

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

Project Data

Data for the fields below are copied from the Screening Report

Project Title:	The Forest Restoration Initiative (TRI) – Child Project Guinea-Bissau: Managing mangroves and production landscapes for climate change mitigation		
Project proponent:	Implementing agency: IUCN Guinea Bissau / PACO Executing agency: TBD		
Funding agency:	GEF		
Executing Agency:	Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (<i>Instituto da Biodiversidade e das Areas Protegidas</i>)		
Country:	Guinea Bissau	Contract value (add currency):	USD 3,298,305
Estimated start date and duration:		Amount in CHF:	
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	No		

ESMS Screening Report

Data for the fields below are copied from the Screening Report


ESMS Screening Report	
Risk category:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> low risk <input type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk
Rationale Summarize findings from the questionnaire and judge significance based on criteria such as sensitivity, magnitude, probability and reputational risks	<p>The project aims at reconciling the need for food security with the need to maintain mangrove functions and services and their respective ability to adapt to climate change. It does this by discouraging biodiversity threatening rice cultivation practice (planalto slash and burn techniques) while promoting the cultivation and regeneration of lowland and mangrove rice fields. At the same time natural recolonization of mangroves will be promoted in rice fields that have been or are planned to be abandoned. In addition to the field component the project will also work at macro level towards policy integration, scientific monitoring and environmental education and communication.</p> <p>While the project’s objectives strive at balancing environmental and societal needs and overall environmental and social impacts are expected to be positive, there are a few issues that should be examined or clarified during PPG phase to improve project design.</p> <p>While the Standard of Involuntary Resettlement/Access Restrictions is not triggered in a strict sense, the Standard’s guiding principles should still be followed. As such it should be ensured that any land-use change decision of communities or private land owners promoted in the context of the project will be entirely voluntary, that the land/tenure rights context is well understood and that support provided by the project through complimentary initiatives will allow local farmers to offset their costs associated with the land-use changes. See further explanation in section B1.</p> <p>The Standard on Indigenous Peoples is triggered due to the presence of indigenous groups in the project sites. Hence the socio-economic analysis undertaken during the PPG phase will need to give special attention to livelihood and rights issues of the different indigenous groups; if risks or vulnerabilities are identified, mitigation measures and more extensive consultation will be required which would need to continue during inception phase (see B2).</p> <p>Risks related to cultural heritage are not apparent, but caution should be taken when planning water management structures (see B3). Biodiversity impacts are expected to be predominantly positive; however a few issues need clarification during PPG phase or inception phase (see B4). A few social issues have been identified which need to be addressed by the PPG team, including gender risks and opportunities for strengthening women rights and benefits.</p>

	While overall climate risks seem to be low given the project's focus on climate change adaptation, care needs to be taken when designing project activities in order to avoid increasing vulnerabilities and maladaptation and ensure sustainability of investments and practices promoted by the project (see D1).	
Required assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: a few impact issues need to be clarified in the PPG- and inception phase (see sections B – D)	
ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts	Trigger	Required tools or plans
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal: Rating and Conclusion

The fields below are completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer at Clearance stage

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:	Olivier Hamerlynck	Independent Consultant	23.11.2017
	Linda Klare	IUCN ESMS Coordinator	14.3.2018
	Title	Date	
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:	2017.11.09 PRODOC TRI Guinea Bissau Final	9.11.2017	
	ESMS screening report Guinea Bissau TRI GEF	22.9.2016	
	Mission reports and socio-economic report Baastel	25.5.2017	
Have findings from ESIA triggered any changes (e.g. risk level)	<p>Chapter 4.11 reviews the risks identified in the ESMS screening report, classifies each of them in terms of risk level and suggests measures for mitigating. Given that the majority of risks are considered of low significance and that those few where the level of risks has been rated as medium seem to be well addressed by proposed mitigation measures, the overall risk level for the project will be remained as Low Risk.</p> <p>Based on findings from the PPG phase and respective field missions the Standard on Cultural Heritage is not considered to be triggered.</p>		
<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>		
Rationale - Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected) – no need to provide a summary of the findings from the checklist	Extensive responses to the queries formulated in the ESMS screening have been included in a dedicated section of the project document (Section 4.11). These responses are on the whole adequate and measures for mitigating potential impacts are already conceptualized in form of project activities. Some data and details of project design are still pending (as described in the Checklist in Annex A in the respective sections).		

