

## ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report - for field projects

### Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Restoring ecological corridors in Western Chad for multiple land and forests benefits - RECONNECT		
Project proponent:	IUCN PACO		
Country:	Chad	Total costs (US\$):	5,366,972
Estimated start date and duration:	36 months	Total costs in CHF:	5,279,810
		Exchange rate (if applicable):	0.98376 (OANDA)
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:	Jacques Somda, Regional Program officer Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, PACO	Aug 2016
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is <math>\geq</math> CHF 500,000</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (&lt; CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is &lt; CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p>	

### Step 2: ESMS Screening

To be completed by IUCN ESMS reviewer(s); only needed when the options 1 or 2 above (marked in red) are ticked

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	GEF/GCF Coordination Unit	21.09.2016
	Bora Masumbuko	PACO, Protected Areas Programme Officer	20.9.2016
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	PIF		
	ESMS Questionnaire		

### 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 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.

There are some social risks, most of them related to the fact that the delineation of forest corridors might imply the reduction of utilization/ abstraction rates for certain forest resources which might affect livelihood needs of vulnerable segments of the population. It is assumed, though, that decisions on land use are taken by the communities themselves (facilitated by the ILODs), hence the Standard on Access Restrictions might not be triggered. Confirming the non-applicability of the Standard, however, requires that the process of decision making at canton-level (designation of corridor areas and classification in protected versus multiple use zone) and the role of communities (represented by the ILODs) is clarified during the PPG phase. Please see respective questions and actions in the concluding remarks of section B1.

	<p>When collecting detailed social baseline data during the PPG phase it should be checked whether there are any groups in the project sites that would qualify as tribal groups following the definition provided in the Standard on Indigenous Peoples (see footnote 2 below). If this was ascertained, the respective questions in the questionnaire in section B2 need to be revisited by the PPG team and specific measures to provide culturally appropriate benefits to indigenous groups and/or avoid risks (following the provisions of the Standard) should be developed.</p> <p>There is a very low risk that anti-erosion mechanisms might affect buried cultural resources. The risk should be monitored and Chance Find Procedures should be at hand if risks get confirmed.</p> <p>Impacts of the project on biodiversity are expected to be essentially positive as it is the explicit aim of the project to restore ecological functionality and to promote sustainable use of natural resources. However, when defining the forest restoration activities and deciding about techniques to be promoted under Outcome 3 (which is assumed to happen during project implementation), risks need to be reviewed following the provisions of the Standard. This should be documented as part of the ESMP monitoring.</p> <p>Socio-economic baseline data collected during the PPG should be used to understand risks for women and vulnerable groups. Opportunities should be sought to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women and vulnerable groups and to strengthen these groups' land and resource rights. Also opportunities to enhance women's capacity to act as change agent for promoting sustainable resource management should be explored. There might be risks related to increasing pressure from non-sedentary groups and immigration. Capacity building of the local resource governance bodies (ILODs and others) should address these risks by improving their capacity to manage conflicting resource needs and influx of people. See actions described in section C.</p>	
<b>Required assessments</b>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Other:	
<b>ESMS Standards and other E&amp;S Impacts</b>	<b>Trigger</b>	<b>Required tools or plans</b>
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" 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
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 – A reference to the need to respect Chance Find Procedures when undertaking earthwork related to anti-erosion mechanism should be included in the final project document.
Other environmental and social impacts: key issues		
Climate change risks: key issues		

# Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

## Project summary

Chad's population is heavily dependent on natural resources to meet its basic needs. The maintenance of soil fertility, the availability of timber and non-timber forest products and the access to water resources (for domestic, agricultural and pastoral uses) constitute three major challenges in rural environments. Moreover, the high dependence on subsistence agriculture and/or cash crops (notably cotton) on rainfall patterns underlines just how vulnerable the rural economy is to climate change. Whilst Chad's rural areas are vulnerable to climate change, the land use practices (agriculture, forest management) are nevertheless one of the main sources of greenhouse gas emissions, as mentioned in the Government of Chad's second nation communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Therefore, reversing the trend in terms of soil and forest degradation would give Chad the potential to sequester of greenhouse gases, notably CO<sub>2</sub>, which is essential for the mitigation of climate change. This is what this project plans to carry out in the Mayo-Kebbi Ouest Region.

