \geq CHF 500,000 <input type="checkbox"/> (2) required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire <input type="checkbox"/> (3) not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 and the project proponent has not identified any risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire		
	Name and function of individual representing project proponent		Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Dr. Kai Schmidt-Soltau	IUCN, SIA Consultant	May 13, 2016
IUCN Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	June 3 rd , 2016
	Gonzalo Oviedo	Senior Advisor Social Policy	June 3 rd , 2016
Documents submitted for screening/clearance:			

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal: Rating and Conclusion

Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk <input type="checkbox"/> TBD
<input type="checkbox"/> Cleared	<i>The conclusions are positive and the project proposal meets all requirements with regards to avoiding or reducing environmental and social risks: the proposal is accepted.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conditionally cleared	<i>The conclusions call for improving one or more ESMS activities and/or for important re-formulation of some mitigation measures. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance rejected	<i>Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, critical mitigation measures have not been incorporated or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.</i>
Rational, including summary key findings checklist, and recommendations:	<p>The project promotes sustainable management of forest and water resources in the Upper Guinea forest ecosystem. Forest ecosystem management is improved by promoting the restoration of productivity of tree-based systems and by developing integrated land use plans. However, low to moderate impacts on the livelihood of local communities might be expected as some of the measures for protected areas such as (re-)classification and zoning or protected areas and development of integrated land use plans might involve restricting access to forest resources. The type and magnitude of these restrictions and their impact on livelihood can only be determined during project implementation when the restrictions are established. Until the significance of this has been determined the project is conservatively classified as moderate risk project.</p> <p>A process is laid out below in case significant impacts of access restrictions have been identified, including the development of an Action plan for Mitigating Impacts from Access Restrictions.</p> <p>Other impacts are considered minor, some are still to be determined at the begin of project implementation upon availability of project site data</p> <p>The project is conditionally cleared; assessment results and reports indicated below are to be submitted to IUCN.</p>

II. ESMS Questionnaire

Potential impacts related to ESMS standards			
Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions			
	To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)	Comments, additional considerations
1. Will / might the project involve physical relocation or resettlement of people? if yes, answer a-b below	No		
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement?			
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?			
2. Does the project include activities that involve restricting access to land or natural resources or changes in the use and management of natural resources? (e.g., establishing new restrictions, strengthening enforcement capacities through training, infrastructure, equipment or other means, promoting village patrolling etc.; if yes, answer a-g below	yes		
3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? if yes, answer a-g below	yes		
4. Does the project create situations that make physical access more difficult to livelihood resources (e.g. to multiple use zones, to schools or medical services etc.)? if yes, answer a-g below	TBD		
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.	yes	Community forest and agroforestry plantation establishment	<p>The following 3 activities might involve elements of access restrictions:</p> <p>Activity 1.15 includes procurement of park/ field equipment at each site, purchase premium to support park surveillance and funding concrete protection measures on the ground.</p> <p>Activity 1.16: Produce formal recommendations for legal (re)classification and zoning of identified priority forest areas; Activity 1.17: Negotiate integrated land use plans in a participatory way with stakeholders and target groups; negotiate and sign conservation agreements with performance based appraisals, focus restricted access to protected areas and stop encroachment, procure field equipment and material at each site</p> <p>However, at this point the sites, types and magnitude of access restrictions measures are not known; they will only be determined during project implementation.</p>
b. Explain the project's level of influence: will it define restrictions, put in place restrictions, strengthen enforcement capacities or promote restrictions indirectly (e.g., through awareness building measures or policy advice)?		Through the establishment of management plans and management systems	<p>1.15: The project strengthens enforcement capacities by providing equipment and funding concrete protection measures – potential for direct access restrictions</p> <p>1.16: formal recommendations for legal (re)classification and zoning of identified priority forest areas are produced by the project; the formal adoption of the recommendations is done by the authorities and outside the project's influence – potential for indirect access restrictions</p> <p>1.17: integrated land use plans are negotiated through specific negotiation workshops organized two times every year at each site leading to signed Conservation agreements - potential for direct access restriction but agreed with stakeholders</p>

