ESMS Questionnaire and Screening Report

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 *(tick one of the three options)*	**1.** ☒ required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000 **2.** ☐ required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire **3.** ☐ 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:	☐ low risk ☒ moderate risk ☐ high risk
Rationale Summarize findings from the questionnaire and judge significance based on criteria such as sensitivity, magnitude, probability and reputational risks	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. 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. 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. 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.
Required assessments	☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) ☒ Other: • Assessment of tenure and land rights • Description of the ESMS-enhanced ROAM methodology
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	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. 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. 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. And last, the project results framework includes a number of indicator specifying beneficiaries explicitely as women and men. However, it is not clear whether data will be disaggragted and reported for men and women seperately. 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.	
ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts	**Trigger**	**Required tools or plans**
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	☐ yes ☒ no ☐ TBD	☐ Resettlement Action Plan ☐ Resettlement Policy Framework ☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction ☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ TBD	☐ Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ TBD	☐ Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ TBD	☐ Pest Management Plan

Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

The project "**Restoring Myanmar's Forested Landscapes (RMFL); Reversing forest degradation and deforestation and restoring forested landscapes through local multi-stakeholder management"** is part of The Restoration Initiative (TRI) programme. This programme consists of a Programme Framework Document (PFD) that defines the overall programme objective, architecture, and available GEF funding from which 12 "child" projects – 11 national projects and 1 global project – will be constituted.

Overall Programme Goal: To reverse forest degradation and deforestation and restore forested landscapes through local multi-stakeholder management

Myanmar Child Project Components: The project is comprised of four components. Indicative outputs are shown below:

Outcome 1: National and sub-national policy and regulatory frameworks support forest landscape restoration.

Target 1.1.1 a) National commitment to the Bonn challenge

Target 1.1.1 b) Six National and sub-national policies, strategies and plans incorporate FLR principles

District Forest Management Plans and National Restoration and Rehabilitation Programme in Myanmar (NRRPM) plans within the Project area revised to include FLR principles

Outcome 2: Forest landscape restoration implemented by stakeholders (government, private sector, civil society and local people, both men and women).

Target 2.1.1: 89,005 hectares (219,936 acres)

Target 2.1.2:

- 6 x township level FLR action plans agreed and implemented, including:
    - 2 x protected area FLR plans
    - 1 x Watershed FLR plan
    - 12 x village level FLR action plans agreed and implemented in a
- Village and township FLR plans harmonised with the District Forest Management Plan (DFMP) and NRRPM plans
- Support to implementation:

Target 2.1.2: 600,000 women and men benefit from the project

Target 2.1.3: 1,057,009 tonnes of CO2eq sequestered/avoided

Outcome 3 Strengthened institutional capacities enable large-scale restoration and maintenance of critical landscapes and improvements in the flow of diverse ecosystem services.

Target 3.1.1: 6 x 2 Township level training

Target 3.1.2: 12 x 3 Village level training

Target 3.1.3: Value of resources (public, private, development partners) flowing into FLR initiatives increased by US$1 million; Small Medium Enterprises developed and tested; FLR investment proposals developed

Outcome 4 Improved knowledge of best practices on forest landscape restoration among key stakeholders

Target 4.1.1 3 TRI exchange events attended by x key stakeholders (women and men) and Effective links with other TRI child projects

Target 4.1.2 Effective monitoring system established, including biodiversity and carbon monitoring and midterm and end of project reviews

Target 4.1.3 a) 150 Farmer to farmer exchanges held

Target 4.1.3 b) 900 villages in 6 townships in Sagaing region are involved in up scaling activities aimed at improving knowledge of best practices on restoration

Target 4.1.4 9 FLR studies completed and published and effective knowledge management system

Target 4.1.5 30 national organisations benefit from TRI knowledge product and/or events