(Annex A)	therefore the project is only conditionally cleared. Most of this is expected to be defined through the baseline assessment and participatory processes of the territory diagnosis carried out in each village and ROAM process.		
Recommendations for next steps (where relevant):	The Checklist in Annex A specifies actions that are needed during project implementation to address the identified data needs or concerns.		
Approval ESMS Clearance (approving authority should be at least M grade)			
Name	Function	Date	Signature
Jean-Yves Pirot	Director, GEF&GCF Coordination Unit	15 /03 / 18	

Annex A: Checklist for Clearance of Project Proposal

This checklist is completed by the ESMS Coordinator in consultation with the IUCN ESMS Expert team. The purpose of the appraisal is to check whether the project and its ESMP have incorporated adequate measures to avoid, minimize or compensate for potential social and environmental impacts and that a suitable mechanism is conceptualized that assures implementation of mitigation measures and monitoring of their effectiveness. Some questions may not be applicable for the appraised project and hence should be marked with n/a.

	Yes, no, n/a	Comment
General appraisal of project proposal and process of stakeholder engagement		
1. Have the ESMS procedures on stakeholder consultation been properly applied during project design and ESIA and resulted in effective engagement of relevant stakeholders, including affected groups? ¹	Yes	<p>Consultation has been conducted at national and local level with government and non-government institutions, relevant resource persons, local administrations in the 3 intervention areas and the partner projects PADES and PPRJF as well as with local communities in the pre-selected villages (see provided list in Annex 8 of the Prodoc). Further consultation is planned during the participatory territorial diagnosis and the ROAM process (both conceptualized as project activities).</p> <p>Action needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the community level, it should be ensured that consultations are disaggregated by ethnic groups and that legitimacy of those interacted with is confirmed; the consultations should be appropriately documented (e.g. participants, function, topics discussed and agreements achieved). The community part of the stakeholder analysis in the project document is rather thin. It has gender and age group disaggregated information but detail on the potential winners or losers is lacking. This should be completed during the participatory diagnosis at the village level.
2. Have required disclosure of information been made in a culturally appropriate way? ²	n/a	As a low risk project there are no disclosure requirements.
3. Have potential data gaps been filled through baseline studies, where relevant?	Yes	<p>There is good understanding of the main environmental and social issues.</p> <p>Action needed: A key technical question to be further explored during the project is whether the acidification of abandoned rice fields - no longer flooded by the tides - is reversible (it seems likely from experience elsewhere).</p>
4. Have the recommendations from the ESMS Screening and/or ESIA been incorporated in the project proposal?	Yes	The ESMS screening queries were addresses during the field work and described in Section 4.11 in the project document, pages 70 to 75).

¹ The minimum requirements for consultation are summarized in table 6 in the ESMS Manual available at www.iucn.org/esms. The final ESIA report must contain a description of the public consultation process, including a summary of the concerns raised by various stakeholders and how these concerns have been addressed in the ESIA and ESMP.

² The minimum requirements for disclosure of information are summarized in table 5 in the ESMS Manual available at www.iucn.org/esms.

		Action needed: Continued attention will need to be given throughout the inception and implementation phases to the labour force issues, the level and adequacy of compensatory measures for those who voluntarily abandon forest rice.
5. Has advice from Screening or ESIA on the development of mitigation measures been followed? Are they presented as project activities or in form of an ESMP or other ESMS action plans ³ ? Have required resources been accounted for in the project budget? Are responsibilities and implementation schedule specified?	Yes	<u>ESMS Screening:</u> Yes, see answer to question 33. Measures for mitigating potential impacts have been conceptualized in form of project activities; some issues will be detailed further during the inception phase as part of the participatory diagnosis and baseline assessment. There are no specific budget lines dedicated to the mitigation measures; this is ok as they are either conceptualized as activities or part of the wide-ranging participatory processes that are going to be conducted on the various issues such as land use, choice of restoration sites and methods, etc. <u>ESIA:</u> n/a
6. Has the guidance on ESMP monitoring ⁴ been followed and a plan to monitor the ESMP presented?	Yes	An ESMP is not mandatory for projects classified as low risk projects. Action needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk matrix presented in chapter 4.11 should be used as a risk management tool throughout the project; the likelihood of risks and consequence/impact should be adjusted when applicable. The risk matrix should further report on new risk and be included in the project's periodic monitoring report. • It is further recommended to involve IBAP as well as institutions of higher learning in monitoring some of the more complex risk issues throughout the project. This should be accompanied by a light research plan identifying institutions and individuals who could perform certain analyses (e.g. soil acidity in the mangrove, etc.).
7. Has a project-level complaint mechanism been developed based on IUCN's generic grievance mechanism?	No	Action needed: A project-level grievance mechanism has not been established, this needs to be done during inception phase. The project proposes that the wide-ranging participatory processes to be conducted on the various issues will be under the supervision of traditional conflict resolution mechanisms such as the elders' committees. The project-level grievance mechanism should make sue of a similar approach. The grievance mechanism should also ensure that the principles established in the generic IUCN mechanism are followed, including the provision to erect signage.