c. Has the existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource (incl. traditional rights) been analysed, broken down by different groups including women, if applicable?	No		A high-level analysis has been provided in the socio-economic assessment but this needs to be complimented by a more detailed analysis once the final sites have been selected. This should include an analysis practice followed in each sites. Results from the analysis of land rights will be important to understand whether the mitigation measures are accessible by affected groups (e.g. if groups affected by access restrictions have access to land and can hence benefit from mitigation measures / training in improved agricultural practices).
d. Explain whether the country's existing laws recognise traditional rights for land and natural resources; are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not recognised?	No	It recognises it only on request and following a rather lengthy process	A high-level analysis has been provided in the socio-economic assessment but this needs to be complemented with on-site data.
e. Have the implications of the access restriction measures on people's livelihoods been analysed, by social group? If yes, describe the groups affected by restrictions. Distinguish social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples) and men and women.	No		A high-level analysis has been provided in the socio-economic assessment but this needs to be complemented with on-site data once types of access restrictions are determined.
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access?	TBD	Participatory management and inclusion of the entire population into the group of beneficiaries	Integrated land use plans will be developed in a participatory way with stakeholders and target groups; in this process stakeholder will be able to identify potential negative livelihood impacts and voice their concerns. The project intends further to enable the generation of sustainable income from tree products and services (including through certification schemes) which will mitigate and partly compensate for impacts from loss of access to resources. However, there might be a need to more strictly tailoring these benefits to the group affected by restrictions (once negative impacts from access restrictions have been confirmed).
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?	No		This will be part of the negotiations carried out during project implementation (activity 1.17) on case negative impacts from access restrictions have been confirmed.
5. Is there a risk that the project might affect current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources, land, or territories through measures other than access restrictions – with negative impacts on people or groups?	No		
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	yes	Most of the conservation NGOs and the national agencies in charge of protected areas	
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	Yes	Activities that involve elements of access restrictions are described in question 4.a. However, the sites, types and magnitude of access restrictions measures will only be determined during project implementation. It is hence not possible at this point to fully judge expected impacts on livelihoods and as such determine the applicability of the Standard.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	<p>As strategy for mitigating livelihood impacts from access restrictions the project will enable sustainable income through training people in agroforestry practices and by linking them to certification schemes in order to assure a more effective marketing of their produce.</p> <p>Given the lack of clarity on the type of restrictions, decisions about the Standard's applicability and need for mitigation measures is postponed to project implementation. The below described process needs to be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of types of access restriction measures implemented in each site; • As part of activity 1.14 (gathering information on human populations, socio-economic dynamics and impacts on livelihoods) an assessment about negative impacts on livelihoods from access restriction measures needs to be undertaken (following the instructions provided in the Guidance Note on Social Impact Assessment); this includes filling the data gaps pointed out above. This will allow identification of the groups affected by access restrictions and an assessment of the magnitude of 		

impacts. Results of this step need to be reported to IUCN;

- In case significant impacts are confirmed an Action Plan for Mitigating Impacts from Access Restrictions needs to be developed (see Guidance Note provided by IUCN); this will require, among others, developing mitigating measures (in consultation with affected groups) and obtaining FPIC from affected groups; the Action Plan needs to be submitted to IUCN for approval.

Standard on Indigenous Peoples ¹		To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)		Comments, additional considerations
1. Is the project located in an area inhabited by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples? If yes, answer questions a-j	TBD			The Manu River Union Forests are home and provide livelihoods for around 10 million people from more than 100 different ethnic groups. Information available at this point does not indicate that some of these ethnic groups belong specifically to indigenous peoples groups; hence applicability of the Standard cannot be assessed at this moment. However, a more detailed analysis is being undertaken as part of project implementation (activity 1.14). Based on the findings from this analysis the applicability of the Standard will be reviewed again. If applicability is confirmed the questions below will guide risk identification and development of mitigation measures.
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still present risks that might affect their rights and livelihood? If yes, answer questions a-j				
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.				
a. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?				
b. How do these groups identify themselves?				
c. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence and influence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.				
d. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' livelihood through access restrictions? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.			This is not envisaged, but there is a risk of economic displacement and restricted access to resources if the project benefits are captured by local elites	
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' material or non-material livelihoods in ways other than access restrictions (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)?				

