

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

Project data and ESMS history


The fields below are copied from the Screening Report

Project Title:	Restoring ecological corridors in Western Chad for multiple land and forests benefits - RECONNECT		
Project proponent:	IUCN PACO		
Country:	Chad	Contract value (US\$):	5,366,972
Estimated start date / duration:	36 months	In CHF:	5,279,810

Risk category - FINAL:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> low risk <input type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk	
Rationale for maintaining risk category assigned during screening or suggesting changes	<p>The project aims at conserving natural resources and restoring ecological functionality by reducing human pressure on natural resources and creating ecological continuity through the designation of corridors between existing protected areas. Strategies for reducing pressure include integrated resource management, restoration of degraded land and improving productivity of natural resources use. The project seeks to strengthen existing local governance mechanisms (ILODs and others) and to empower these local stakeholders in regional planning and natural resource management. By providing multiple benefits for local communities it balances conservation objectives with social and development needs.</p> <p>The project was screened on environmental and social risks at an early phase of project development. Despite the project’s intention to integrate social and environmental objectives, the screening had identified potential environmental and social risks, most importantly related to the protection of forest blocks which might imply restriction on the use of forest resources with associated livelihood impacts as well as related to potential risks for indigenous peoples associated to these restrictions. Also, some minor environmental risks were identified. The findings of the screening are summarized in the Screening Report (separate document).</p> <p>After having further detailed the project design and improved the understanding of the socio-economic baseline through consultations and data collection in the field, the identified impacts were judged either as minor and/or appropriately addressed or mitigated through by project activities; for further details see the below Checklist for Clearance (Annex A). Hence the project maintains the classification as low risk project.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan
Cultural Heritage	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures

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	16.5.2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:	1 ProDoc 9417 RECONNECT Chad UICN-GEF Final		
	2 CEOEndorsement GEF6 9417 RECONNECT Chad IUCN		
	Appendix13 FieldMissionReport PPG ReconnectTchad_GEF_IUCN		
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 - Summarize key findings from the checklist (Annex A)	<p>Completing the checklist in Annex A has confirmed that the project can be cleared, on the condition that the following assessments are carried out during the inception phase and respective reports submitted to IUCN for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the socio-ecological context of transhumant pastoralists in the areas broadly around Lake Chad and/or the active migration zone between northern Nigeria / southern Niger and the MKO (Activity 1.11) and • Assessment of potential livelihood impacts of regulations or restrictions, and their impact on local stakeholders (Activity 2.6). 		
Recommendations for next steps (where relevant):	n/a		
Approval ESMS Clearance			
Name	Function	Date	Signature
Jean-Yves Pirot	Director GEF and GCF Coordination Unit	16 May 2017	

Annex A: Checklist for ESMS 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. 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 and resulted in effective engagement of relevant stakeholders, including affected groups? ¹	Yes	See overview of stakeholder consultation provided in Chapter 6 and in the Appendix 13 (Field Mission) of the Project Document
2. Have required disclosure of information been made in a culturally appropriate way (e.g. through information sessions with local communities or local newspapers)? ² Indicate place(s) and date(s) of disclosure.	n/a	
3. Have the EISA recommendations been incorporated in the project proposal and mitigation measures presented in form of an ESMP (or other ESMS action plans) ³ ? Have required resources been accounted for in the project budget (including initial investments and recurring expenses)? Are responsibilities and implementation schedule specified?	n/a	
4. Has the guidance on ESMP monitoring ⁴ been followed and an ESMP presented?	n/a	
5. Have potential data gaps been filled through baseline studies (where relevant)?	n/a	Some data couldn't be gathered during the project preparation phase, either due to constraints of timing and/or the requirement to have other activities undertaken first. Filling the data gaps was conceptualized as project activities: Activity 1.11: Analysis of the socio-ecological context of transhumant pastoralists in the areas broadly around Lake Chad and/or the active migration zone between northern

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.

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.

		Nigeria / southern Niger and the MKO Activity 2.6: Assess potential livelihood impacts of regulations or restrictions, and their impact on local stakeholders
6. Have relevant stakeholders been informed about the IUCN ESMS grievance mechanism or is it stated how this will be done upon launch of the project? ⁵ Have cultural appropriate adaptations been made to improve complaint resolution at the local level, where relevant?	No	Information about the grievance mechanism should be disseminated at the earliest possible moment, no later than the official launch of the project. Cultural appropriate adaptations to improve complaint resolution at the local level are encouraged (e.g. assignment of a local ombudsperson).
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions - answer only if standard has been triggered		
7. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid the need for resettlement or access restrictions?	Yes	The Standard is not triggered in a strict sense as the access restriction element of the Standard generally applies in situations where restrictions are established under formal and statutory frameworks. Situations where communities establish resource use regimes themselves for the purpose of sustaining long-term use of the resources (which is the case of the project), are usually not considered under this Standard. However, social impacts might occur in case local decision-making processes do not provide sufficient consideration to the needs of vulnerable members of the society. This risk has been addressed by the project through the following activities: Activity 2.6: Assess potential livelihood impacts of regulations or restrictions, and their impact on local stakeholders. Activity 2.7: Select through a participative process, and based on the ranking above, the forest blocks to be managed through the project.
8. If avoidance 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")?		
9. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Do they seem fair and are they accessible by all affected groups? Are they sufficient and reach all affected groups?	n/a	
10. Has a FPIC process been adhered to and have affected people participated in designing an action plan or a process framework and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring? Have the consultation been done with legitimate representatives of the affected groups? Is this properly evidenced?	n/a	