This project's goal is to maintain and preserve natural resources in the geographical location between the Sena-Oura National Park, the Binder Léré Wildlife Reserve and the Yamba Berté Forest Reserve (which constitute the three protected areas in the Mayo-Kebbi Ouest Region), by reducing human pressure on the environment. It is built around four components, namely (1) Local governance and capacity building, (2) Maintenance of the ecological functionalities of forest massifs, (3) Integrated management and increase in productivity of natural resources and (4) Monitoring/assessment, communication and knowledge management.

Expected outcomes are as follows:

- Outcome 1.1: Improvement of the various stakeholders' commitment to the joint, community, sustainable management of natural resources in order to achieve the ecological reconnection between the various corridors identified.

Following activities:

- Support for the internal organization of the ILOD which were established with support from previous projects (PCGRN, PRODALKA<sup>1</sup>) and other local structures (notably Village Committees),
  - Support for the functioning of the ILOD and other structures,
  - Preparation and revision of the local development plans (in accordance with the process defined by PRODALKA),
  - Preparation and revision of land-use planning tools (local development plans, charters and agreements),
  - Technical training in activities related to the management and monitoring of natural resources: forestry, restoration of degraded soils, non-timber forest products, sustainable fishing, pastoralism, etc.
  - Raising the awareness of populations and target groups.
- Outcome 2.1: Sustainably managed forest corridors and gallery forests

Output 2.1.1: Identification of forest corridors:

- Updated cartography of land use in the Mayo-Kebbi Ouest Region;
  - Diachronic analysis of changes in land use allowing deforestation hot spots to be identified;
  - Preliminary identification of the most appropriate forest corridors allowing the three protected areas to be linked up. The corridors must meet a certain number of key criteria: ecological relevance (as such, particular attention will be paid to gallery forests bordering on watercourses), distance (as far as possible) from deforestation "hot spots" and transhumance corridors, the absence of industrial activities, etc. ;
  - Field checks of the status of the preselected corridors, and carrying out a census of activities involving the use of natural resources. Identification of the areas that need to be restored.
- Outcome 2.2: Increase in the CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration capacity through the management of 70,000 hectares of forest areas (1,300,000 t CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent)

Output 2.2.1: Investment plans with experimental regulations of forest corridors developed and implemented

- A consensus-building process at a canton level to integrate the corridors into local development plans (consistent with the activities in component 1) as protected zones or, if the use of resources is excessive, forest areas with multiple uses where agricultural clearing is banned;
  - For forest zones with multiple uses, the definition of the rules of use for forest resources (consistent with the activities in components 1 and 3);
  - The physical delimitation of corridors (in zones with high levels of human pressure);
  - The implementation of forest restoration activities in the degraded zones;
  - The implementation of a mechanism to monitor the integrity of ecological corridors.
- Outcome 3.1: Sustainable use of natural resources and the fulfilment of communities' needs

Output 3.1.1: Development and implementation of techniques for the sustainable use of natural resources

- Timber resources:

---

<sup>1</sup> Conservation and Management of Natural Resources Project (*Conservation et gestion des ressources naturelles, PCGRN*) and the Programme for the Decentralized Rural Development of Mayo Dallay, Lake Léré and the Kabbia (*Programme de Développement Rural Décentralisé du Mayo Dallay, du Lac Léré et de la Kabbia, PRODALKA*)

- The supply of timber and non-timber forest products. Special emphasis will be placed on the issue of fuelwood;
    - Restoration through enrichment;
    - Restoration through protection.
  - Productivity of pastures and pastoralism.
    - Identification and delimitation of transhumance corridors;
    - Maintenance of the productivity of pasture zones;
    - Management of bush fires.
  - Fisheries resources
    - Sustainable management and harvesting of fish
    - Protection of spawning grounds
    - Restoration/protection of the shores of Lake Léré
  - Cohabitation between humans and wildlife
    - Techniques for preventing and scaring away pest species that cause damage to agriculture
- Outcome 3.2: Increase in the productivity of degraded soils

Output 3.2.1: Promotion of agroforestry and techniques for the restoration of degraded soil

- The implementation of anti-erosion mechanisms in sensitive areas (river sources / headwaters, slopes, fluvial terraces, etc.);
- The adoption of techniques to maintain soil fertility in agricultural areas (linked to agroforestry);
- The restoration of lacustrine areas that are of key importance for the water cycle and populations.

## A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

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*

Partially. During the project identification, consultations with key stakeholders were conducted. However, not all relevant stakeholders were consulted.

*IUCN ESMS Reviewer*

The existing stakeholder analysis should be refined/completed in order to provide for identifying groups that might be affected by the project and to plan their involvement in the further design steps. The analysis should be broken down by gender, where relevant.