³ For instance Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) or Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restrictions.

⁴ See ESMS Guidance Note on Developing and Monitoring an ESMP, available at www.iucn.org/esms.

8. Have relevant stakeholders been informed about the grievance mechanism or is it stated how this will be done upon launch of the project? ⁵	No	Action needed: To be done during the inception workshop.
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions		
9. Does the project require resettlement or access restrictions causing adverse social impacts? Have project alternatives or adjustments of project design been sufficiently considered to avoid the need for resettlement or access restrictions?	No	The Standard is not triggered as there are no resettlement plans and any changes in practices and land-use will be decided by the communities and the individual farmers on a voluntary basis.
<i>Answer questions below only if standard has been triggered</i>		
10. If avoidance of resettlement or access restrictions is not possible, have measures been developed to minimize the impact on people's livelihood and/or a mechanism for compensation, assistance and benefits to enhance or at least restore the livelihoods of affected people relative to pre-project levels ("no net loss")?	n/a	
11. FPIC process: Have consultations been held with legitimate representatives of the affected groups? Have they participated in designing a process framework or an action plan and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring? Have they provided consent to project activities that trigger resettlement or restrictions? Is this evidenced/documentated?	n/a	
12. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Are they accessible by all affected groups? Are they sufficient?	n/a	
Indigenous Peoples		
13. Is the Standard triggered?	Yes	The villages Elia, Djobel and Bolol in the Cacheu region are populated by the Baiote and Feloupe ethnic groups who live in the region for many centuries. The two groups, who are considered a sub-group of Diola people, have built very close cultural and social relationships over the past centuries that they most social scientists see them as one group. People of this ethnic group are animist and they

⁵ See chapter 3.3.2 of the ESMS Manual about the need to inform stakeholders about the grievance system, available at www.iucn.org/esms

		<p>maintain their ancestral traditions closely linked to mangrove rice production.</p> <p>People in the villages Enxudé, Flack Cibe, Djabada and Gâ-Pedro in Quinara are mostly from the Balanta ethnic group which are not considered indigenous to this territory as they have moved into this area within the last century. However, there is still a small presence members of the indigenous Papel communities.</p> <p>The villages Cadique Nalu, Cadique N'bitna, Cadique Maila, Cadique Iala, Caboxanque, and Bedanda in the Tombali region are mainly made up by Nalus who occupied the territory originally and Balanta who moved into the area more recently. The traditional power and "land owners" are still the Nalus, the Balanta cultivate the land given away by the Nalus. However, as Balanta moved in over time the Nalu ethnic group has become a minority in these villages. While the Nalus are still dominant, power relations may change affecting the social cohesion in these villages.</p> <p>Action needed: Given the ethnic diversity of the villages a sociologist (or socio-economist) should be added to the project team (as already stated in the PIF and reiterated in the screening report) or at least in form of targeted consultancy assignments; this is to ensure that different ethnic groups are appropriately involved in the project's participatory processes and that relevant risks as well and changes in power relations (induced by the project or not) are perceived.</p>
<i>Answer questions below only if standard has been triggered</i>		
14. Are negative impacts on indigenous people expected?	No	<p>The project aims at rehabilitating traditional rice production and mangrove ecosystems which is expected to address critical risks all local communities (irrespective of being considered indigenous or not) are facing (e.g. coastal erosion and seawater rise). While mangrove rice cultivation is most strongly embedded in the livelihood culture of Felupes and Baiotes (and the non-indigenous Balantas), rice production is also a critical livelihood element for the other groups. It needs to be taken into account though, that in Tombali mangrove rice cultivation is mostly practiced by the Balantas given their longstanding tradition with this production system and that the Nalu, who have adopted these techniques from the Balanta over time, depend on the Balanta in terms of labour availability.</p> <p>It is recognized that the promoted changes might involve certain risks or negative impacts. One relates to the fact that the protection of mangrove rice field from sea level rise might require the conversion of limited number of abandoned tidal rice fields into mangroves which might be detrimental to some families who traditionally own these lands. Second, changing from forest slash and burn techniques to tidal / mangrove rice cultivation is likely to involve higher labour costs. However, these issues are expected to be addressed by project design (hence answer "No") as</p>