¹The coverage of indigenous peoples includes: (i) peoples who identify themselves as "indigenous" in strict sense; (ii) tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and (iii) traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services

f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?			
g. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?			
h. Does the project intend to use the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples?			
i. Has any process been started or implemented to achieve the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples to activities directly affecting their lands/territories/resources?			
j. Are opportunities considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a culturally appropriate and gender inclusive way?			
k. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?			
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	TBD	The Manu River Union Forests are home and provide livelihoods for around 10 million people from more than 100 different ethnic groups. Information available at this point does not indicate that some of these ethnic groups belong specifically to indigenous peoples groups; hence applicability of the Standard cannot be assessed at this moment.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	A more detailed analysis needs to be undertaken as part of project implementation (activity 1.14). Based on the findings from this analysis the applicability of the Standard will be reviewed again. If applicability is confirmed the questions below will guide risk identification and development of mitigation measures.		

Standard on Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
	Yes, no, n/a	To be completed by project proponent <i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	IUCN ESMS Reviewer <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? If yes, answer questions a-d	yes	In is located in the buffer zone around 12 protected areas	
2. Is the project located in or near to areas recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users? If yes, answer questions a-d	No		
3. Is the project located in/near to areas which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value ² ? If yes, answer questions a-d	Yes	several	KBAs including important bird areas
Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.			
a. If the project aims to establish or expand the protected area (PA), is there a risk of adverse impacts on natural resources on areas beyond the PA?	N/A		
b. If the project aims at changing management of a PA, is there a risk of adverse direct and indirect impacts on other components of biodiversity?	No		No, the project's main objective is to improve biodiversity and applies sound best practices in PA management.
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourisms facilities, access roads), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity, (consider the construction and use phases)?	N/A		
d. If the project promotes ecotourism, is there a risk of adverse impacts to biodiversity, e.g., due to water/waste disposal, disturbance of flora/fauna, overuse of sites, slope erosion etc.)?	N/A		
4. Will the project introduce or translocate species as a strategy for species conservation or ecosystem restoration (e.g. erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation)? If yes, answer questions a-c	No		
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g.,	yes	Agroforestry development	

² Areas important to threatened species according to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, important to endemic or restricted-range species or to migratory and congregatory species; areas representing key evolutionary processes, providing connectivity with other critical habitats or key ecosystem services; highly threatened and/or unique ecosystems (e.g. to be determined in future by the evolving IUCN Red List of Ecosystems); areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and subsets such as important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), important Plant Areas (IPAs), important Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity or Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites.

agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? If yes, answer questions a-c			
Answer only if you answered yes to items 4 or 5 above.			
a. Does this project involve non-native species or is there a risk of introducing non-native species inadvertently? If yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour? Have precautions been taken to avoid risks?	No		The main outcome of the project is to identify the land practices that conserve and promote native forest trees species in restored, multi-functional landscapes guided by the objective to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality. There are no plans to introduce non-native species. However, there is always a risk of introducing non-native species by accident, during processes of restoration. This happens through non rigorous protocols in germplasm transfer from one country to country. Therefore the project needs to ensure that during the actual implementation stages, Protocols for Germplasm procurement are rigorously respected.
b. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of facilitatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)? Have precautions been taken to avoid risks?	TBD		Same as above (question a)
c. Have or will potential adverse impacts on people's livelihood been analysed and precautions taken to avoid risks?	TBD		Not yet, but the choice of agroforestry tree species is guided by the objective to provide benefits for the farmers. So, no risk is expected.
6. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water flows on-site or downstream (including increases or decreases in peak and flood flows and low flows) through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or through other activities?	No		There is no risk expected that project activities affect water flows in a negative way. All decisions about the use of water resources will be based on the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis where environmental impacts will be determined undertaken by qualified experts.
7. Will the project affect water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g., water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.	No		There is no risk expected that project activities affect water flows in a negative way. All decisions about the use of water resources will be based on the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis undertaken by qualified experts.
8. Is there a risk that the project will affect water quality of waterways (e.g., through diffuse water pollution from agricultural run-off or other activities)?	No		
9. Is there a risk that the project will affect ecosystem functions and services not covered above, in particular those on which local communities depend for their livelihoods?	TBD		
10. Does the project promote the use of living natural resources (e.g., by proposing production systems or harvest plans)? If yes, is there a risk that this will lead to unsustainable use of resources?	No		No, on the contrary; the aim of the project is to develop sustainable production practices and promote their adoption through a certification system. The certification system provides verification of adherence to practices.
11. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? If yes, answer questions a-b	TBD		It is not expected that chemical enhancers are used; restoration interventions are extensive, not intensive; they will use locally adapted species; and opportunities