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*

Partially. See above.

*IUCN ESMS Reviewer*

The socio-economic baseline assessment should include extensive consultations with local stakeholders and in particular with groups identified as potentially affected by the project. This should include women groups but also other groups that are specifically vulnerable.

## B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards

### B1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Will / might the project involve relocation or resettlement of people? <b>if yes, answer a-b below</b>	No	<i>Shaded cells do not need to be filled out</i>
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? (e.g., establishing new restrictions, strengthening enforcement capacities through training, infrastructure, equipment or other means, promoting village patrolling etc.); <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	No	
3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	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.)? <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	No	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.		
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.	See activities under output 2.2.1	<p>Two components of the project include activities that involve a certain level of restrictions on the use of natural resources:</p> <p><b>Outcome 1</b> aims at strengthening existing local natural resource governance structures (ILOD) and their capacity in stimulating local stakeholders' commitment to sustainable management of natural resources. Key responsibilities of the ILODs include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) creation of local agreements for regulating the use of natural resources in the different sub-zones for which the respective ILOD is responsible or else for specific resources,</li> <li>(2) contribution to specific charters which provide general guidelines for the management of natural resources in large areas and</li> <li>(3) support to the local development plans which define the material goods and services required in order to improve local living conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The first two tools might involve some element of access restriction as the sustainable management of resources might require <b>reducing or banning utilization or abstraction rates of resources.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 2</b> aims at maintaining ecological functions of the project's forest areas and involves a series of protection and</p>

			restoration activities. The key focus is the <b>identification of forest corridors and designation either as protected zones</b> or, if the use of resources is excessive, as <b>forest areas</b> where agricultural clearing is banned <b>while allowing certain other uses</b> and the establishment of <b>experimental regulation</b> allowing the three protected areas to link up. Both categories (protected zones and forest areas with multiple use) imply a certain level of access restriction, obviously the level is stronger for the protected zones.
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)?		The project will follow consultation process to identify rules and corridors that can put restricted for certain uses (see activities under output 2.2.1.	<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> The project will strengthen the capacity of existing local resource governance bodies (ILODs) and these will be the actors suggesting potential resource restrictions. Because ILODs don't have coercive means to enforce regulations, any resource management rule suggested by them will only be effective if they manage to assure consent from all relevant stakeholders;</p> <p><b>Outcome 2:</b> The project will facilitate a consensus-building process at the canton level to integrate the corridors into local development plans and designate them either as protected zones or as forests with multiple use. It is not clear, though, who would be involved in the decision making process about the corridors and classification in protected or multiple use zone; and whether this includes representatives of local communities (e.g. ILODs)?</p>
c. Has the existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource (incl. traditional rights) been analysed, broken down by different groups including women, if applicable?		Yes, but not broken down by different groups, because this is not applicable	Not agreed. The PPG phase should include a brief analysis of the legal framework for land/resource rights. Understanding land and resource rights, in particular the of women and vulnerable groups, will be important when designing activities under outcome 3 – to assure that these activities will also provide benefits for these groups.
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?		The country's existing laws do recognise traditional rights for land and natural resources	Agreed, however it is good to verify that the recognition of traditional rights is actually also recognized by authorities acting at the local level and that it is consistently applied to all stakeholders concerned by the project.
e. Have the implications of access restrictions on people's livelihoods been analysed, by social group? Explain who might be affected and describe the impacts. Distinguish social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples) and men and women.		The implications of access restriction on people's livelihood have not been analysis into detail, but the project planned to support people affected through the promotion of integrated management and increase in productivity of natural resource in component 3.	<p>While the activities planned under Outcome 3 are expected to have positive impacts on people's livelihood, it will still be important for project design to understand people's dependency (broken down by groups) on forest resources; this should be part of the PPG phase. Existing assessments such as the socio-economic diagnosis of the area carried out by the projects PCGRN and PRODALKA should be made use of.</p> <p>As part of Outcome 1 it will be essential that members of ILODs understand the implication of resource management recommendations for specific vulnerable groups in order to pre-empt negative social impacts of the future resource use</p>

