

Annex 6. Environmental and Social Risk Screening and Environmental and Social Management Framework

Also Includes:

- **Pest Management Plan**
- **Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework**
- **Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions**

Programme title: Ecosystem-based Adaptation in the Indian Ocean ('the Programme')

Programme Duration: 10 years

Accredited Entity: Agence Française de Développement (AFD)

Executing Entity: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)

Environmental and Social Risk category: *Low level of Intermediation, I3*

Document Date: 1 April 2020

Contents

Summary	3
Programme Description	6
Environmental and Social Risk Screening	10
Safeguard Policies: Environmental and Social Management Framework	14
Section A: General Implementation Arrangements	17
Section B: Environmental Management Framework	29
Section C: Pest Management Plan	34
Section D: Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework	41
Section E: Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions	52
Appendix A. AFD’s Environmental and Social Risk Assessment for CEPF showing classification as category C	60

Summary

The Programme, which focuses on engaging Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), including community-based groups, in Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) will ultimately have considerable, long-term environmental and social benefits. The Programme seeks to strengthen the resilience of the vulnerable ecosystems and human communities in the four Programme countries, which are all island developing states (Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, and Seychelles). Overall, AFD determines that the Programme has low overall environmental and social risks. As the Programme will operate by making grants to fund on-the-ground activities, it is classified as a Programme with low risk through intermediation (I3) under GCF's environmental and social risk categories.

Like all island developing states, the four Programme countries are extremely vulnerable to climate change. Their populations, agricultural lands and infrastructure are highly exposed to climate change because they tend to be concentrated in coastal zones¹ where sea-level rise and increased frequency and severity of extreme weather is most damaging². All the Programme countries report recent climate change such as increased temperatures, rainfall changes, sea-level rise and increasing ocean acidification. Climate models, even under the most optimistic scenarios, project that existing changes are going to become more pronounced in the future, putting people, infrastructure, agriculture, natural ecosystems and people's livelihoods at risk. Increased air and sea surface temperatures, changes to seasonal rainfall and increased numbers of extreme weather events including both droughts and flooding are expected. Cyclones are already a significant threat to life and assets and are expected to intensify.

Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) measures have been identified as high priorities in the climate change strategies of all the Programme countries. EbA encourages conservation, improved management and restoration of ecosystems to provide the essential services that people need to adapt to climate variability. However, beyond a few pilot projects, financing for EbA is currently insufficient in the Programme countries despite the urgent need and opportunity to scale up EbA action. The Programme will provide specific funding for EbA through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to mobilize Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

The goal of the Programme is to reduce the vulnerability of island populations by securing the critical ecosystem services they need to be resilient to climate change. The Programme will use tried-and-tested tools and methodologies that CEPF has developed over the last 20 years for strengthening and engaging civil society actors in ecosystem conservation. CEPF's model, which has previously focused primarily on biodiversity conservation, will be modified to direct investments to geographic and thematic areas of highest priority for EbA. The Programme will work through CSOs, help to build their capacity, and help them develop partnerships with the private and public sector. The Programme includes a component to achieve long-term sustainability and encourage replication of best practice, including in other hotspots

¹ Madagascar, due to its size, is the exception but still has significant coastal populations and offshore islands that share the same characteristics as the other countries.

² <https://www.ipcc.ch/srocc/>

where CEPF works. Replication outside of the four Programme countries will be work that CEPF does outside of the actual scope of the GCF-supported Programme. The Programme has three components:

Component 1: Developing strategic plans for EbA in the small island biodiversity hotspot that are well aligned with national climate change strategies;

Component 2: Supporting EbA activities through grants to CSOs;

Component 3: Ensuring long-term sustainability and replicating success through knowledge products and tools for EbA.

This document is in two parts. The first part is a **Programme screening** to highlight the environmental and social risk factors that could occur in the Programme and should be mitigated. The risk factors were screened according to the interim ESS of GCF and consider the requirements of the interim ESS, Environmental and Social Policy, Gender Policy, and the Indigenous Peoples Policy of the GCF.

Based on the project screening, **the Programme is deemed to have minimal environmental and social risks equivalent to Category C of the GCF Environmental and Social Policy**. The direct activities of CEPF (organization of workshops, trainings etc.) will have low impacts and the subprojects proposed by CSOs are also expected to be Category C. The proposed activities should, by their nature, be designed with the intention of positive environmental outcomes and CEPF will discourage applications for subprojects that could have adverse impacts. Similarly, subprojects that include involuntary restriction of access to land or natural resources will be discouraged. Involuntary restrictions should be minimised because CSO projects are expected to have strong buy-in from stakeholders in the communities where they are located. The Programme will work specifically through CSOs and therefore be encouraging the development of national civil society organizations and community-based groups, which should help ensure that proposed interventions have strong local backing. Nevertheless, CEPF has in place an ESMF to ensure that subprojects with potential negative environmental and/or social impacts have appropriate mitigation measures in place. The Programme will work through financial intermediation for the majority of its activities. CEPF will be responsible for providing grants to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) who will be responsible for the EbA subproject activities. Therefore, following GCF's categorization process the Programme is considered to have a **Low level of intermediation, or I3**.

The second part of the document provides CEPF's Environmental and Social Management Framework as it will be applied in this Programme. Included as part of CEPF's ESMF are a Pest Management Plan, Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework, and Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions. The Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework is unlikely to apply in the Programme as only one group, the Mikea of a small region of south-west Madagascar, are generally considered as Indigenous People in the four Programme countries. Several other donors already work in that area and so it is unlikely to be chosen as a priority area during the participatory priority setting in Component 1 of the Programme. Nevertheless, the framework has been included in this document in case that area of Madagascar is chosen as a Priority zone for investment by the Programme.

CEPF manages a complex portfolio of grants in biodiversity hotspots across the Globe. CEPF's ESMF applies to CEPF's entire portfolio and is an integral part of CEPF's Operations Manual, which has been provided

as Annexe 21 to the current Proposal. The ESMF therefore needs to respond to the policies of all of CEPF's donors, including AFD, as well as the GCF policies. As such, some of these other donor policies (notably the World Bank's safeguard policies and Conservation International's environmental and social policies) are referred to in this document. In the context of the follow-up to the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and in line with the 2014 Law on the Orientation and Programming Development Policy and International Solidarity, **AFD has harmonized the principles of its Environmental and Social Risk Management Policy to coordinate its actions with the environmental and social framework of multilateral donors.** AFD has therefore aligned its Policy with the World Bank's environmental and social standards for projects with High or Substantial environmental and social impacts. **Therefore, the World Bank policies referred to in this document have been adopted as AFD policies for the purposes of this Programme and indeed all AFD's support to CEPF globally.**

CEPF's existing ESMF is compatible with, and addresses the requirements of GCF's Environmental and Social Policy and GCF's Indigenous Peoples Policy. The ESMF presented here in Annex 6 has been extracted from the CEPF Operations manual to provide a stand-alone document as requested as an annex to the GCF Programme Funding Proposal. Some additions and modifications to the standard CEPF ESMF have been made in this document to reference relevant GCF policies and AFD policies in addition to those of CEPF's other donors. Modifications to CEPF's standard ESMF have also been made to reflect the fact that AFD is the GCF Accredited Entity for this Programme. Some of the text also refers to other CEPF policies or procedures that can be found in the Operational Manual (Annex 21).

Programme Description

Like all island developing states, the four Programme countries (Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, and Seychelles) are extremely vulnerable to climate change. Their populations, agricultural lands and infrastructure are highly exposed to climate change because they tend to be concentrated in coastal zones³ where sea-level rise and increased frequency and severity of extreme weather is most damaging⁴. All the Programme countries report recent climate change such as increased temperatures, rainfall changes, sea-level rise and increasing ocean acidification. Climate models, even under the most optimistic scenarios, project that existing changes are going to become more pronounced in the future, putting people, infrastructure, agriculture, natural ecosystems and people's livelihoods at risk. Increased air and sea surface temperatures, changes to seasonal rainfall and increased numbers of extreme weather events including both droughts and flooding are expected. Cyclones are already a significant threat to life and assets and are expected to intensify.