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization *(to be completed for **field projects** only)*
1. Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only interests and influence of stakeholders but also whether there are any stakeholders that might be affected by the project? Does the stakeholder analysis disaggregate between women and men, where relevant and feasible?
To be completed by project proponent
Yes, this has been done during PPG. *See separate stakeholder analysis report (included in ProDoc, section Stakeholder Analysis and Stakeholder Engagement Table)*
IUCN ESMS Reviewer
The stakeholder analysis is done with enough detail for this stage of the project development. It is also understood that the village level workshops which are planned for the implementation phase aim to define the restoration and alternative livelihood options in more detail and will provide further opportunity to learn about stakeholder interests and concerns and allow community members to express issues and concerns themselves. It will be important, though, that the selection of participants is done in a mindful way in order to ensure that all relevant sections of the community (including vulnerable and different age groups) will be represented in the village level workshops and that a good gender balance will be achieved.
2. Has information about the project – and about potential risks or negative impacts – been shared with relevant groups? Have consultations been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept? Did the consultations include stakeholders that were identified as potentially affected? Have women been consulted? Has this been done in a culturally appropriate way to allow a meaningful engagement of affected groups and women?
To be completed by project proponent
Yes, this has been done during PPG. *See separate stakeholder consultation report (ESMS annex A)*
IUCN ESMS Reviewer
The SH consultation process is well documented through Table 18 as well as through Annex A. The latter provide a detailed record of discussion held with stakeholders during the design process. Table 18 combines a description of the consultation process (in a synthesized form) and a stakeholder analysis (interest, influence of stakeholder and potential impact of the project on the SH) and also designates potential roles in the project. It could have benefited from identifying potential synergies between existing programmes/initiatives and the TRI project by defining potential partners and their role in the project in a bit more detail or key connections between their programmes and the TRI project. The identification of impacts is rather weak and does not seem very purposeful as it only indicates levels of impact but does not specify the impacts, in particular potential negative ones.

B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards			
Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions			
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	***To be completed by project proponent*** *If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)*	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer*** *Comments, additional considerations*
1. Will / might the project involve relocation or resettlement of people? **if yes, answer a-b below**	No	*Shaded cells do not need to be filled out*	
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**	No		
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.		The project will involve voluntary regulation of access and use of some parts of forests through introducing a local management institution and implementation of community forestry. This will only be introduced through agreed and inclusive processes. Voluntary collective regulation of use enables improvements in the forest resource, allowing increased flows of forest products and other benefits. Stronger enforcement against destructive illegal logging activities.	The consequences of the law enforcement need to be analysed with greater details as they can sometimes restrict the access of a resources (even illegal) to vulnerable HH and create greater vulnerability. It should be ensured that the enforcement is not the only measure taken but that a real theory of change around stopping the illegal logging is developed (stakeholder analysis, studies of various complementary livelihoods options in addition of the law enforcement). If the project works with CFs that are primarily constituted by consolidating privately claimed farmland inside RF as a partitioned CF ((as opposed to CFs owned by the whole community), there would be no restriction of access to villagers as previously the land of the CF would have constituted privately claimed agricultural land in the RF.
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)?		Indirectly through consultations with the community and local authorities. The end goal being a community in a more cooperative relationship with the authorities, for increased access to forest ecosystem services and against destructive illegal logging practices.	
c. Has the existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource (incl. traditional rights) been analysed, broken down by		Yes, see separate report *(ESMS Annex C*)	The report on the Legal Framework has been acknowledged as well as the fact that the project plans to further the

different groups including women, if applicable?			analysis through a study on land tenure and use rights in the respective site (see outcome 4). A consultancy on land tenure and use rights is needed since it seems like a very important basis to build on for project design. Such an analysis should take into account the statutory law (national, state/region regulations but also community level) as well as whether potential customary law is recognized.
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?		There is little perception of 'traditional rights' amongst communities during the field mission. This is probably due partly to the military rule which asserted comprehensive control over land and its administration. Use rights in the Permanent Forest Estate are recognised under the Forest Law and in forests outside of the Forest Estate under the VFV law 2012. But mechanisms to regulate use are lacking, other than in areas where Community Forests have been created.	This would need to be cross checked again through a consultancy, as written above the customary law are often an important part of NR management at community level.
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.		Yes, to be incorporated in the stakeholder analysis. Communities are generally eager to implement community forestry in order to produce more forest products, to move from open access over-extraction causing degradation to a regulated common property system. Introduction of community forestry typically involves introduction of regulated extraction of forest products within sustainable levels. Sometimes this involves access restriction to reduce extraction in the short term, in order to assure it in the long term. The nature of the restrictions will vary from place to place and cannot be summarised in a generic manner, but typically depend on social consensus.	The explanation is well received. It is also acknowledged that as part of the FLR process the project will undertake a situation analysis both at township and village level. The FLR process will be based on the ESMS-enhanced ROAM methodology.
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access? If yes, specify measures. Are they feasible, appropriate and gender inclusive?		Project will promote pro-poor livelihood support. Wherever poor are affected by changing access mitigation measures will be defined. These will be developed through project implementation, for instance in community forest management where some areas are closed for regeneration other areas will be opened rotationally	This will be described in the ESMS enhanced ROAM methodology annexed to the Project document. It will need to be ensured that measures will also be available for forest users that are landless and vulnerable– in case voluntary regulation might restrict their access to forest resource.
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?		Through field piloting, we have informally sought provisional consent of communities to work with them in the project. However it would be unethical to raise expectations until the project begins, so it is more correct procedure to move towards a formal FPIC process once the project is ready to engage in a real agreement with the communities.	
5. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources, land, or territories through measures other than access restrictions?	No	The project will seek to improve these. There is a small risk from seeking formalization of tenure, but the project will be seeking to improve tenure.	
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	Yes	The General Administration Department (GAD) organised the relocation of over 100 villages and a town in the area which was inundated in 2001 by the construction of the Thapanzeik	The construction of Thanpanzeik dam had meant that more than 100 villages around the reservoir were resettled around 20 years ago, mostly resettled upstream inside the RF