			charters and agreements. Hence, when training members of the ILODs elements of vulnerability assessment should be included.
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access? If yes, specify measures. Are they feasible, culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?		Yes. See above	Agreed, activities planned under Outcome 3 aiming at increasing productivity of natural resources can be expected to counterbalance potential negative impacts from the creation of forest corridors.  Clarification is needed during PPG phase what exactly the investment plans will entail and whether the project also intends to finance infrastructure (e.g. following the model of PRODALKA) – these activities might also act as mitigation for impacts from access restrictions.
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?		No. But the project planned to consult with stakeholders in identifying corridors that may involve access restriction and/or relocation	It will be important, though, that the process of consensus-building at canton level will be delineated more clearly during the PPG phase. This should include defining who should agree, how the process will be linked to the local level (e.g. ILODs), what form and level of consensus is sought etc.. The Standard requires that groups whose livelihood might be affected by access restrictions are involved in defining mitigation measures and provide their consent.
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		
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	No		
<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b> <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b> <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures?</b> <b>What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>	TBD	<p>The question whether the Standard is triggered cannot be definitively answered at this point. The access restriction element of the Standard mostly applies in situations where restrictions are established under formal and statutory frameworks (e.g. legal framework for protected area) and peoples and communities are then obliged to adhere to these land-use rules. Situations where communities establish resource use regimes themselves for the purpose of sustaining long-term use of the resources, are usually not considered under this Standard; this is because the restrictions are based on own decisions and are not imposed on them by third parties.</p> <p>Based on the above rationale, activities planned under <b>Outcome 1</b> are not considered to trigger the Standard for the following reason: The ILODs don't have any power to enforce resource management rules; for the rules to become effective the ILODs need to mobilize local communities' commitment and consent. Hence the resource management rules are interpreted as being established by the communities themselves. Nevertheless, there is a risk that local decision-making processes are dominated by powerful members of the community without giving due consideration to the needs of vulnerable groups.</p> <p>With regards to <b>Outcome 2</b> (which involves the designation of corridor areas) the decision is less straight forward and requires further specification during the PPG phase. Designating areas as protected or multiple use zones (with only certain uses allowed) might restrict people in their ability to fulfil their resource needs. From the PIF it is understood that the project will facilitate a consensus-building process at the canton level to integrate the corridors into local development plans and designate them either as protected zones or as forests with multiple use. What is not clearly delineated in the PIF, though, is who will decide (1) which areas to select as corridors and (2) which are designated as protected or multiple use zones; and to what extent the ILODs (and as such the communities) are actively participating in these decisions.</p>	



It is tentatively judged that the Standard is not triggered because it is assumed that the local communities are represented in these land use decisions through the ILODs. It is acknowledged that the project already foresees measures for minimizing potential social risks, e.g. by implementing activities aimed at enhancing the productivity of natural resources (Outcome 3) and by excluding areas with high human pressure from the corridors. However, the following action is required for the PPG and implementation phase, respectively:

- PPG phase:

- As part of the collection of socio-economic baseline data a high-level overview of the dependencies on natural resources should be provided, broken down by different social groups. The existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource should be examined and it should be confirmed that traditional rights for land and natural resources are not only recognized but also executed by local authorities. It should further be checked whether there are any groups at the project site whose rights are not recognised and as such may be at risk.
- The decision-making process at canton level for selecting areas as corridors and establishing the use regime needs to be clarified; will it involve local communities? Will they be able to refuse their consent to the corridor designation in case this puts their livelihood at risk? Clarifying these issues together with the project partners and documenting the decisions is necessary to confirm or dismiss the applicability of the Standard.

- Project implementation phase:

- The high-level overview of resource dependencies provided in the PPG phase will be validated by a census (as already described in the PIF, output 2.1.1.); this will allow confirming the judgement taken in the PPG phase about potential livelihood impacts. The census should disaggregate relevant social groups (e.g. women, tribal people, non-sedentary groups, migrants etc.). If impacts on groups or individuals are identified appropriate measures should be put in place to mitigate risks.
- It should be further assured that the local decision process on resource use regimes facilitated by the ILODs reflects voluntary and informed consensus and does not neglect the needs of certain groups.
- Members of the ILODs should be trained in identifying and pre-empting negative social impacts of resource management recommendations. This will allow them to more effectively guide natural resource management, gain enhanced ownership and achieve necessary buy-in from relevant actors. The training should include elements of vulnerability assessment.