While the combined effects of projected climate change mean that many people are at risk, the populations and economies of the Programme countries are highly dependent on natural resources and therefore ecosystem services. However, the natural ecosystems that provide these services are already under severe threat from human activities in all the Programme countries, which are within a *biodiversity hotspot* – a region of high biodiversity importance but with extremely threatened natural ecosystems. As a consequence, the resilience and ability of ecosystems to provide essential ecosystem services necessary for people to adapt to climate change is diminished, thereby further exacerbating climate change vulnerability. The most significant impacts are expected to include: decreased provision of freshwater due to degraded watersheds; increased flooding due to conversion of ecosystems that provide natural flood regulation; loss of coastal protection due to damage to coastal ecosystems such as mangroves and coral reefs; declines in the productivity of fisheries due to loss of nursery habitats; and decreased agricultural production due to heat stress and drought.

Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) measures have been identified as high priorities in the climate change strategies of all the Programme countries. EbA encourages conservation, improved management and restoration of ecosystems to provide the essential services that people need to adapt to climate variability. However, beyond a few pilot projects, financing for EbA is currently insufficient in the Programme countries despite the urgent need and opportunity to scale up EbA action. The Programme will provide specific funding for EbA through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to mobilize Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). CEPF was established in 2000 as a mechanism to enable CSOs to support conservation of critical ecosystems within biodiversity hotspots. CEPF is a joint initiative of AFD, Conservation International, the European Union, the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan and the World Bank. CEPF currently funds biodiversity conservation action in the four countries of the biodiversity hotspot and so there is an immediate opportunity to use its existing CSO networks to

³ Madagascar, due to its size, is the exception but still has significant coastal populations and offshore islands that share the same characteristics as the other countries.

⁴ <https://www.ipcc.ch/srocc/>

address climate change issues at scale. Integrating biodiversity and climate change issues are at the heart of the international agenda this year and this is exactly what this proposal is about.

The goal of the Programme is to reduce the vulnerability of island populations by securing the critical ecosystem services they need to be resilient to climate change. The Programme will use tried-and-tested tools and methodologies that CEPF has developed over the last 20 years for strengthening and engaging civil society actors in ecosystem conservation. CEPF's model will be modified to direct investments to geographic and thematic areas of highest priority for EbA. The Programme will work through CSOs, help to build their capacity and help them develop partnerships with the private and public sector. The Programme includes a component to achieve long-term sustainability and encourage replication of best practice, including in other hotspots where CEPF works. Replication outside of the four Programme countries will be work that CEPF does outside of the actual scope of the GCF-supported Programme. The Programme has three components:

Component 1: Developing strategic plans for EbA in the small island biodiversity hotspot that are well aligned with national climate change strategies;

Component 2: Supporting EbA activities through grants to CSOs;

Component 3: Ensuring long-term sustainability and replicating success through knowledge products and tools for EbA.

All grants for site-based EbA activities (funded under Component 2) must be located at priority sites identified in the updated Ecosystem Profile, following the KBA+ methodology – which will be used to identify priority sites for ecosystem service provision (see Annex 2, Feasibility Study for details). It is expected that these sites will be concentrated in coastal ecosystems, given the nature of climate change threats to small islands, but freshwater, forests and other terrestrial ecosystems will also be considered, based on their critical role in supporting climate resilient livelihoods and the delivery of essential ecosystem services. Because many communities have livelihood strategies that depend on coastal and terrestrial resources, particular attention will be given to sites that present opportunities for “ridge-to-reef” approaches to conservation and restoration of ecosystems and ecosystem services.

Through this process, a portfolio of grants to CSOs will be developed in each country that aims to increase the resilience of local communities to climate change through restoration and improved management of ecosystems and ecosystem services that are critical for local or national populations. There will be variation within and among countries with regard to the specific EbA approaches adopted but these are likely to include interventions to:

- Protect and restore wetlands, mangroves, coral reefs and seagrass meadows that deliver protection against storms and sea level rise, and provide food and income to coastal communities.
- Protect and restore watershed forests that perform critical flood prevention, soil stabilization and catchment protection functions.

- Pilot and replicate climate-resilience agroforestry models, using native plant species for shade, ground cover and nutrient fixing.
- Preserve and restore traditional and indigenous knowledge and natural resource management practices, including ones related to building materials, wild foods and traditional medicines.
- Diversify, strengthen and protect livelihood assets and strategies, including through sustainable fisheries management, nature-based tourism, value chains for natural products, etc.
- Restore small island ecosystems through eradication and control of alien invasive species.

This component also recognizes that work on the science underpinning EbA approaches is needed within the biodiversity hotspot, which will be particularly relevant for associating academic institutions with the Programme. Applied research activities will be supported during the Programme implementation period to improve understanding of the role of specific ecosystems and to test the effectiveness of promising EbA techniques. The research will generate important information to guide policy decisions about EbA in the Programme countries and globally. This component will also include activities to ensure rigorous, science-based quantification and verification of the impacts of the grant portfolio on ecosystem services.

The Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands Hotspot is one of 36 biodiversity hotspots on Earth. It is, therefore, one of the planet's richest areas, not only in terms of biodiversity, but also in regard to endangered species. This hotspot is comprised of the nation of Madagascar, the Mascarene Islands (Réunion, Mauritius and Rodrigues), the Comoros and the Seychelles. **Only Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius and Seychelles are included in the scope of the Programme.**

Even when compared to the world's other hotspots, this region is considered a priority for conservation because of its extreme biological diversity and uniqueness—there are approximately 15,000 species of plants found only in the hotspot. The region is also prioritized in light of its high level of ecosystem degradation, as demonstrated by the massive deforestation in Mauritius and Madagascar. As elsewhere in the world, this degradation is severely impacting the ability of ecosystems to provide the ecosystem services that people depend upon.

While the hotspot is defined by terrestrial diversity, the marine biodiversity of the Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands Hotspot is also considerable, both in terms of endemism levels (including corals, coastal species, and species found in ocean trenches), the international significance of some far-ranging taxa such as cetaceans and marine turtles, and the ecosystem services that marine and coastal ecosystems provide.

The Programme is expected to make a significant contribution to the climate change and sustainable development strategies of the Programme countries by increasing resilience and reducing the vulnerability of ecosystems and people. High level impacts of the Programme include: decreased vulnerability for at least 698,000 people through access to more resilient ecosystem services and income; restoration or improved management of at least 1.89 million hectares of coastal and terrestrial ecosystems that play critical roles in ecosystem service provision; and increased capacity of at least 25 CSOs, thereby enabling them to make further contributions to EbA. While EbA is the main focus of the Programme, the proposed protection and restoration of ecosystems is expected to have important

mitigation benefits through avoided emissions from deforestation and sequestration linked to ecosystem restoration activities.

Environmental and Social Risk Screening

The Programme will provide grant funding to Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in four countries to undertake Ecosystem-based Adaptation activities. The exact activities to fund will be identified through a broad stakeholder consultation process at the national and regional levels that will define priorities for EbA (under Component 1 of the Programme). The priorities will then be published as part of an Ecosystem Profile document. CSOs will then submit detailed proposals that respond to the priorities. At this proposal preparation stage, the exact activities and locations of the CSO projects are not known. The screening below has therefore been done based on the scope of the Programme as described in the Full Proposal and the other annexes, including the operational procedures of CEPF (see annex 21).