		dam, in Shwe Bo and Katha Districts. Regulations in protected areas around Chatthin Sanctuary enforced by the Nature Conservation and Wildlife Division of the Forest Department have restricted access for forest product collection.	including villages in the project area. Resettlement involved disputes, some people never received any land as compensation or the land given was not suitable for cultivation. As a consequence they became casual laborers, small-scale shop owners, involved in small-scale charcoal production, collecting firewood or migrating outside for their livelihood. While the project is not associated to the past resettlement process and related grievances, these negative experiences need to be taken into consideration when developing FLR strategies.
Standard triggered? "Yes / No / TBD" Explain why	No	The project does not involve any activities that require involuntary resettlement, but include some aspects of access restrictions as it plans to guide communities in managing their forests more sustainably which might involve designating areas or resources for regeneration. However, any future regulation of access and use of forests resources will be decided by the communities themselves, hence is considered entirely voluntary. Hence the standard is not triggered in a strict way. Nevertheless, it is recommended to apply some precaution. The process of developing management plans will be implemented through village level workshops where key restoration interventions within the village area will be decided. The process should be closely guided by the ESMS-enhanced ROAM methodology which will be attached to the project document. The project will need to ensure that all relevant groups, including vulnerable/marginalised sections of the community, are included in these discussions/ negotiations and that their concerns and resource needs are taken into consideration and be prioritised wherever possible. However, all the above only relates to areas suitable for community-based management. If the project supports CFs constituted by a small group of individual farmers who have previously cultivated rain fed farmland inside an FR, there would be no access restrictions issue as any land use change or restriction would relate to land that has been claimed and previously used for agriculture by the same person. There are other social risks arising in such situations - explained in Section C.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		This will be done as part of the ROAM process.	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		It is recommended undertaking a consultancy on land tenure and use rights, as part of the design phase	
Standard on Indigenous Peoples[1]			
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	***To be completed by project proponent*** *If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)*	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer*** *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**	No		
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?	No		

[1]The 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

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.)?		'National races', ethnic minorities (Do we need to answer?)	There are Lisu, Kudu, Kachin households found in the villages, but no major IP groups
b. How do these groups identify themselves?		Ethnic groups, ethnic minorities (not indigenous). (Do we need to answer?)	By their own name and language or dialect
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.		In the project area virtually all populations are majority Bamar ethnic group, and so do not classify as 'IP's (1) They are not regulated by their own customs/systems of governance (2) They are ethnically and culturally the ruling sector of the society (not in a subordinate position) (3) They do not have a specific or strong collective attachment and dependency to their land/territory/resources.	Kadu, Lisu, Kachin
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.	No		
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)?	No		
f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	No		
g. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No		
h. Does the project intend to use the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples?	No		
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?	No		
j. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	No		
k. 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?	No		
Standard triggered? "Yes / No / TBD" Explain why	TBD	The consultation during the PPG field work seems to confirm that the population residing in the identified six townships mainly belongs to the majority Burmese Bamar ethnic group, but some minority ethnic groups (Kadu, Lisu and Kachin peoples) have been identified. In some villages the groups are mixed, in others ethnic minorities live separately, but with their agricultural land often situated in the same area.	

		The decision whether or not the Standard is triggered will be taken upon completing the detailed situation analysis as part of ROAM process in each site. This step should clarify the presence of ethnic minority groups, whether and how strongly their cultural and practices differ from the Burman group. Some ethnic groups, like Lisu, are strongly involved in hunting which might require special attention when agreeing on management regulations. The situation analysis should also clarify gender differences of the respective ethnic groups, in particular whether women are given land inheritance.
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?		

