

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Programme Framework: The Restoration Initiative (TRI) – Fostering innovation and integration in support of the Bonn Challenge Myanmar Child Project: Restoring Myanmar’s Forested Landscapes (RMFL). Reversing forest degradation and deforestation and restoring forested landscapes through local multi-stakeholder management		
Project proponent:	IUCN Asia Regional Office		
Country:	Myanmar	Total costs (indicate currency):	USD 2’652’293 (excl. agency fee), co-finance TBD
Estimated start date and duration:	01.01.2018 – 31.12.2021 (48 months)	Total costs in CHF:	CHF 2,568,160 (excl. agency fee), co-finance TBD
		Exchange rate (if applicable):	0.96828
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	No		

Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the questionnaire is presented in Annex A

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Angela Jöhl Cadena, Senior Programme Officer, IUCN Asia Regional Office With inputs from the PPG team (Dr Oliver Springate-Baginski, Dr William Jackson & Win Hlaing)	05.03.2017
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000 2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire 3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire	

Step 2: ESMS Screening

To be completed by IUCN ESMS reviewer(s); only needed when the boxes highlighted in red are ticked (option 1 & 2 above)

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator, IUCN HQ	15 sep2017
	Raphael Glemet	Senior programme officer IUCN ARO	15 sep2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	GEF TRI PIF February 2016.doc.docx		2015-07-31
	Project Document		25jul 2017
	Reports field missions		

ESMS Screening Report			
Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk	<input type="checkbox"/> high risk

<p>Rationale Summarize findings from the questionnaire and judge significance based on criteria such as sensitivity, magnitude, probability and reputational risks</p>	<p>The project aims to restore Myanmar's forested landscapes by reversing forest degradation and deforestation and restoring forested landscapes through local multi-stakeholder management. The project includes interventions at the national level for influencing forest-related policies (outcome 1), concrete FLR actions at the local level for improving ecosystem functionality and an increasing the flow of ecosystem services to local communities (outcome 2), institutional capacity building at subnational and field level (outcome 3) and the generation and dissemination of knowledge on landscape restoration (outcome 4). The interventions at the local level will include technical strategies for restoring and managing trees and forests and economic and livelihood interventions, but the concrete intervention in each site will only be identified and prioritized by the local multi-stakeholder group during project implementation guided by the Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodology (ROAM) framework and dependent on the outcomes of the site-specific situation analysis. In consultation with the Forest Department (FD) and based on a set of criteria the project design team identified six townships in two districts (Katha and Shwebo) as region for the field intervention. Within these six townships, the project will focus on 12 target villages to be identified during the township level workshops.</p> <p>The discussion of impact issues in the ESMS questionnaire did confirm that it is unlikely that the project will cause significant environmental and social risks. There are no serious concerns in relation to ESMS Standards. The introduction of social institutions for community forest management aims at sustainable management of the resources which is expected to provide social benefit. Restoration strategies selected in each of the 12 target sites might include decisions about potential restrictions. However, these decisions will be taken by the communities themselves, a process supported by the project team, which is expected to lead to strengthened participation and inclusion in forest governance. Hence the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions is not triggered in a strict sense. However, to be on the precautionary side, it will need to be monitored closely that decisions about restoration actions will be entirely voluntarily and that no sectors in the communities might be affected by these actions.</p> <p>The decision about the other three Standards (Indigenous Peoples, Cultural Heritage and Biodiversity) will depend on the outcomes of the situation analysis carried out as part of the ROAM process in each site and the decided FLR intervention. Some potential impact issues have already been flagged in Section B. The ROAM process and how it has been adapted to the project context in Myanmar is briefly explained in chapter 4.2 and demonstrates that there is a strong congruence with the ESMS principles on stakeholder engagement, FPIC, protection of the needs of vulnerable groups and gender equity. But the Prodoc will need to include a methodological description to demonstrate how the ROAM process will ensure adherence to all ESMS principles and how the selected FLR interventions will be assessed on the standards and on other social and environmental risks. Such an ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework is considered equivalent to an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which would usually be required in circumstances where project activities will only be defined during the implementation phase.</p> <p>As discussed in section C while social impacts are expected to be largely positive given the project's objective to improve the flow of ecosystem services to local communities and its inclusive approach, there are some issues that require attention; in particular, the risk that communities might not be able to benefit from FLR action in case the supported community forest (CF) groups are composed of selected individuals. This together with the fact that concrete restoration activities will only be decided during project implementation as part of the ROAM process requires the classification of the project as a moderate risk project following the ESMS precautionary principle. Assigning this category will also allow ensuring an appropriate level of monitoring and supervision with regards to social impacts during project implementation.</p>
<p>Required assessments</p>	<p><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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of tenure and land rights • Description of the ESMS-enhanced ROAM methodology
<p>Required actions for gender mainstreaming</p>	<p>The description of the ROAM process that will be implemented for defining the respective restoration interventions in each site, reflects important elements of gender-responsive project design: it includes an assessment of benefits and costs of ecosystem flows to the different social groups (including gender-disaggregated information on incomes, poverty levels, negative impacts, equity), as part of the situation analysis. And when deciding about the FLR intervention it is said to explicitly prioritize those that reflect women's needs.</p> <p>However, there are a few areas where the gender focus of the project could be further enhanced. One would be to formulate gender equality and women empowerment as one of the project's overarching principles guiding its implementation. It is acknowledged that one of the current principles does include a specific reference to women ("Participation and empowerment of poor and marginalised groups including women by enhancing opportunities for the poor"). However, this principle reduces the focus to poor and marginalised women and does not formulate gender mainstreaming in a broader context (e.g. the potential need of a gender differential treatment to address a bias or disadvantage due to gender roles or norms); it also does not recognize the important role that women often play in sustainable resource management.</p>