Checklist of risk factors aligned to the GCF environmental and social safeguards	
Assessment and management of environmental and social risks and impacts	
Will the activities involve transboundary impacts on air, water or other natural resources?	No
Are the activities likely to contribute to cumulative impacts?	No
Will the activities involve associated facilities and third-party impacts?	No
Are the activities likely to induce potential social conflicts?	No
Do the accredited entities, executing entities and implementing agencies (grantees, sub-borrowers and proponents) have the capacity to implement the environmental and social management plans/action plans?	Yes, both AFD and CEPF have substantial experience on environmental and social safeguards. A Regional Implementation team will in part be chosen on the basis of their capacity to implement the ESMF and additional training and mentorship will be provided by CEPF staff. The ESMF has been designed taking into consideration the differing capacities of CSOs in the countries where CEPF operates. Building capacity of the CSO grantees with respect to environmental and social safeguards will be an important co-benefit of the Programme.
Labour and working conditions	
Are the activities likely to affect working conditions, particularly in terms of employment, compliance with labour and other laws pertaining to non-discrimination, equal opportunity, child labour, and forced labour of direct, contracted and third-party workers?	Not significantly. Some people employed by CSOs will benefit from employment under the Programme and other beneficiaries will receive support for climate resilient livelihood options. CEPF's procedures that will be applied to subprojects will require grantees to confirm they are compliant with national employment legislation in the countries where they work before grants are awarded. In addition, part of CEPF's role is to encourage the emergence of credible and capable CSOs. One of the tools used

	is an obligatory organizational capacity assessment of all grantee CSOs (see page 289 of Annex 21 – CEPF’s operational manual), which includes identifying weaknesses in management systems and administrative capacity within CSOs. One of the functions of the Regional Implementation Team and the CEPF secretariat is to provide capacity building to CSOs to address priorities identified during the assessment.
Will the activities pose occupational health and safety risks to workers, including supply chain workers?	No
Resource efficiency and pollution prevention	
Will the activities generate emissions; discharge pollution into water and land; generate activity related greenhouse gas emissions; use hazardous materials; generate noise and vibration; and/or generate waste including hazardous waste?	Minimal greenhouse gas emissions and pollution expected as from any project (i.e. from electricity use and some transportation activities). The Programme may support investments related to invasive species management. These investments may include the procurement, handling, storage and use of pesticides in small quantities. No pesticides that are unlawful under national or international law will be supported under the Programme. Special due diligence will be required to finance any activities that apply pesticides. Procedures for use of pesticides are covered in CEPF’s Pest Management Plan, provided as part of this document. Any such activities are expected to have low negative environmental impact.
Are the activities likely to utilize natural resources, including water and energy?	No. Not significantly
Will there be a need to develop and implement measures to reduce pollution and promote sustainable use of resources?	Not as a Programme impact. Promotion of sustainable use of resources is likely to be an objective of some grant applications.
Community health, safety and security	
Will the activities potentially generate risks and impacts on the health and safety of the affected communities, including impacts on ecosystem services affecting the local community health and safety?	Not negative impacts. The Programme is specifically designed to improve the quantity and quality of ecosystem services.
Will the activities increase the risk of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment?	No
Will there be a need for an emergency preparedness and response plan that also outlines how the affected communities will be assisted in emergencies?	No
Will there be potential risks posed by the security arrangements and potential conflicts at the project site between the workers and the affected community?	No
Land acquisition and involuntary resettlement	

Annex 6. Environmental and Social Risk Screening and Environmental and Social Management Framework – Ecosystem-based Adaptation in the Indian Ocean

Are the activities likely to involve the acquisition of lands, land rights or land-use rights through expropriation or other compulsory procedures in accordance with the legal system of the country?	No
Are the activities likely to alter existing land use and restrict access to natural resources resulting in loss of livelihoods and other economic activities?	Potentially there could be changes and restrictions related to use of natural resources in some subprojects but these are expected to be minimal. CEPF also applies a policy on restrictions of access to natural resources as part of its ESMF
Biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of living natural resources	
Is the project or programme likely to be located on modified, natural and/or critical habitats or in protected or internationally recognized ecological areas?	Yes
Is the project or programme likely to introduce invasive alien species of flora and fauna, affecting the biodiversity of the area?	No. Removal of invasive alien species of flora and fauna is anticipated to be an objective of some of the subprojects proposed by CSO grantees
Is the project or programme likely to have potential impacts on biodiversity (especially critically endangered and/or endangered species, endemic or restricted-range species, and globally significant migratory or congregatory species) and ecosystem services, including production of living natural resources?	Not negative impacts. Subprojects proposed by grantees are likely to have objectives that seek to improve ecosystem services and have positive co-benefits for biodiversity
Indigenous Peoples	
Are the activities likely to have impacts on indigenous peoples and communities, such as impacts on lands and natural resources, land tenure and on cultural resources?	Not negative impacts.
Are the activities likely to lead to physical displacement of indigenous peoples and/or restrict the access of indigenous peoples to lands and resources resulting in loss of livelihood?	No physical displacement. Any restrictions of access to lands or resources should be voluntary and only come about if the communities involved are proposing such restrictions as part of a subproject they are asking support for. Nevertheless, CEPF has a process framework for involuntary restriction of access to resources that will apply to the Programme and is included in this document.
Will the activities provide equitable opportunities to indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups during stakeholder consultation and in decision-making during the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the activities?	The Programme is designed to be an opportunity for local communities and other vulnerable groups to access funding for EbA activities.
Will the activities need to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)? If so, has the project obtained FPIC?	It's unlikely that the types of EbA subprojects proposed by CSOs will require FPIC. However, the ESMF outlines procedures for determining if FPIC is needed. If it is needed, the required standard for this Programme would be Free, Prior and Informed Consent rather than the Free, Prior and

	Informed Consultation as noted in CEPF's standard IPPF.
Cultural Heritage	
Will the project or programme be located on areas that are considered to have archaeological (prehistoric), paleontological, historical, cultural, artistic and religious values or contain features considered as critical cultural heritage?	Unlikely. Such subprojects would need to be proposed by, or involve as beneficiaries, the communities for whom the area is of importance.

Based on the project screening the Programme is deemed to have **minimal environmental and social risks** equivalent to **Category C** of the GCF Environmental and Social Policy. The direct activities of CEPF (organization of workshops, trainings etc.) will have low impacts and the subprojects proposed by CSOs are also expected to be Category C. Many subprojects are expected to occur in ecologically sensitive areas since the objective is to protect and/restore such areas to secure critical environmental services. However, the proposed activities should, by their nature, be designed with the intention of positive environmental outcomes and CEPF will discourage subprojects that could have adverse impacts. Similarly, subprojects that include involuntary restriction of access to land or natural resources will be discouraged. Involuntary restrictions should be minimised because CSO projects are expected to have strong buy-in from stakeholders in the communities where they are located. The Programme will work specifically through CSOs and therefore be encouraging the development of national civil society organizations and community-based groups, which should help ensure that proposed interventions have strong local backing. Nevertheless, CEPF has in place an ESMF to ensure that subprojects with potential negative environmental and/or social impacts have appropriate mitigation measures in place.

The proposed Programme will work through financial intermediation for the majority of its activities. CEPF will be responsible for providing grants to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) who will be responsible for the EbA subproject activities. Therefore, following GCF's categorization process the Programme is considered to have a **Low level of intermediation**, or I3.

In addition to the screening described above, AFD, as a donor to CEPF has assessed CEPF's activities according to its environmental and social policies and considers CEPF to have low environmental and social risks equivalent to Category C (see Appendix A).

Since the specific CSO subprojects and their locations have yet to be defined, the Programme will use CEPF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to govern the due diligence process with regards to environmental and social safeguards. The ESMF describes the process used to determine the types of environmental and social impacts assessments, environmental and social management plans and other pertinent management plans for the projects. In addition to standard environmental and social issues, the ESMF also incorporates additional frameworks including:

- a framework for project planning that describes best practice for stakeholder engagement;
- a framework for Pest Management for projects that may include invasive and/pest species management and require procurement, handling, storage and use of pesticides;
- an Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework that sets out the requirements and process for preparation of an indigenous people's plan should any of the projects involve indigenous peoples or their lands (though note that this is not expected for this Programme); and
- a process framework for involuntary restrictions that guides the projects in addressing risks and impacts resulting from potential restriction of access to lands or resources.

OM 3.6

Safeguard Policies: *Environmental and Social Management Framework*

CEPF appraises projects not only on their technical merit, but also on their environmental and social ramifications. Therefore, procedures for addressing environmental and social issues are included in the project cycle management process. A driving principle of CEPF is to prevent and mitigate any harm to people and thus to incorporate environmental and social concerns as an intrinsic part of project cycle management.

This section explains the CEPF environmental and social assessment processes. It also includes an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework, Pest Management Plan guidelines, and a Process Framework to further elaborate safeguards specific to Indigenous Peoples, the use of pesticides, and when a project may result in restriction of access to natural resources.

Environmental and social safeguards will be tracked during all stages of the project cycle with the main objective of ensuring that supported activities comply with the policies and guidelines laid out in the CEPF Operational Manual and with the Green Climate Fund (GCF)'s, AFD's, the World Bank's and CI's environmental and social safeguard policies. This includes confirming that measures are incorporated into the project design to prevent, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse environmental and social effects of individual projects.