Standard on Cultural Heritage			
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	***To be completed by project proponent*** *If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)*	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer*** *Comments, additional considerations*
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?	No		
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)?	Yes	In larger landscape, but not affected by the project.	
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)?	No		
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		Potential field interventions for the Thapanzeik Dam catchment communities include supporting efforts to improve infrastructure that will enable better access to markets.
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?	No		
8. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	~~No~~ Yes		The prodoc states that it is possible that the Project will support actions to improve the access to cultural heritage

			within the PFE for the social or economic benefit of local communities. But alos that in such cases, strict safeguards will be developed and applied
Standard triggered? "Yes / No / TBD" Explain why	TBD	At this stage of planning there is no evidence that the project might include access restrictions to cultural resources. Also the risk of damaging cultural resources is unlikely as the project does not include construction of major infrastructure. However, small infrastructure work is possible, at least in one of the project sites, and the final decision whether or not the Standard is triggered will be taken for each site as part of ROAM process upon completing the detailed situation analysis and agreeing on the concrete FLR actions and the project's economic and livelihood activities. There seems to be a small probability that the project might support improved access to cultural heritage in order to provide for social or economic benefit of local communities. This will require that consultation process follows the Standard's provision including ensuring FPIC of all stakeholders who claim legitimate rights to those resources.	
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?			
Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	***To be completed by project proponent*** *If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)*	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer*** *Comments, additional considerations*
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, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d**	Yes	Chattin Wildlife Sanctuary is part of the landscape. Category IV.	
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, provide details and 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, provide details and answer questions a-d**	No		
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 caused by the project on natural resources on areas beyond the PA?	N/A		

[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.

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?	N/A		
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.)?	No	Extremely unlikely, as the primary benefit would be improved management capacity and improved regulation of human impacts on park. There is little realistic scope for ecotourism development beyond what little already exists	
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, provide details and answer questions a-d**	No		
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	Yes	Agroforestry, community forestry, trees on farm as part of the FLR approach. Only native species will be used.	
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?	No	Nurseries are all local to the plantation areas so there is no risk of exotic introduction. All species expect to be planted are already widely planted under existing planting schemes.	While a certain risk of introducing invasive alien species in advertently exists, the risk seems to be relatively low as it can be readily managed by providing appropriate guidance to project staff and partners (included in LoA) that in the selection of species invasive species need to be avoided.
b. If a.is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?	N/A		
c. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of faciliatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	No		
d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood ?	No		
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	The project aims to improve the hydrological regime in the area and therefore improve downstream benefits.	
7. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g.,	No	The project anticipates improving water flows. The project will restore recently degraded forests, not promote forests as a	The potential impact of reforestation on the hydrology of the sites is expected to be positive. In the LoA with partner

water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.		new vegetation type	organization it should be specified, though, what skills are needed to provide appropriate advice to FLR interventions so that they that will generate the best possible outcomes for water and catchment management (e.g. choice of species, role of agroforestry, and approach to site preparation and management).
8. Is there a risk that the project affects water quality of waterways (e.g., through diffuse water pollution from agricultural run-off or other activities)?	No	The project anticipates improving water quality.	
9. Is there a risk that the project affects ecosystem functions and services not covered above, in particular those on which local communities depend for their livelihoods?	No		
10. In case the project promotes the use of living natural resources (e.g., by proposing production systems or harvest plans), is there a risk that this might lead to unsustainable use of resources?	No		
11. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b**	No		
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?	-		
b. Has a pest management plan been established?	-		
12. In case the project intends to use biological pest management techniques, has the potential of adversely affecting biodiversity been ruled out?	No		
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		
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	TBD	Impacts on biodiversity are expected to be highly positive. The risk related to invasive species seems very low as it can be readily managed (see answer to question 5.a above). Impacts on the hydrological cycle are expected to be largely positive. However, given that the concrete FLR interventions have not been decided yet, it will be necessary that during the ROAM process each intervention is assessed on potential issues based on the above questions.	
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?			
C. Other social or environmental impacts			
Other social impacts			
	Yes,	***To be completed by project proponent***	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer***

	no, n/a, TBD	*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		It is expected that the Roam process will ensure that gender differences are identified and analysed. If CF are primarily constituted by consolidating privately claimed rainfed ya farmland inside RF, there is a high risk that women will not be able to benefit as they lack control over the rainfed agricultural ya land and are generally not considered by the FD as land holders. Hence, site selection should ensure that the targeted CFs are owned by the whole community and not by a few individuals (or in other words that sites are selected where existing reserved forest without *ya* farmland make up the CF).
3. Does the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	Yes	The project will aim to enhance benefits for women through improve social inclusion in village development planning, self-help groups, and inclusion in village enterprise development. This will be achieved through the activities towards outcome 2.1 (Output 2.1.2)	The Prodoc explains that the process of development of Action plans (described under Outcome 2.1) and the respective situation analysis will use a gender-differentiated focus wherever relevant. The benefits should be reflected in the indicators or targets in a more detailed way, gender disaggregation of indicators. The project can pro-actively help empower women when focusing on forest areas that can be subject to communal ownership. Proper *community*-based rights created with the express purpose of acknowledging such community-based rights in natural forest will provide the greatest protections for women's participation.
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?	Yes	The project will aim to empower women to achieve strengthened rights and access, better inclusion of women in collective land management.	When defining the institutional setting for community forest management the project team should provide for specifying or promoting the role of women. This might include building women's capacity or empower them to actively participate and voice their concerns.
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action?[3]	No		