		<p>follows:</p> <p>The first issue will be addressed by facilitating community internal consultation to ensure that all lineages/families (irrespective of ethnic group) affected by cultivated land loss will benefit from community compensation. In addition the project will ensure that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a period of 18 months of participatory mapping and planning will be held before any land-use changes will be promoted and • restoration works will not start until compensation and conflict resolution are internally solved at the villages' level. <p>The second issue (higher labour intensity) will be addressed by the project through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complimentary initiatives (e.g. livelihood activities) and • by covering labour intensive work associated with the rehabilitation of the abandoned tidal rice fields through food for work schemes. <p>The baseline assessment and its socio-economic survey in year 1 will collect household data that will be instrumental predicting changes in labour and household income and for monitoring the changes.</p> <p>Action needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When collecting baseline data as input for the rice field rehabilitation strategy for each village the project should ensure disaggregation by ethnic groups, rice-cultivation type (forest rice growers versus mangrove rice growers) and gender (e.g. women-led households); and allow for analysing power relations among ethnic groups, pattern of land ownership and potential vulnerabilities. • It should be further ensured that ethnic groups have equal opportunity to participate in the design of the mangrove and rice field rehabilitation interventions and equal access to project benefits (e.g. support to rehabilitation works and for income generating activities). • Disaggregation by ethnic groups is also important for monitoring socio-economic impacts and changes. • While not being an impact induced by the project, special attention should be given to the Nalu ethnic group who used to be the landowning majority in Tombali and are now a minority (and the Papel in Quinara who experience a similar situation) and how their land and access rights will be guaranteed in the longer term in light of demographic changes.
15. Have project alternatives or adjustments of project design been sufficiently considered to avoid negative impacts?	n/a	
16. Have measures been developed to minimise the impacts,	n/a	Additional mitigation measures are not needed as risk issues are already addressed

secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits to these communities and/or provide adequate and fair compensation for impacts?		by project activities under various components (see discussion question 9).
17. FPIC process: Have consultations been held with legitimate representatives of the affected indigenous groups? Have they participated in the design of mitigation measures or in the development of an indigenous peoples plan (IPP) and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring? Have they provided consent to project activities that might trigger impacts? Is this evidenced/ documented?	n/a	<p>During the PPG phase consultations have been held in each of the pre-selected villages with representatives of the local communities and indigenous groups. This has allowed identifying their views, adaptation of project design and resulted, among others, in the production of preliminary mangrove restoration potential maps for (see Annex 6). A comprehensive participatory process with local communities is foreseen in each targeted village for developing territorial diagnosis (Activity 2.1.1.1) and implementing social intermediation and dialogue to confirm the selection of areas for mangrove restoration and regeneration (Activity 2.1.1.2). These processes will ensure that all land use decisions promoted by the project in each of the targeted villages are based on FPIC.</p> <p>Action needed: It appears that consultation in Quinara with members of the Papel have been limited. It will be important to ensure adequate participation during the territorial diagnosis and the baseline assessment.</p>
18. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Are they sufficient and reach all affected groups?	n/a	
Cultural Heritage		
19. Is the Standard triggered?	No	<p>The Standard is not triggered because negative impacts are considered unlikely.</p> <p>(1) It is unlikely that historic sites be situated in the mangrove areas or in mangrove / lowland rice field given the very recent and highly dynamic ecosystems</p> <p>(2) Sacred sites located in or near villages will be identified through the participatory territorial diagnosis and mapping and as such it will be ensured that restoration works will not affect any of them.</p>
<i>Answer questions below only if standard has been triggered</i>		
20. Have appropriate stakeholders been consulted in the assessment of impacts on cultural heritage (incl. users of the resources)? Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid impacts or restricting access to resources?	n/a	

21. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise adverse impacts on cultural heritage and on the users of the resources? Have appropriate stakeholders been included in this process and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?	n/a	
22. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	n/a	
23. If the project involves earth works with a potential risk of accidental discovery of buried resources, does the project proposal contain provisions for "chance find"?	n/a	
24. If the project intends to promote the development or use of resources to which communities have legal (including customary) rights, has a FPIC process been implemented? Have arrangements been made to ensure fair and equitable sharing of the benefits?	n/a	
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Living Natural Resources		
25. Is the Standard triggered?	Yes	
<i>Answer questions below only if standard has been triggered</i>		
26. Will the project be able to avoid even minor, localized environmental impacts in protected areas and other areas of high biodiversity value?	n/a	The project is not expected to negatively impact such areas. It is one of the main objectives of the project to restore high mangrove areas with high biodiversity value.
27. If the project requires the introduction of non-native species, will it be able to avoid adverse impacts including the potential of species developing invasive characteristics? Will the project be able to also control other pathways for invasive species, where such a risk exists?	Yes	The risk of this is negligible as only local species of mangrove will be used.
28. For projects managing or restoring ecosystems, have precautions been taken to avoid adverse impacts on other components of biodiversity?	n/a	There are very few or no species dependent on degraded mangrove.
29. Will the project be able to avoid adverse impacts on water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle that	n/a	Restoring dynamics and connectivity are part of the project's layout.

might inhibit freshwater and other water-related ecosystems from fulfilling functions in relation to up- and downstream water resources?		
30. Where the use of living natural resources is being promoted by the project, will it be ensured that the use is socially and environmentally sustainable?	Yes	The proposed income generating activities: vegetable gardening, solar-based salt production, oyster production and sustainable fishing are either compatible or even favourable to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.
31. If the project requires the use of biocides (e.g. pesticide), has the Guidance Note for Pest Management Planning been followed? Have alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid such use? If biocides cannot be avoided, will the project be able to prevent negative impacts on human health or biodiversity?	n/a	
Other environmental or social risks		
32. Is the project in compliance with national legislation and regulations that pertain to environmental and social matters and respective international laws, conventions and standards?	Yes	This is explicitly stated in the project document. In addition, one of the aims of the project is to support the adoption of specific mangrove legislation that has been drafted in 2014. The outputs of the project are intended to influence policy and further strengthen national and regional environmental law.
33. If impacts have been identified, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts or provide appropriate compensation? For impacts on vulnerable groups or on gender groups, please see section below.	Yes	<p>Risks identified in the ESMS screening and respective mitigation measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks of human-wildlife and rice-cultivation livestock conflicts are addressed by using solar powered electrical fences (activity 6.1.2.6). • The health risks, especially malaria and bilharzia, have been assessed and are expected to be low or at least not modified by the project interventions. The target population is part of the treated bed nets distribution system of the Ministry of Health. • The immigration risks are thought to be low as the lands that are to be restored are part of the heritage of the communities. There is immigration happening upstream of the project area (development of cashew plantations). <p>Action needed: One additional minor risk has been identified related to abandonment of forest rice as forest rice might be required for certain rituals. Hence this should be discussed and agreed with the respective communities / ethnic groups where this is a relevant concern.</p>
34. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	Yes	They are well conceptualised but will need to be adapted through a learning by doing approach helped by the long and intensive participatory mapping and

Are they accessible by all affected groups and sufficient?		consultation of local stakeholders.
Gender		
35. Were men and women involved in project design and ESIA process in a culturally appropriate way?	Yes	<p>The socio-economic analysis provides a good description of gender issues, e.g. gender differences, gender differentiated needs and risks. To the level possible women and youth participated during the field missions. Annex 8 demonstrates that about 50% of stakeholders consulted at the community level were women.</p> <p>Some elements of project design will only be fleshed out in more detail during the implementation phase - during the participatory territorial diagnosis (activity 2.1.1.1) and the ROAM process. Strong participation of women community members will be sought as described under 2.1.1.1 and in the guiding principles for the ROAM process.</p>
36. If gender issues were identified during screening and ESIA, does the project proposal include measures to address these issues? Have these measures been developed in consultation with women in affected communities and gender experts with knowledge of local needs?	Yes	<p>Main findings of the socio-economic study include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While some variation exists between regions and villages, women generally have an important role in rice production and in particular in post-harvest activities. Additional work include water and firewood collection (the latter not only for cooking but also for salt production), as well as other income generating activities such as fishing or harvesting of oysters and forest products and handicrafts. Altogether this results in heavy workload. • Other constraints and challenges women are facing: low literacy level resulting from insufficient access to education (in particular for girls who attend only basic school years in order to serve as workforce or are forced to gain income in the city), low capacity to reduce post-harvest loss, insufficient profitable income generating activities (IGA) opportunities and insufficient rights to land. • Although land legislation recognizes private land ownership without discrimination of sex, the ethnic groups located in the project site still deny women ownership to land. Communities consulted during the PPG phase did not consider this as problem as women would have full rights to use land and resources (e.g. harvest) and would also not be constrained in accessing natural resources. It is not clear, however, what implications are for women who are not part of any household aggregation or what happens when husbands emigrate <p>Action needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further consultations with women during the participatory diagnosis at the village level will be essential to clarify above issues and provide further analysis - distinguishing between general constraints or needs (baseline) and risks potentially induced by the project such as the risk of further aggravating the work load when promoting more labour intensive cultivation practices