The CEPF Programme Cycle Management Approach, as laid out in the CEPF Operations Manual describes a project cycle of design, implementation, and evaluation. CEPF addresses environmental and social issues within this cycle as follows:

- Design
 - Inquire on, and assess, environmental, and social guidelines.
 - Discuss with project designers and study any reports as requested.
 - Prepare comments and requests for additional information.
 - Advise on any specific requirements for compliance.
 - Review and assess for approval and/or any special measures required.
- Implementation
 - Continue to inquire and review environmental and social safeguard issues.
 - Prepare any comments and requests for new information.
 - Review and advise on implementation of any special measures required.

➤ Evaluation

- Ensure inclusion and review environmental and social safeguard issues in final project reporting as well as any lessons learned.
- Post all related information and documents on www.cepf.net for global learning.

Environmental and Social Safeguard Assessment Process

The CEPF project proposal forms seek out several elements of the basic project design including objectives, performance indicators, and sustainability issues. Within these applications are a series of safeguard questions that must be answered. For each, grantees are asked to provide a supporting statement to justify their answer.

CEPF will assess these answers during the initial proposal review. This review may be deemed satisfactory, or may involve further discussion with the potential grantee. In some cases, additional information may be required for further review and discussion. Throughout the review process, CEPF will maintain contact with the potential grantee to obtain clarification on information provided and request any additional information and documentation needed. In conducting the preliminary evaluation, CEPF will focus on analyzing the materials provided by the potential grantee to determine the following aspects related to the environmental and social effects of the project:

- Compliance with CEPF, GCF, AFD, World Bank and CI environmental and social safeguard policies
- Potential for the project to cause adverse environmental impacts
- Potential for the project to cause adverse social impacts
- Capacity of the applicant to implement any required safeguard-related measures during the preparation and implementation of the project.

At the conclusion of the initial screening, CEPF will identify any environmental and social effects of the project and define any safeguard requirements necessary. For projects above \$20,000, a more detailed Programme Proposal Application is required, and safeguard requirements may be further elaborated and defined. The grantee is responsible for implementation and monitoring of any required safeguard instrument or other required measures to address Safeguard Policies.

This process is then tracked throughout project implementation similar to the tracking of performance toward project objectives. At each performance reporting stage, grantees will revisit the safeguard policy issues to reconfirm their status, adjust any that may have changed during implementation, and make necessary mitigation steps as needed. In cases where grantees are implementing mitigation actions, they will report on the progress of such implementation similar to that which they are doing for other project elements. The

intent of this process is to ensure that the environmental and social safeguard issues are continually monitored and mitigated throughout project implementation.

The final step is to evaluate the environmental and social issues at project completion. Any related documents and lessons learned will be shared via www.cepf.net to help in the design and mitigation of negative environmental and social impacts in future projects.

Table 3.6.A: Safeguard Policy and Programme Cycle Framework

PCM Phase	Process Steps	Responsibility	Safeguards	Decisions(s)
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPF application • Review process & discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant • CEPF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental & social screening, assessments, frameworks • Free, prior and informed consultations for Indigenous Peoples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve • Develop mitigation steps • Decline
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPF project performance monitoring report • Review process & discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant / Grantee • CEPF 	Environmental & social safeguard measures	Monitor and re-assess safeguards
End of Programme Evaluation	Final project completion report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantee • CEPF 	Environmental & social measures	Evaluate, document lessons learned

Should the grant applicant or grantee be required to develop an assessment, Indigenous Peoples Framework, Process Framework, Pest Management Plan or action plan with regard to one of the safeguard policies, GCF disclosure policies will be followed. These require that all such reports and/or plans be provided in a timely manner prior to consultation and in a form and language understandable and accessible to the groups being consulted. In addition, these documents will be provided to CEPF and made available at www.cepf.net.

Further information on these Safeguard Policies can also be found on the GCF Web site at <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/environmental-and-social-policy>.

Environmental and Social Management Framework

Section A: General Implementation Arrangements

Background

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a long-term global program with multiple donors. Its Programme Development Objective is to strengthen the involvement and effectiveness of civil society in contributing to the conservation and management of globally important biodiversity. The Global Environment Objective is to achieve sustainable conservation and integrated ecosystem management in areas of globally important biodiversity, through consolidating conservation outcomes in existing CEPF regions and expanding funding to new critical ecosystems.

These objectives are being achieved by providing strategic assistance to locally-based NGOs, community groups, Indigenous Peoples, the private sector and other civil society partners to support: a) strengthened protection and management of biodiversity within selected hotspots and critical ecosystems, b) increased local and national capacity to integrate biodiversity conservation into development and landscape planning, and c) expanded and improved monitoring and learning to demonstrate biodiversity impact and enable adaptive management and replication. The CEPF program provides a field-tested mechanism for achieving these objectives, demonstrated by successful experience since its inception in 2000.

Objectives

The sub-projects supported by the CEPF will have few, if any, adverse impacts on the environment and local communities. However, sub-projects with minor impacts may be approved provided that they include appropriate mitigation and compensation measures as appropriate and in accordance with GCF principles and the principles of CEPF's donors.

The objective of this Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is to ensure that adverse environmental and social impacts are avoided or appropriately mitigated and compensated for. The ESMF was originally based on the World Bank's environmental and social safeguard policies but also addresses AFD, CI and GCF policies. A key principle is to prevent and mitigate any harm to the environment and to people by incorporating environmental and social concerns as an intrinsic part of project cycle management. Environmental and social issues will be tracked during all stages of the sub-

project cycle to ensure that supported activities comply with the policies and guidelines laid out in the ESMF.

The ESMF provides an overview of relevant GCF, AFD, World Bank, and CI policies and describes the planning process concerning environmental and social issues, including for screening, preparation, implementation, and monitoring of sub-projects. The ESMF specifically includes an Environmental Management Framework to address environmental safeguard issues (OP 4.01), a Pest Management Plan to address issues related to the purchase, application and storage of pesticides (OP 4.09), an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework to address the World Bank's policy concerning indigenous peoples (OP 4.10), and a Process Framework to address the World Bank's policy on involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12) concerning sub-projects that may result in restriction of access to natural resources.

Overview of Environmental and Social Issues

A number of GCF, AFD, World Bank and CI safeguard policies and resolutions are relevant to CEPF activities. These are briefly described in this section followed by a description of the institutional arrangements and planning procedures to ensure their application for CEPF sub-projects. More detailed description of measures to address particular issues pertaining to the respective safeguard policies is provided in four separate frameworks (sections B, C, D and E) of this ESMF. The [GCF policies are available at their website](#)⁵, the [AFD policies are available at their website](#)⁶, [World Bank safeguard policies are available at their website](#)⁷, the, and the [CI policies are available at their website](#)⁸.

Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01) – CEPF addresses priority conservation objectives and is thus expected to have a highly positive environmental impact. Resources will be directed to important biodiversity issues while ensuring minimum adverse environmental effects. Minor infrastructure construction (e.g. boundary markers, checkpoints, guard-posts and trails) may be supported and may have minor environmental impacts.

Screening criteria and planning procedures will identify sub-projects with potential adverse impacts. These are described in the Environmental Management Framework in

⁵ <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/environmental-and-social-policy>

⁶ <https://www.afd.fr/en/ressources/environmental-and-social-risk-management-policy-afd-funded-operations>

⁷ <http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/environmental-and-social-policies-for-projects/brief/environmental-and-social-safeguards-policies>

⁸ <http://www.conservation.org/about/Pages/our-policies.aspx>

section B to address issues pertaining to [OP 4.01](#) as well as the policies on natural habitats ([OP 4.04](#)), forests ([OP 4.36](#)), and physical cultural resources ([OP 4.11](#)).

Natural Habitats ([OP 4.04](#)) – The CEPF approach is fully consistent with the World Bank’s natural habitats policy. It does not cause, nor facilitate, any significant loss or degradation of natural habitats. By design, the project finances only those activities that promote protection of threatened species and their natural habitats. It is intended to prevent, or reduce, habitat loss or degradation. All activities are consistent with existing protected area management plans or other resource management strategies that are applicable to local situations. The selection criteria (section B) and review process of this ESMF for identifying and assessing sub-project activities aims to ensure that [OP 4.04](#) provisions are followed.