B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples <sup>2</sup>			
	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer	
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in an area inhabited by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples or to which these groups have a collective attachment? <b>If yes, answer questions a-j</b>	No		
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still affect their rights and livelihood? <b>If yes, answer questions a-j</b>	No		
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.)?			Chad does not recognize the concept of indigenous people on its territory. However, when establishing the social baseline during the PPG, it should be looked at whether there are any groups that qualify as tribal groups following the definition provided in footnote 2. Based on these findings the questions below need to be revisited by the PPG team and if risks are identified appropriate mitigation measures conceived.
b. How do these groups identify themselves?			
c. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence and influence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.			
d. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' livelihood through access restrictions? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.	N/A		
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)?	N/A		
f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	N/A		
g. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	N/A		
h. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	N/A		
i. Has any process been started or implemented to			

<sup>2</sup>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

achieve the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples to activities directly affecting their lands/territories/resources?			
j. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	N/A		
k. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a culturally appropriate and gender inclusive way?			
<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	TBD	To be determined during the PPG when establishing the social baseline - whether there are any groups in the project sites that would qualify as <b>tribal groups</b> (see footnote 2). If this is ascertained the questions in the questionnaire in section B2 need to be revisited by the PPG team and specific measures to provide culturally appropriate benefits to indigenous groups (following the provisions of the Standard) should be developed as part of the PPG.	
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>			
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>			
<b>B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage</b>			
	<b>Project proponent</b>		<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
	<small>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</small>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection? )? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	TBD		
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)? )? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	TBD		
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)? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	TBD		
a. 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		
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	No		Not agreed. The project may include building anti-erosion mechanisms (river sources / headwaters, slopes, fluvial terraces, etc.) which pose a small risk of encountering buried

			cultural resources.
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items 4–5 might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	No		
d. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	No		
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	No		
<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	No	The project involves a small civil works component - anti-erosion mechanisms - which poses a low risk of encountering buried cultural resources. The risk should be monitored and Chance Find Procedures should be at hand to be able to respond to unexpected encounter during civil works.	
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>			
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>			
<b>B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources</b>			
	<b>Project proponent</b>		<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? <b>If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d</b>	Yes	Sena-Oura National Park in Chad Closed to Bouba Ndjida (Cameroon) national parks	
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? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	TBD		
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 <sup>3</sup> ? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	TBD		
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	No		Agreed. The project does not aim at expanding PAs but at removing threats to biodiversity and improving ecological

<sup>3</sup> 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.

on areas beyond the PA?			functionality of corridor areas between the PA.
b. If the project aims at changing management of a PA, is there a risk of adverse direct and indirect impacts on other components of biodiversity?	No		n/a as there is no intention to change management of PA
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourism facilities, access roads), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity, (consider the construction and use phases)?	No		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		n/a
4. Will the project introduce or translocate species as a strategy for species conservation or ecosystem restoration (e.g. erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	No		The answer should be “yes” as the project includes restoration activities and hence will introduce species.
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	Yes	Component 3 of the project involve support to sustainable agricultural land management.	
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		The answer should be “yes”. Reforestation projects usually involve: (1) accidental introduction of non-native species during processes of restoration (e.g. through non rigorous protocols in germplasm transfer from one country to another) and/or (2) a deliberate introduction of non-native species as part of the ecological restoration strategy (e.g. as strategy for climate adaptation. <b>Clarification needed during PPG phase.</b> It is understood that the concrete forest restoration activities are decided during <b>project implementation</b> . The ESMP should note these risks and refer to the Standard (Chapter III. Risks related to managing or restoring ecosystems and ecosystem services) as guidance for the restoration strategy and the species selection in particular. It should be further pointed out that the project needs to rigorously respect protocols for Germplasm procurement. The implementation of the provision will be part of ESMP monitoring.
b. If a is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?	N/A		This can only be answered once the restoration strategy is available. To be discussed in ESMP monitoring.
c. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of facilitatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	N/A		<b>TBD as part of the PPG</b>

d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood?	N/A		<b>TBD as part of the PPG</b>
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		Agreed. Reforestation and putting in place anti-erosion mechanisms (river sources / headwaters, slopes, fluvial terraces, etc.) are expected to have an exclusively positive impact on water flow and the water table. No containment of surface or groundwater is planned.
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., water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.	No		Agreed. Reforestation is expected to have positive impacts.
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		
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		Agreed. The project aims to have positive impacts on ecosystem services to benefit needs of local communities.
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		Agreed. The focus of the project is to promote sustainable use of living natural resources by training actors to recognize abstraction thresholds.
11. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b</b>	No		The answer should be "yes". The project might involve application of pesticides; however it is the explicit purpose of the project to promote sustainable agriculture and including progressive phasing out of chemicals in favour of organic techniques. Hence no special requirements are triggered.
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?	N/A		
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		
<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	No	The impacts of the project on biodiversity are expected to be largely positive as it is the explicit aim of the project to promote sustainable use of natural resources. However, risks related to species introduction as part of the reforestation activities need to be reviewed when defining the forest restoration activities in the degraded zones and deciding about the management techniques to be promoted under Outcome 3. Adherence to the Standard's provisions needs to be demonstrated as part of ESMP monitoring.	