	<p>Second, as pointed out in section C, there is a risk that women might not benefit from the FLR intervention in case the community forests are primarily constituted by consolidating privately claimed rainfed ya farmland inside RF as women lack control over the rainfed agricultural ya land. The site selection should hence ensure that the targeted CFs are owned by the whole community and not by a few individuals.</p> <p>And last, the project results framework includes a number of indicator specifying beneficiaries explicitly as women and men. However, it is not clear whether data will be disaggregated and reported for men and women separately. The framework also does not include any specific gender indicators to allow monitoring tangible gender results. This being said, it is acknowledged that the project's process oriented approach constraints the formulation of concrete action at this stage as these will depend on the outcome of the ROAM process. It is recommended to formulate measurable gender targets when agreeing on FLR interventions.</p>	
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 type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

Step 3: ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

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

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	7.2.2019
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:	ESMS enhanced ROAM Myanmar		6.12.2017
	1_IUCN GEF TRI Myanmar project document_7 Dec 2017		7.12.2017
	0_GEF6 CEO Endorsement Request TRI Myanmar_7 Dec2017		7.12.2017
Have findings from ESIA triggered any changes (e.g. risk level or Standards triggered)	no		
CLEARANCE DECISION			
<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)	The project has been screened on environmental and social risks which resulted in the classification of the project as a moderate risk project due to a limited number of social risks and the fact that concrete restoration activities will only be decided during project implementation as part of the FLR planning process. As the identified social risks were overall considered of minor significance or are expected to be readily managed through the presented project activities and the fact that the risks are exclusively associated with the FLR interventions under outcome 2 (to be defined as part of the ROAM		

	<p>planning process) led to the decision to enhance the methodological guidance of the ROAM planning process by incorporating key principles and provisions of the ESMS. This is documented in form of an ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework. This Framework has been reviewed and considered equivalent to an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which would usually be required in circumstances where project activities will only be defined during the implementation phase.</p>		
<p>Clearance conditions (when conditionally cleared, e.g. tasks to be completed during inception phase):</p>	<p>The project is cleared on the basis that the process outlined in the Process Framework is fully adhered to following the institutional arrangements described in chapter III c) of the Process Framework. This needs to be evidence in the technical reporting and during the supervision missions. If risks of agreed FLR intervention have been identified the National Project Coordinator (NPC) needs to establish an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and report on its implementation which should be integral part of the project's monitoring procedure.</p>		
<p>Approval ESMS Clearance</p>			
<p>Name</p>	<p>Function</p>	<p>Date</p>	<p>Signature</p>
<p>Sheila Aggarwal-Khan</p>	<p>Director IUCN GEF/GCF</p>	<p>7.2.2019</p>	