Forests ([OP 4.36](#)) – Activities will explicitly focus on conservation and more sustainable management of forests and other natural habitats. All activities are consistent with existing protected area management plans or other resource management strategies that are applicable to local situations. Similarly, to the natural habitats policy, the selection criteria and review process of this ESMF for identifying and assessing sub-project activities aims to ensure that [OP 4.36](#) provisions are followed. All activities in forests will be managed in participation with local communities.

Pest Management ([OP 4.09](#)) – The project may support investments related to agriculture extension services or invasive species management. These investments may include the procurement, handling, storage and use of pesticides. No pesticides that are unlawful under national or international law will be supported by CEPF. Special due diligence will be required to finance any activities that apply pesticides under Categories Ia, Ib or II as described in the [WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard](#).

CEPF will avoid the use of pesticide and herbicide intensive techniques and instead will support an approach that includes: (a) avoiding the use or promotion of pesticides with toxic categories I or II used for weed control or as insecticides except as a last resort; (b) promoting production practices such as rotational grazing that reduce the appearance of pests and increase natural enemies; (c) promoting the use of biological controls; (d) using animals more resistant to pests and applying products only when infestation level are critical; (e) avoiding the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used; and (f) training producers, technicians, and farm workers to responsibly manage products, equipment, and containers to avoid their own contamination or that of cattle food or produce. This approach will abide by the FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides. Any Class I or II pesticides procured by grantees must have prior no-objection and the use of pesticides may require a pest management plan (which will be

determined by screening criteria). The Pest Management Plan for CEPF and the project is presented in OM 3.6.3.

Physical Cultural Resources (OP 4.11 / BP 4.11) – CEPF will not fund any activity that involves the removal, alteration or disturbance of any physical cultural resources (defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, or other cultural significance). These may, however, be present in sub-project areas and measures should be put in place to ensure that they are identified and adverse effects to them are avoided. This is particularly relevant for projects that support development of management plans and other land and natural resource use planning, projects that support alternative livelihood activities, and projects that include small infrastructure construction. Section B of this ESMF includes procedures to ensure that [OP 4.11](#) provisions are followed.

Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10 / BP 4.10) – Many of the world’s remaining areas of high biodiversity overlap with lands owned, occupied and utilized by indigenous peoples. Many CEPF-funded sub-project activities are thus likely to overlap with the areas inhabited by indigenous communities. [OP 4.10](#) aims to ensure that affected indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits and that adverse impacts are avoided or adequately addressed through a participatory and consultative approach. Specific measures to achieve these objectives are described in the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework of this ESMF (section D), including provisions for social analysis, consultations and the preparation of an Indigenous Peoples Plan.

Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12 / BP 4.12) – CEPF will not fund sub-projects involving resettlement or land acquisition. However, some sub-projects may include restrictions of access to natural resources. All project applications will thus be assessed for their potential to restrict access to natural resources. Such potential restrictions will be addressed through the preparation of a sub-project specific Process Framework that will describe the process and principles for determining restrictions, offsets, compensation and other mitigation measures with the full participation of potential and actual affected persons. Section E provides further details on addressing potential restrictions of access to natural resources.

Environmental and Social Safeguard Process and Responsibilities

The CEPF Secretariat has the overall responsibility for ensuring that environmental and social issues are adequately addressed within the sub-project cycle. The sub-project applicant/grantee is responsible for actual preparation and implementation of required safeguard procedures and measures.

Throughout the sub-project review process, the CEPF Secretariat will maintain contact with the applicant to obtain clarification on information provided and the preparation process in general. It may request additional steps, information and documentation as needed to meet the objectives of the ESMF. There are two key decision points during the sub-project preparation process. A screening of sub-project proposals (Letter of Inquiry) will identify potential safeguard issues and ascribe preparation procedures to further assess potential impacts and design mitigation measures, as needed. A review of the final sub-project proposal will, besides reviewing the general proposal against the CEPF hotspot profile, objectives and procedures, assess the adequacy of the sub-project's preparation process and implementation measures vis-à-vis the safeguard issues, including:

- Compliance with this ESMF, CI⁹ policies and resolutions, and GCF, AFD and World Bank environmental and social safeguard policies.
- Potential for the project to cause adverse environmental impacts.
- Potential for the project to cause adverse social impacts.
- Adequacy and feasibility of the proposed safeguard mitigation measures and monitoring plans, including any Pest Management Plan, Indigenous Peoples Plan or Process Framework for restrictions of access to resources.
- Capacity of the applicant to implement any required safeguard-related measures during the preparation and implementation of the project.

This review may find the safeguard process and measures satisfactory, or may find the need for further discussion with, and steps by, the applicant to achieve the objectives of this ESMF, including revising safeguard measures and documents as appropriate. If the risks or complexity of particular safeguard issues outweigh the benefits, the sub-project should not be approved as proposed. For sub-projects affecting indigenous peoples their free, prior and informed consent is required (see section D for more details).

The review will be undertaken by the CEPF Secretariat in collaboration with Regional Implementation Teams. They will also consult or include experts on the social safeguard issues as appropriate, including AFD safeguard specialists if needed.

⁹ CI provides supporting legal and financial services to the CEPF Secretariat

During sub-project implementation, safeguard issues are tracked along with performance toward sub-project objectives. At each performance reporting stage, the grantee will revisit the safeguard issues to assess their status and address any issues that may arise. In cases where the grantee is implementing a safeguard instrument or other mitigation measures, it will report on the progress of such implementation similar to that which they are doing for other project elements. The intent of this process is to ensure that the environmental and social safeguard issues are continually monitored and mitigated throughout project implementation.

The CEPF Secretariat will monitor the implementation of safeguard issues during sub-project implementation. It will review and approve Plan of Actions that are required to be prepared during implementation of sub-projects restricting access to natural resources (see section D). AFD will include supervision of safeguard issues in its regular supervision of the CEPF Secretariat. AFD will report on any safeguard issues to GCF in its submission of annual performance reports to GCF.

The key responsibilities of the CEPF Secretariat and applicant/grantee are described in further detail in Table 3.6.1.A. Exact procedures depend on the specific sub-project activities and the local context, for instance, the number of safeguard policies that are triggered and the level of impacts (see sections B, C, D and E for more details).

Table 3.6.1.A: Key responsibilities for ESMF implementation

Programme Phase	CEPF Secretariat (and RITs)	Sub-project Applicant / Grantee
Screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise applicants and other stakeholders of environmental and social safeguard procedures. Review Letter of Inquiry and screen for potential safeguard issues, and advise applicants regarding the nature and content of the safeguard documents and measures to be prepared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess any potential safeguard issues early in the preparation process, including screening for the presence of indigenous peoples. Describe potential safeguard issues in the full proposal.
Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise applicants on safeguard issues, and provide capacity building and technical backstopping, as needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake safeguard required processes, such as consultations with local communities, environmental review, and social assessment. Design safeguard measures and prepare documents, such as an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) and a Process Framework (PF) with the participation of local communities. If applicable, disclose draft safeguard documents with the sub-project proposal to affected communities prior to final review of proposal by the CEPF Secretariat.
Review and approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review sub-project proposal for safeguard impacts and social risks. Assess the adequacy and feasibility of the safeguard assessment and consultation process. If needed, request further steps. Assess the adequacy and feasibility of the safeguard measures and documents. If needed, request appropriate changes to these and re-assess prior to final approval. If indigenous peoples are affected, ascertain that they have provided their free, prior and informed consent to sub-project activities affecting them. Sub-projects affecting indigenous peoples cannot be approved without such agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit sub-project proposal with safeguard measures and documents (e.g. social assessment, environmental review, IPP, PF), if required. If requested by the CEPF Secretariat or RIT, take additional steps to meet ESMF and safeguard policy provisions. Re-submit proposal with revised safeguard measures and documents, as needed. All national and local legislation and regulations will be complied with.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the capacity of the applicant to implement safeguard measures • If applicable, publicly disclose safeguard related information on the web after sub-project approval 	
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervise and review safeguard documents and issues during sub-project implementation. If needed, request changes to safeguard measures and/or implementation of these. • Review and approve Plan of Actions that are required to be prepared during implementation of sub-projects restricting access to natural resources (as will be described in the PF for sub-projects with potential impacts from such restrictions). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disclose final safeguard documents, if any, to affected communities. • Monitor and document the implementation of safeguard measures. When indigenous peoples are affected, include them in participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises. • Prepare Plan of Actions for sub-projects restricting access to natural resources (as per the PF prepared). Monitor and document implementation of these plans.
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure inclusion and review of environmental and social safeguard issues and outcomes in mid-term and final sub-project evaluation and reporting, including concerning any lessons learned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the implementation and outcomes of safeguard measures. When indigenous peoples are affected, include them in participatory evaluation exercises.