			are often highest where there is little competition for land use. However, in cases of assisted natural regeneration or enrichment planting, there may be need for protection of trees from browsing animals or for organic manure to stimulate rapid growth of planted trees so they are not dominated..
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
12. Does the project intend to use biological pest management techniques that might risk affecting biodiversity?	No		All practices promoted by the project aim at enhancing biodiversity.
13. Is there a risk that the project will cause adverse environmental impacts in a wider area of influence (landscape/ watershed, regional or global levels) including transboundary impacts?	No		The impacts are expected to be positive.
14. Is there a risk that consequential developments triggered by the project will have adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services? Is there a risk of adverse cumulative impacts generated together with other known or planned projects in the sites?	No		
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	Yes	The Standard is triggered because there is a low risk of an inadvertent introduction of non-native species.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		As explained above, these risks can be well managed by rigorously respecting protocols for Germplasm procurement.	

Standard on Cultural Heritage		
	To be completed by project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection?	Yes	
2. Does the project area harbour cultural resources such as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resources with archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community (e.g., burial sites, buildings, monuments or cultural landscapes)?	TBD	
		Comments, additional considerations
		The Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve is a Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site (in danger)

3. Does the project area harbour a natural feature or resource with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature (e.g., sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas or sacred species)?	TBD		
4. Will the project involve infrastructure development or small civil works such as roads, levees, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation or buildings such as visitor centre, watch tower?	No		
5. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	No		
6. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items 4–5 might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	No		
7. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	TBD		This might potentially be the case when restricting physical access to PA. This is only known upon classification/zoning. Access restrictions might affect cultural practices of communities, ritual use of forests or waters, ceremonial activities the collection of medicinal plants etc.
8. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	No		
Standard triggered? "Yes / No / TBD" Explain why	TBD	While the site could potentially harbour cultural resources, given that the project does not involve infrastructure development, civil works or other activities that involve excavation or movement of earth there are no obvious risk of damaging resources. It cannot be fully excluded, however, whether access restriction might affect communities in their cultural practices.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		Required actions: When developing land use plans and determining access restriction the potential of adverse impacts as described in question 7 need to be assessed.	

Other social or environmental impacts			
Other social impacts			
	To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is there a risk that the project affects human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? Differentiate between women and men, where applicable.	No		

2. Is there a risk that the project creates or aggravates inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the situation or livelihood conditions of women or girls?	No		Women are important users of forest resources. Access restriction to forest resources (e.g. fire wood) might affect them more strongly than men. Women are also important users of water resources. Strategic Action Programmes (SAP) for the protection and the management of the transboundary water resources might not sufficiently respect needs or vulnerabilities of women. However, it is generally assumed that the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis will cover gender dimensions (e.g. needs, vulnerabilities, health issues etc.)
3. Does the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	Yes	As part of the group of beneficiaries	There might be a risk that the training courses might fall short in accommodating special needs of women in order to enable participation (e.g. in terms of conditions of participation, time arrangements etc)
4. Does the project provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?	No		
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? ³	No		
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups ⁴ in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?	Yes	There is a risk of elite capture that would personalise common benefits	There is a risk of vulnerable or marginalized people not being able to seek the opportunities provided by the project (e.g. training in farming/agroforestry) because they don't have access to land, farming resources or lack other essential conditions. This should be prevented by affirmative action wherever possible.
7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.	yes	The elites might bring in migrant workers as they work for less than the local populations	
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. human-wildlife conflicts)?	No		
9. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	No		
10. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	No		
11. Is the project likely to induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?	No	There might be an influx of workers for the agroforestry plantations	The risk is not judged as significant.