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where women lack inclusion in decision-making (e.g. different ethnic groups) ensure that such constraints are overcome in a cultural sensitive way (e.g. during the participatory territorial diagnosis).
37. Does the project include specific plans and measures to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	Yes	<p>The proposed income generating activities (output 2.2.1) will pay special attention to the needs of women and will be instrumental to overcome part of the identified general constraints; vegetable gardening, solar-based salt production, oyster production and sustainable fishing are traditionally part of women's remit and their development can be expected to contribute to empowering women. The project plans to target provision of equipment such as rice husking machines and wood-conserving stoves at women which is expected to help them overcome respective productivity and work-load challenges. The promotion of energy-efficient cooking stoves will provide further alleviation as it will reduce the quantity of firewood to be gathered.</p> <p>It is important to understand that the existing set of IGAs - pre-identified together with the community groups during PPG phase - will be confirmed and further specified during the participatory diagnosis together respective target groups including women.</p>
38. Does the project include specific measures to strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources, when appropriate and consistent with national policy?	Partly	While it is not an explicit objective of the project to improve women's rights and access to land and resources, some of the IGA will contribute to improve access to resources.
39. Does the monitoring plan provide for measuring gender equality progress and/or gender disaggregated indicators? If there is a risk that women may be affected by project activities, are specific provisions included to monitor these impacts and are services of qualified experts secured to guide this monitoring work?	Yes	<p>Women's involvement in regeneration activities (output 2.2.1), especially mangrove nurseries, will be monitored as indicated in the Project Results Framework (women's involvement in agricultural practices, capacity building, trainings and information sharing is explicitly mentioned to be at least 50% (2.1.4 and 2.1.5)).</p> <p>Action needed: The indicator related to income improvements are not disaggregated as households have been identified as relevant entities. Opportunities for adding a sex-disaggregated indicators or monitoring techniques should be explored together with the beneficiaries during the baseline assessment.</p>
Vulnerable groups		
40. If risks for vulnerable groups were identified during screening and ESIA, were those addressed in the final project proposal?	n/a	The socio-economic analysis identified a number of risks but these were all baseline risks or changes that are happening with or without the project. There are as yet (except for women and youth) no vulnerable groups identified. It should be noted that rural Guinea-Bissauan society is rather horizontally structured, not very hierarchical and with low social differentiation between chiefs and others as well as

		a tradition of dialogue within the community. Action needed: The baseline assessment to be undertaken in year 1 and respective household surveys should ensure disaggregation between social groups to detect potential vulnerabilities and risks.
41. Does the project include specific plans and measures to reduce vulnerability, build resilience and promote equity?	n/a	Not applicable at this stage. This will only be relevant if risks were identified during the baseline assessment.
42. Does the monitoring plan include provisions to monitor these impacts?	n/a	Not applicable at this stage. If risks were identified, the implementation of measures and their effectiveness will need to be monitored.
Climate Change		
43. If it has been identified that climate change might affect the implementation of project activities or their effectiveness and sustainability, has this been addressed by mitigation measures?	n/a	One of the main objectives of the project is to counter and mitigate climate change impacts and so far no negative impacts of change climate conditions on project activities have been identified. It is not unlikely that there might be unforeseen impacts, but it is assumed that the project has the tools to detect and monitor (GIS and drones for the ecosystems and the household surveys for the communities, etc.).
44. If there is a risk that the project might increase the vulnerability of local communities and the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes, have these issues been addressed by mitigation measures?	No	No, the project intends to reduce climate risks and reduce vulnerability.
45. Are opportunities sought to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	One of the main objectives of the project is to contribute to improve local adaptation capacities and to maintain ecosystem services active.