Selection criteria

To meet program objectives and objectives of GCF, AFD, World Bank and CI policies, the following types of sub-projects cannot be financed under the CEPF:

- Sub-projects that involve significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats and forest resources.
- Sub-projects that adversely affect physical cultural resources.
- Sub-projects requiring land acquisition or relocation of local communities.
- Sub-projects affecting indigenous peoples without having obtained their free, prior and informed consent
- Sub-projects that would be considered Category A or Category B projects under GCF's categorization system.

Application forms will include a description of environmental and social issues to assist applicants and the CEPF Secretariat to identify and assess potential adverse impacts. In the *Letter of Inquiry*, the applicant will identify and make a preliminary assessment of the potential issues. Based on this information, the RIT/CEPF Secretariat will determine eligibility and the scope and level of preparation activities concerning the safeguard issues.

In the *full proposal*, the applicant will describe potential environmental and social issues and how these have been assessed and the outcome of any consultations with local communities. For sub-project proposals with potential minor adverse impacts the applicant will describe appropriate mitigation measures and a monitoring system to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts (see sections B, C, D and E) on environmental issue, for more guidance). Any required safeguard documents will be submitted with the proposal. The CEPF Secretariat will consider this information when reviewing sub-projects for eligibility and scope and level of safeguard measures, if any.

Table 3.6.1.B provides an overview of potential impacts for various sub-project activities. The table does not replace subjective judgment on part of the applicant and the CEPF Secretariat/RIT in assessing sub-project impacts and mitigation measures. The scope and level of detail of the safeguard planning process and implementation measures shall be proportional to the complexity of the sub-project and its anticipated impacts. Most CEPF sub-projects are expected to have no or very few and minor impacts, and the safeguard procedures, if any, may thus be limited to an initial assessment of potential impacts, and in cases where indigenous peoples or other local communities are present in the sub-project areas, consultations with these communities.

For example, the presence of indigenous peoples in the sub-project area requires that the applicant consults with the indigenous peoples and assesses any potential impacts – both positive and negative – and how these can be addressed. If there are no impacts and if the indigenous peoples agree, no further measures may be necessary (e.g. surveys, assessments and mapping exercises of threatened species may not need additional measures if they do not affect the indigenous communities and if they are informed of the schedule for on the activities; if these are purely desk exercises consultations may not be needed). If there are potential impacts, a more detailed social assessment and consultation process is required to develop an Indigenous Peoples Plan describing measures to ensure that the indigenous peoples are not adversely affected and benefit from sub-project activities, as appropriate (see section D for more details).

Table 3.6.1.B: Sub-projects with potential safeguard impacts

Actions	Env. Review	Indigenous Peoples (IP) ¹⁰	Restricted Access
<i>Conservation of selected species across their range</i>			
Implementing priority activities from an agreed Action Plan for selected species	Maybe	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Conducting surveys, assessments and monitoring of key species; and mapping vegetation/habitat	No	Maybe	No
Planning and lobbying for establishment/extension of PAs and corridors	Maybe; if construction: yes	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Strengthening PA management (training, PA management plan, habitat improvement - restoration or removal of IAS, boundary demarcation, fire management)	Maybe; if construction: yes	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Supporting local stakeholders (local communities and authorities) to help protect/manage biodiversity; e.g. wetland or coastal zone management, participatory monitoring, habitat restoration	Maybe; if construction: yes	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Supporting specific conservation actions (reintroductions, ex-situ [turtle nursery])	Maybe	If IP present: yes	No
Supporting public awareness and education campaigns; 'pride' campaigns; and establishing and supporting nature youth clubs	No	Maybe	No
Supporting nature and species-based ecotourism, nature trails, training	Maybe	If IP present: yes	No
Printing local language materials and supporting local scientific journals	No	No	No
Promoting good agricultural practices or other sustainable livelihood activities in terrestrial or coastal	Yes	If IP present: yes	Maybe

¹⁰ If indigenous peoples are present in the sub-project area and may be affected –the applicant is required to consult these communities and assess potential impacts. This initial consultation and assessment process will determine the need for further steps, if any (see section C for further details).

ecosystems that promote species conservation or Ecosystem based Adaptation			
Establishing new financing mechanisms for species conservation or Ecosystem based Adaptation (e.g. links to PES and protecting habitats)	No	Maybe	No
Establishing sustainable use schemes, e.g. butterfly farming	Maybe	Maybe	No
Providing student research grants	No	Maybe	No
Mitigation of specific threats to threatened species across their range			
Analyses to better understand the threats and drivers for species conservation or Ecosystem based Adaptation (including socioeconomic studies)	No	Maybe	No
Purchasing and installing enforcement monitoring software and procedures (e.g. MIST)	No	Maybe	Maybe
Studying markets/supply chains in wildlife trade; training to enforce legislation	No	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Eradicating/controlling invasive species	Yes	If IP present: yes	No
Establishing community-based anti-poaching networks	No	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Addressing human-wildlife conflicts	Yes	If IP present: yes	Maybe
Hosting transboundary meetings and collaborations to address threats to species conservation	No	Maybe	No
Emergency funds			
Investigating sudden new threats to species in specific locations (diseases, pollution, stranding, oil spill)	No	Maybe	No
Supporting emergency actions aiming to preserve highly threatened species (targeted support for protected areas, meeting to agree 'last chance' emergency measures, purchase of crucial equipment to protect specific threatened species)	No	Maybe	No
Conducting urgent surveys and monitoring (e.g. for public enquiries or consultations); and providing specialist identification of species in need of urgent attention	No	Maybe	No

Disclosure

Key documents prepared to address safeguard issues need to be publicly disclosed according to the GCF's disclosure policy (available at <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/environmental-and-social-policy>). Should the grant applicant be required to develop a stand-alone environmental review or social assessment, a Pest Management Plan, an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), or a Process Framework (PF), these documents will be disclosed to local communities in a form, manner and language appropriate for the local context. Disclosure will occur in two phases:

- Disclosure of assessment documents (e.g. social assessment and environmental review) and draft safeguard documents (e.g. IPP and PF) during sub-project preparation and prior to final review and approval of the sub-project proposal. Disclosure during sub-project preparation aims to seek feedback and input from

local communities, and as appropriate other stakeholders, on the sub-project proposal and safeguard measures and documents.

- Disclosure of final safeguard documents prior to sub-project implementation to inform local communities of implementation measures concerning safeguard issues.

The CEPF Secretariat will disclose information of approved sub-projects, including any safeguard issues, through its website. The website will list contact information where interested stakeholders can inquire further documentation and raise their concerns or recommendations to the CEPF Secretariat.

Grievance Mechanism

Local communities and other interested stakeholders may raise a grievance at all times to the applicant/grantee or the CEPF Secretariat. Affected local communities should be informed about the ESMF provisions, including its grievance mechanism. Contact information of the applicant/grantee, the CEPF Secretariat and AFD should be made publicly available.

As a first stage, grievances should be made to the applicant or grantee, who should respond to grievances in writing within 15 calendar days of receipt. Claims should be filed, included in project monitoring, and a copy of the grievance should be provided to the RIT who must in turn forward a copy to the CEPF Secretariat. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response, the grievance may be submitted to the CEPF Secretariat directly at: cepfexecutive@conservation.org. The CEPF Secretariat will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring.

If the claimant is not satisfied with the response from the CEPF Secretariat, the grievance may be submitted to AFD at the local AFD office.

Sub-projects triggering an IPP or PF should also include local conflict resolution and grievance redress mechanisms in the respective safeguard documents. These will be developed in participation with the affected communities in culturally appropriate ways and will ensure adequate representation from vulnerable or marginalized groups and sub-groups (see sections D and E for more details).

OM 3.6.2

Environmental and Social Management Framework **Section B: Environmental Management Framework**

CEPF supports activities in various sites globally. The exact sites for the Programme are not yet known, but will be chosen based on ecosystem-based adaptation needs, social and political environment, and current or planned investment by other donors. Investments are likely to target protected areas, coastal ecosystems, biological corridors and other key landscapes that provide important ecosystem services.