³ Affirmative action is a measure designed to overcome prevailing inequalities by favouring members of a disadvantaged group who suffer from discrimination. However, if not designed appropriately these measures could aggravate the situation of a previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

⁴ Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

12. Please specify any other risk that could negatively affect the livelihoods of local communities; also consider indirect, cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts.	N/A		
13. Is there a risk that the project affects the operation of dams or other built water infrastructure (reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals) e.g., by changing flows into those structures? If yes, has an inventory of existing water resources infrastructures in the project area been compiled and potential impacts analysed?	No		
14. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	Yes	As the government and its agencies in particular FDA considers itself as the owner of all land and forests they are said to be rather defensive with a view on community forest establishment etc.	One of the principles of the project is to promote a strong local communities empowerment for better appropriation and improved results sustainability. Hence the risk will be addressed by negotiating integrated land use plans in a participatory way with stakeholders and target groups

Other environmental impacts			
	To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)	Comments, additional considerations
1. Will the project lead to increased waste production, in particular hazardous waste?	No		
2. Is the project likely to cause pollution or degradation of soil, soil erosion or siltation?	No		
3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	No		
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions?	No		
5. Is there a risk that the project triggers consequential development activities which could lead to adverse environmental impacts, cumulative impacts due to interaction with other projects (current or planned) or to transboundary impacts (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	TBD	As the project aims to establish agroforestry in areas presently not used, this could lead to environmental degradation if not done properly.	
6. Do any of the planned activities fall within specific legislation requiring environmental and/or social impact assessments? If yes, specify.	No		
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations or provisions of the host country?	No		
Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above. Aside from these issues, are there any other potential negative impacts?		No significant risks have been identified; however the project should be proactive in designing measures (e.g. training) to assure that they are accessible by women and vulnerable groups.	

<p>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</p> <p>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</p>	<p>Required actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on dependency on forest resources and vulnerability of certain groups (women, vulnerable groups) are gathered as part of in Activity 1.14.). These findings should be taken into consideration when designing training measures to assure that socio-cultural conditions of women and vulnerable groups are appropriately addressed. The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis needs to assure that gender dimensions are sufficiently covered (e.g. water needs, vulnerabilities, health issues etc.).
---	---

Climate change risks			
Risks caused by a failure to adequately consider the effects of climate change			
	To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Have historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and climate change in the project area been taken into consideration?	Yes	The objective to enhance the deforestation of watersheds is proposed as mitigation measure to reduced water availability downstream.	
2. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	Yes	Droughts.	
3. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more susceptible than others (e.g., women or vulnerable groups)?	TBD		
4. Is there a risk that current or projected climate variability and changes might affect the implementation of project activities or their effectiveness and the sustainability of the project (e.g., through risk and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding, or droughts)?	TBD		Climate variability or changes might affect the sustainability of promoted restoration interventions. There might be a risk that some native species don't adapt to changing rainfall, temperature and other climate patterns.
5. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities and the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes (e.g., through risks and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding or droughts)?	Yes		If the promoted agricultural/agroforestry practices are not adapted to climate variability or change, they might jeopardize the livelihood of farmers who have invested in the techniques and depend on the income.
6. Does the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	No		
<p>Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above.</p>			

Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed

Required actions:

- When designing agroforestry practices and other sustainable land use measures changes in biophysical conditions due to climate change need to be taken into consideration.