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

Indigenous peoples - answer only if standard has been triggered		
11. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid impacts on indigenous peoples?	postponed	The PPG missions confirmed the seasonal presence of transhumant pastoralists in the MKO; the most prominent group of transhumant herders being the Mbororo Peul (or Wodaabe) and the Uddah. These social groups are largely marginalized within the legislative and political context and have very limited access to basic social services, including health care, education, safe water sources or sanitation services. While Chad does not recognize the concept of indigenous people on its territory, their social organization and way of life fulfil the IUCN definition of "indigenous peoples". Because of seasonal presence in the project site, it was not possible to undertake a comprehensive livelihood assessment during the project preparation phase. A dedicated assessment has been programmed (activity 1.11) to be carried out at the outset of the project. The assessment will analyse livelihood conditions and identify potential negative impacts (material or non-material) from project activities, in particular impacts related to resource management regulations. The study will further elaborate on ecological impacts of herd movements taking into account historical conditions, current movements and impacts as well as future scenarios. The study is intended to broaden the understanding of social and environmental benefits of pastoral rangeland systems, but also to ascertain challenges resulting from interaction with sedentary systems in the context of socio-economic change processes and impacts from climate change. In case potential impacts are identified, culturally appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed as part of output 1.1.4 which will be discussed, refined and agreed (following FPIC) with legitimate representatives of transhumant groups.
12. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts, secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits to these communities and/or provide adequate and fair compensation for impacts?		
13. Have consultations been held with affected indigenous groups regarding rights or use of natural resources and have they adhered to FPIC? Is this properly evidenced? Have affected groups participated in the design of mitigation measures (ESMP) or indigenous peoples plan (IPP) and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?		
14. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Are they sufficient and reach all affected groups?		
Cultural Heritage - answer only if standard has been triggered – NOT TRIGGERED		
1. Have appropriate stakeholders been consulted in the assessment of impacts on cultural heritage and on the users of the resources? Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid impacts or restricting access to resources?	n/a	The project involves a small civil works component - anti-erosion mechanisms - which poses a very low risk of encountering buried cultural resources. Due to the low probability of risks the Standard is considered as not triggered. The remaining risk, however, will be monitored and Chance Find Procedures will be at hand to be able to respond to unexpected encounter during civil works (see Appendix 11)

2. 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 developing these measures and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?	n/a	
3. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	n/a	
4. 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"?	yes	
5. 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 - answer only if standard has been triggered- NOT TRIGGERED		
Other environmental or social risks - answer only if other environmental or social risks had been identified during screening (or scoping)		
6. Is the project in compliance with national legislation and regulations that pertain to environmental and social matters and respective international laws, conventions and standards?	n/a	
7. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid social and environmental risks identified during screening (or scoping)?	n/a	
8. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts or provide appropriate compensation?	n/a	
9. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	n/a	
Gender		
10. Were men and women involved in project design and ESIA	yes	During the field mission women were consulted and involved in project design.

process in a culturally appropriate way?		However, it was also realized that for conducting a more in-depth gender analysis more time is required to ensure a meaningful consultative process. This has been conceptualized as a separate activity.
11. 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?		A number of measures have already been identified such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring that training opportunities are accessible for women (restoration, sustainable harvesting, surveying, productive skills etc.) • hiring women consultants in order to facilitate communication with women and ensure that project activities are better aligned to their needs and capacities, as part of output 2.1.5 (Sustainable financing mechanisms for the long-term community-based management of natural resources established) financing will be provided in particular for products or enterprises/cooperatives developed/led by women (groups); • output 3.1.4 (Identification of economically viable commodities and potential markets for natural resource products) gives particular emphasis to products that are already or can be managed by women or women groups It is expected that the consultative gender analysis might result in the identification of further measures.
12. Does the project include specific plans and measures to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		
13. Does the project include specific measures to strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources, when appropriate and consistent with national policy?	postponed	This will be explored as part of the gender analysis.
14. 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	Some indicators have already specified to be disaggregated by gender; the gender analysis might propose further indicators.
Vulnerable groups		
15. If risks for vulnerable groups were identified during screening and ESIA, were those addressed in the final project proposal?	postponed	Potential livelihood impacts will be assessed as part of Activity 2.6 (Assess potential livelihood impacts of regulations or restrictions, and their impact on local stakeholders)
16. Does the project include specific plans and measures to reduce vulnerability, build resilience and promote equity?	postponed	The development of mitigation measures will only be needed in case the above assessment (activity 2.6) will identify risks. If this was confirmed mitigation measures will be developed as part of activity 2.7. Select through a participative process, and based on the ranking above, the forest blocks to be managed through the project.

Climate Change

<p>17. 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This is addressed by Output 4.1.1: Assessment and Strengthening of the communities' resilience to climate change implemented as a driving principle of the project</p>
<p>18. 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?</p>		
<p>19. Are opportunities sought to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?</p>		