CEPF will address priority conservation objectives and is thus expected to have a highly positive environmental impact. Resources will be directed to important biodiversity issues while ensuring no or minimum adverse environmental effects. Sub-projects should not adversely affect natural habitats and forests resources. CEPF will not fund any activity that involves the removal, alteration or disturbance of any physical cultural resources (defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, or other cultural significance). These may, however, be present in sub-project areas and the screening criteria and review process of this ESMF aims to ensure that they are identified and adverse effects are avoided.

Minor environmental impacts of CEPF-financed activities may occur from small-scale infrastructure construction (e.g. boundary markers, guard posts, checkpoints), land and resource use changes, and tourism activities. The review process for identifying and assessing safeguard impacts of sub-project activities and assessing impact mitigation measures, as described in this ESMF, aims to ensure that the World Bank's safeguard policies on environmental assessment ([OP 4.01](#)), pest management ([OP 4.09](#)), natural habitats ([OP 4.04](#)), physical cultural resources ([OP 4.11](#)) and forests ([OP 4.36](#)) are followed. Ensuring that these safeguards are followed will ensure that the Programme is also in compliance with the environmental and social policies of GCF, AFD, CI and other CEPF donors.

Review of Environmental Issues

The applicant for sub-projects is required to include in the sub-project Letter of Inquiry a brief description of any activities that may involve environmental impacts, any known environmental sensitivities, and any sites with known or potential archeological, paleontological, historical, religious or unique natural values.

Sub-projects with significant and irreversible impacts on the environment that are not easily mitigated are not eligible. In the event of sub-projects with potential minor and manageable environmental impacts, an environmental review should be undertaken (see Table 3.6.2.A for more guidance; see also the World Bank's Environmental Assessment Policy and Sourcebook for guidance on determining level of impacts). The review examines the sub-project's potential negative and positive environmental impacts and defines any measures needed to prevent, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts and improve environmental performance. This would in most cases be a simple review through reference to existing reports and studies (if available), and through discussions with local communities and other stakeholders, if needed. In some cases, a more detailed review may be needed.

The findings and results of environmental review are described in the sub-project full proposal. Applications that do not provide adequate environmental data, should not be considered for financing until they meet the requirements. Sub-project proposals with minor and manageable environmental impacts should include the following basic elements in the application:

- A description of the possible adverse effects that specific sub-project activities may occur (see table 3.6.1.B for some basic guidance on potential environmental impacts).
- A description of any planned measures to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts, and how and when they will be implemented.
- A system for monitoring the environmental effects of the project.
- A description of who will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the mitigation measures.
- A cost estimate of the mitigation measures (the costs for environmental management will be included in the of sub-project proposal).

The scope of any environmental review and mitigation measures will be determined by the CEPF Secretariat in consultation with the applicant through the sub-project screening and approval process. If needed, the CEPF Secretariat may request further information or a more detailed environmental review prior to approving a project. Guidance may be sought from AFD, if needed.

Mitigation Measures

The main environmental impacts for eligible sub-projects would be minor impacts from construction of infrastructure (e.g. checkpoints, guard posts, trails), potential increase in recreational use of protected areas, and change in natural resource management/use.

The small-scale construction of infrastructure may have minor, short-term direct impacts on vegetation and local species-mainly due to soil excavation, dust, and noise. Increased recreational use of project sites may produce a direct impact because of under-management of tourist sites and facilities, possible overuse of campsites or trails, increased waste, harvesting of live wood for campfires, purposeful disturbance of wildlife, accidental fires, disturbance of flora and fauna, trespassing into fragile areas, and non-maintenance of trails leading to slope erosion.

Since only sub-projects with minor impacts are eligible, these are easily mitigated through the application of sensible site selection criteria, good construction practices and diligent management practices in the operational phase. This may include proper siting of infrastructure to avoid and minimize impacts, construction contract procedures for dealing with “chance finds,” control of dust generation and prevention, waste management and technology for toilet facilities like leaching fields, organic composting, and septic tanks (see Table 3.6.2.A). Further guidance on Health and Safety issues is provided for in the [World Bank Group Environmental Health and Safety Guidelines](#).

There is a possibility that sub-project activities may result in damage to physical cultural property unless these are identified. Sub-project proposals with activities that may occur in areas with possible physical cultural resources will specify procedures for identifying physical cultural property and for avoiding impacts on these, including:

- Consultations with the appropriate authorities and local inhabitants to identify known or possible sites during sub-project planning.
- Siting of sub-project activities to avoid identified sites (including identifying such areas in protected and natural resource management planning and zonation).
- “Chance finds” procedures will include cessation of work until the significance of a “find” has been determined by the appropriate authorities and local inhabitants, and until fitting treatment of the site has been determined and carried out.
- Construction contract procedures will include the same procedures for dealing with “chance finds”.
- Buffer zones or other management arrangements to avoid damage to cultural resources such as “sacred” forests and graveyards. Local communities to which these areas belong should decide access procedures and should not be excluded from accessing these areas.

The ESMF stresses community participation since local knowledge is important in identifying, designing and planning the implementation of practical mitigation measures. It is especially important where the success depends on community support and action, both in implementing mitigation measures and in monitoring their success.

Table 3.6.2.A: Potential environmental impacts and standard mitigation measures

Sub-project activity	Potential impacts	Standard mitigation measures	Monitoring and indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of basic infrastructure (e.g. shelters, trails) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor, short-term potential impacts on already disturbed and small areas of vegetation – mainly due to soil excavation, dust and noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult local communities to determine appropriate siting of infrastructure to minimize impacts Ensure trails are ‘fit-for-purpose,’ restricting width to the needs to foot patrols or tourists. In areas where trail bikes are used, the means of controlling access will be instituted. Obtain any permits required by national and local regulations prior to construction Choose most appropriate timing for construction to avoid or minimize impacts Infrastructure will be designed in accordance with local traditions, local architecture, and good environmental practices Appropriate management/disposal of waste+ debris 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incidental take of species is recorded (indicator species identified and monitored) Communities’ free, prior and informed consent is recorded Debris does not litter the site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in natural resource use and management (e.g. restoration of gallery forest, re-engineering water flows in wetlands) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impacts would almost always be positive; however, in a few cases unintended impacts may accidentally occur, such as introduction of invasive species, and human/wildlife conflicts (e.g. resulting in crop loss) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with local communities to determine appropriate land and resource management regimes Use only native species for restoration Consider compensation and/or avoidance mechanisms to minimize crop loss and conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator species are monitored Communities free, prior and informed consent is recorded
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reintroduction of captive-bred threatened species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of disease into the wild 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake health checks prior to release System for avoiding and mitigating disease outbreaks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor introductions and disease outbreaks

Annex 6. Environmental and Social Risk Screening and Environmental and Social Management Framework – Ecosystem-based Adaptation in the Indian Ocean

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in recreational use of protected areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on habitat and wildlife through increased noise and disturbance, waste, accidental fires, harvesting of rare species or natural resources • Lack of maintenance of trails leading to erosion on slopes • Social impacts on local communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support training and TA to develop skills for effective tourism management • Promulgate rules and guidelines for visitors • Provide waste and toilet facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring number of tourists • Monitor habitat disturbance • Communities free, prior and informed consent is recorded
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire suppression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on fire-dependent ecosystems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform prescribed burns to nurture fire-dependent species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor fire-dependent indicator species response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAS removal (by mechanical or chemical means) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native species accidentally removed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training on IAS and native species differentiation • Isolate native species through demarcation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor native indicator species for ecosystem response

OM 3.6.3

Environmental and Social Management Framework **Section C: Pest Management Plan**

Any CEPF sub-project that proposes to use chemical pesticides must prepare a pest management plan as described in the over-arching CEPF Pest Management Plan:

- The pest management plan (PMP) will describe CEPF requirements to ensure the use of best practice in the control and removal of alien and invasive plants, insects, and animals.
- The objective of these guidelines is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potentially adverse effects of the application of pesticides, insecticides, and herbicides (herewith referred to in the unitary as “pesticides”) in efforts to restore natural habitats.
- This document describes the requirements and planning procedures for applicants/grantees in the preparation and implementation of alien and invasive species (AIS) control projects funded by CEPF, as well as the role of CEPF in ensuring compliance with these guidelines.