[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 ä previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

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)?	No	An inclusive approach will be used in terms of including vulnerable and marginal community members in planning and actions. In order to assure social inclusion it will of course be essential to select local NGOs to work with that are already sensitive to inequality in target villages (e.g. NAG, Thada Consortium etc.)	As stated in the prodoc, the village level workshops where restoration interventions will be decided are facilitated by the project team who will ensure that marginalised groups will be specifically included and their needs prioritised wherever possible. This will happen by the project proactively focuses on restoration of areas that can be subject to community-based management.
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.	No		A significant and quite probably risk is that the CFs supported by the project are not owned by the entire community but by a user group with only selected members from the community who can claim agricultural land in the RF. This will most likely mean that there will be no benefit for the community from the FLR activities as the privatized CF will support the crops the farmers decide with the FD, e.g. teak, which according to the planned changes to the forest law, can in future be claimed privately. Hence, in order to ensure that the project generates benefits for the communities (as claimed by the Theory of change) and avoid social conflicts within the community, the project should make sure to select - to the maximum extent possible – forest areas which can be subject to community based management.
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, 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		
12. Is there a risk that the project could negatively affect the livelihoods of local communities indirectly or through cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts?	No		Only if the potential limitation to resources at target community level impact some trade/processing activities from other communities. The ROAM process should look at the value chain of the existing livelihood sources.
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		Mention of a dam close to one of the villages. FLR approach will be upstream which should in the worst case have no impact and in the best case ensure a decreased sedimentation flow in the reservoir once forest are restored.

[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.

14. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	No	The project works through existing legal and social frameworks, most importantly the Forest Law 1992 and the Community Forest Instruction 1995, revised 2016	
Other environmental impacts			
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	***To be completed by project proponent*** *If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)*	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer*** *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)?	No		
6. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations or provisions of the host country (including legislation requiring environmental impact assessments)?	No	The project proposes to work through existing legal and social frameworks, most importantly the Forest Law 1992 and the Community Forest Instruction 1995, revised 2016, and in the context of the Environmental Conservation Law 2012. Nothing in the project conflicts with these.	
Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above. Aside from these issues, are there any other potential negative impacts?		Environmental impacts for forest restoration activities are expected to be largely positive given the project's FLR approach. Some social risk issues have been identified above, most of them minor, with exception of the risk that communities might not be able to benefit from FLR action in case the supported CF groups are composed of selected individual. The project should be able to avoid this risk, by selecting villages and restoration sites that are owned or controlled by the entire community. This as well as other risk and opportunity issues mentioned above should be addressed by the analysis and consultations taking place during the ROAM process.	
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?			

D. Climate change risks

Risks caused by a failure to adequately consider the effects of climate change

	Yes,	***To be completed by project proponent***	***IUCN ESMS Reviewer***

	no, n/a, TBD	*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 area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	Yes	Floods and droughts, wildfires	
2. 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)?	Yes	Deteriorating rainfall regime (more erratic, more extremes), higher summer temperatures, dryer conditions. These patterns are already affecting rural livelihoods and will increasingly affect them in the future. All groups are vulnerable to these patterns.	
3. 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)?	Yes	The project area is in a climatic transition zone between semi-arid and sub-tropical areas. There is an increasing risk of drought in the semi-arid area. We may expect the transition zone to move north with climate change. The project area is already a challenging place to work due to access limitations. There is extensive road-building on-going, which will reduce this problem. It is unlikely that this will be counteracted by climate change. The project will be increasingly important as the effect of forest loss on declining ecosystem services is felt more acutely with climate change.	
4. 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?	No		On the contrary, the project is expected to play an important role in restoring watersheds, protecting riparian zones, and reducing impacts of soil erosion, hence mitigating vulnerability of communities and ecosystems to climate change
5. Does the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	• Enhanced forest landscape management and restoration will increase the resilience of ecosystems to climate change. • Enhancement and protection of ecosystem services, including climate change regulation, will increase the resilience of communities.	
Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above.		No risks identified. On the contrary, the project plays an important role to reduce local communities' vulnerability to impacts from climate change.	
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			