<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>		
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>		
<b>C. Other social or environmental impacts</b>		
<b>C1: Other social impacts</b>		
	<b>Project proponent</b>	<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
	<small>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</small>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
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	Not agreed. This question should be answered during the PPG after having gathered socio-economic baseline data (disaggregate between women and men) and a high-level overview of dependencies on natural resources has been achieved (see section B1).
3. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		Through the promotion of sustainable land management practices, the project use opportunities to secure and enhance economic, social and environmental benefits to women
4. Explain whether the project provides, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?		Through community consultation as planned by the project, the project will provide for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? <sup>4</sup>	No	
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups <sup>5</sup> 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	Not agreed. This question should be answered during the PPG based on socio-economic baseline data gathered.

<sup>4</sup> Affirmative action is a measure designed to overcome prevailing inequalities by favouring members of a disadvantaged group who suffer from discrimination. However, if not designed appropriately these measures could aggravate the situation of a previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

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		The pressure on natural resources is expected to increase (e.g. between different socioeconomic groups with competing resource needs such as farmers and transhumant pastoralists as well as by migrants moving into the area). However, it is precisely the objective of the project to address the growing scarcity of resources by integrated management strategies that are expected to improve ecological functioning and productivity. Strengthening the capacity of local governance to manage natural resources (conceptualized in component 1) can also be seen as measure to reduce the potential of conflicts. It will be important that capacity building will provide strategies and concrete tools how to deal with competing resource demands and manage conflicts; and that the conflict resolution mechanisms and sanctions developed by PRODALKA are reviewed on effectiveness and further strengthened.
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?	N/A		
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		See response to question 7
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		
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?	N/A		
14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country or is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	No		

## C2: Other environmental impacts

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
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		Agreed. The project will contribute to increasing the GHG sequestration potential in the area.
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. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to or is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?	No		

***Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above. Aside from these issues, are there any other potential negative impacts?***

***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?***

When collecting baseline data and analysing the socio-economic context during the PPG phase special attention should be given to identifying, understanding, and describing gender differences and gender roles in natural resource management; this should include analysing women's dependencies on natural resources, women's access to productive resources and their legal rights as well as their influence in collective decision-making. The socio-economic and gender analysis will be instrumental to improve project design (reflect needs and differing realities of both men and women), to identify opportunities for women empowerment and to understand whether there is a risk that project activities might inadvertently cause any negative impacts on women.

If impacts are identified the project design team will need to develop, in cooperation with affected groups, suitable mitigation measures. The project design team should further identify opportunities for targeting project activities more specifically to women. Examples are capacity building in natural resource management, active promotion of women's participation in the project's productive activities (e.g. agroforestry practices, soil restoration techniques etc.) or income-generating activities targeted at women. The team should also explore opportunities for strengthening women as change agent as experiences have shown that women often act as an effective promotor sustainable resource management.

In addition to risks for women the socio-economic analysis should also consider risks for other vulnerable or marginalized groups and, if risks are confirmed, propose appropriate mitigation measures.

There might be risks related to increasing pressure from non-sedentary groups and immigration. Capacity building of the local resource governance bodies should address these risks by improving their capacity to manage diverse resource needs and influx of people. A project implemented by IUCN in Northern Kenya could serve as example.

<b>D. Climate change risks</b> (Risks caused by a failure to adequately take the effects of climate change on people and ecosystem into consideration)			
		<b>Project proponent</b>	<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
		Yes, no, n/a, TBD	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
			<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1.	Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	No	
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	Farmers, Pastoralists and women are more vulnerable  A vulnerability assessment should be included in the assessment of resource dependencies (output 2.1.1.) in order to understand whether some people are more susceptible to the impacts from climate change than the others.
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)?	No	
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	The proposed project will rather increase community adaptation to climate change effects
5.	Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?		The project will deliver outcomes that will lead to increase resilience for forest ecosystems, including protected areas and for local communities.
<b>Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above.</b>		Overall the impacts are expected to be positive.	
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>			
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed</b>			