The spread of alien and invasive plants and animals is the second greatest cause of biodiversity loss after habitat destruction. In the context of CEPF, many of the KBAs and corridors targeted for investment suffer from, in particular, non-native plants which have opportunistically taken over natural landscapes, and from non-native animals that upset island ecosystems. Many Ecosystem Profiles, particularly those related to small islands, specifically include the control and removal of such alien and invasive species as an investment priority. The control of alien and invasive species in KBAs and corridors is not an exception, but a standard part of CEPF operations in some hotspots, and as such, applicable guidelines must be followed.

Situations where these guidelines apply include grants which:

- Pay for the direct purchase or expenses related to the manufacture, acquisition, transport, application, storage, or disposal of pesticides, including the costs of materials, equipment, and labor.
- Pay for the direct purchase or expenses related to the control or removal of animals by chemical means.

- Pay for the planning, management, or supervision of work which involves the general use of pesticides or animal control as described in the two points above.

Examples of the types of grants to which these guidelines apply include, but are not limited to:

- A grant that involves the employ of labor and application of herbicide to restore a degraded landscape and allow endemic vegetation and animals to return.
- A grant that involves the supervision of teams conducting AIS control by chemical means, where those teams are operating with funding from a host country government or other donor.
- A grant that involves the eradication by chemical means of non-native rats, cats, reptiles (e.g., Brown Tree Snake), birds (e.g., Common Myna), and invertebrates (e.g., Golden Apple Snail) from an island or isolated natural habitat.

These guidelines do **not** apply to the physical removal of alien and invasive plant and animals through physical means as part of the restoration of degraded habitat or the maintenance of KBAs and corridors.

A single set of guidelines cannot anticipate every scenario under which a grantee will propose to remove alien and invasive species. The conditions of the habitat, the type of species, the method of control, the capacity of the organization, the latest knowledge of environmental impacts, and even the definitions of “best practice” will change over time. Thus, these guidelines establish a process that grantees must follow, rather than a specific set of AIS control measures.

Components of the PMP

Any CEPF project that proposes to use a pesticide must prepare a pest management plan with six sections, outlined below. These projects should benefit from the accumulated knowledge on the use of pesticides in invasive eradication, including those that are available at:

- The [IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group](#), which provides dozens of resources, including the Global Invasive Species Information Network List of Invasive Alien Species Online Information Systems (www.gisn.org).
- For Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot, the [Pacific Invasives Initiative Resource Kit for Rodent and Cat Eradication](#), which contains multiple templates and guidelines on animal control in the region.
- For Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany Hotspot, in particular in South Africa, the [Expanded Public Works Programme Working for Water](#), managed by the Department of Water Affairs, including the [Position Paper on Biocontrol](#), the

[Programme Operating Standards](#), and the treatment tables for aquatic and terrestrial invasive, available at the same website.

- [The World Health Organization’s Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard](#), updated every two years.

The pest management plan consists of six sections comprising 34 questions:

A. Grant Summary

1. Grantee organization.
2. Grant title.
3. GEM number (*to be completed by CEPF*).
4. Grant amount (US dollars).
5. Proposed dates of grant.
6. Countries or territories where pesticides will be applied.
7. Full name, title, telephone numbers, and electronic mail address of Grantee personnel responsible for the pest management plan.
8. Summary of the project.
9. Date of preparation of the pest management plan.

B. Pest Management Approach:

This section should describe the applicant’s understanding of the problem, their experience with pest management issues, and their proposed actions during the project. Specifically, what do you intend to do and how will you do it? The information presented should include methods of application, e.g. by hand or via aerial spraying.

10. Current and anticipated pest problems relevant to the project.
11. Current and proposed pest management practices.
12. Relevant integrated pest management experience within the project area, country or region.
13. Assessment of proposed or current pest management approach and recommendations for adjustment where necessary.

C. Pesticide Selection and Use:

This section aims to get a comprehensive understanding of the pesticide that will be selected, why it was selected and what efforts were made to assess risk. Note that in this section the applicant will also be required to present information on the potential risk that the selected pesticide will have on non-target species.

14. Description of present, proposed and/or envisaged pesticide use and assessment of whether such use is in line with best management practices.

15. Indication of type and quantity of pesticides envisaged to be financed by the project (in volume and dollar value) and/or assessment of increase in pesticide use resulting from the project.
16. Chemical, trade, and common name of pesticide to be used.
17. Form in which pesticide will be used (e.g., pellet, spray).
18. Specific geographic description of where the pesticide will be applied: name of province, district, municipality, land owners, or map coordinates (if available); and the total area (hectares) to which the pesticide will be applied.
19. Assessment of environmental, occupational and public health risks associated with the transport, storage, handling and use of the proposed products under local circumstances, and the disposal of empty containers.
20. Description of plans and results for tracking of damage to and/or deaths of non-target species prior to pesticide application and subsequent to pesticide application.
21. Pre-requisites and/or measures required to reduce specific risks associated with envisaged pesticide use under the project (e.g., protective gear, training, upgrading of storage facilities, etc.).
22. Basis of selection of pesticides authorized for procurement under the project, taking into consideration WHO and World Bank standards, the above hazards and risks, and availability of newer and less hazardous products and techniques (e.g. bio-pesticides, traps).
23. Name and address of source of selected pesticides.
24. Name and address of vendor of selected pesticides.
25. Name and address of facility where pesticides will be stored.

D. Policy, Regulatory Framework, and Institutional Capacity:

This section aims to understand the institutional and legal framework under which the pesticide will be applied, with reference to the documentation and standards required under local and national law and international good practice. Where the particular pesticide is not regulated at the target site, the proponent must identify similar pesticides and the applicable regulation, international laws in neighboring countries that could apply, and international good practice. The proponent must also explain why this particular pesticide is necessary even in the absence of national laws.

26. Policies on plant/animal protection, integrated pest management, and humane treatment of animals.
27. Description and assessment of national capacity to develop and implement ecologically-based AIS control.
28. Description and assessment of the country's regulatory framework and institutional capacity for control of the distribution and use of pesticides.
29. Proposed project activities to train personnel and strengthen capacity (list # of people and what they are being trained in).
30. Confirmation that the appropriate authorities were approached (who and when) and that the appropriate licenses and permissions were obtained by the project.

E. Consultation:

This section aims to outline the range of informed consultations that the grantee has had both with experts to optimize the potential for success, and with stakeholders, particularly local communities, who are potentially affected (by proximity, by the use of certain areas for free-ranging livestock or non-timber forest product collection, etc.) by the use of pesticides.

- 31. Plans for, dates, and results of expert consultations, if necessary.
- 32. Plans for, dates, and results of consultations with local communities.

F. Monitoring and Evaluation:

This section aims to outline what steps the proponent will take to monitor and evaluate the purchase, storage, application and effects of the pesticide in the target area.

- 33. Description of activities related to pest management that require monitoring during implementation.
- 34. Monitoring and supervision plan, implementation responsibilities, required expertise and cost coverage.

Implementation Strategy

Proposal Stage

The following steps will take place during the proposal preparation phase:

- The Letter of Inquiry and Grant Writer proposal should indicate that the Pest Management Safeguard has been triggered.
- The proponent should prepare a Pest Management Plan, to be submitted to CEPF at the same time as their full proposal.
- The proposal should include, in its section entitled Programme Rationale, relevant information justifying the inclusion of pest management activities in the project.
- The proposal should include, in its section entitled Programme Approach, a summary of relevant information from the pest management plan.
- The Logical Framework should include, as a clear and separate Component, implementation of a pest management plan, with associated Products / Deliverables.
- If the proponent requires funding for any of the following, the Budget should clearly show the costs of purchase of AIS control equipment and chemicals, labor for their application, and the cost of expert consultation to ensure proper selection of method, among others.

Implementation Stage

The Grantee shall implement a Pest Management Plan adhering to the sections described above, Components of the PMP. During implementation:

- The Grantee shall follow the prescriptions of its Pest Management Plan and make regular reports to the Regional Implementation Team (RIT, the CEPF Secretariat's proxy in a hotspot). These reports will constitute Products/Deliverables in the sub-project's Logical Framework.
- CEPF requires that concerns raised through consultations with communities and management authorities be documented and addressed in the Pest Management Plan. Where applicable, letters of endorsement from appropriate management authorities are required.
- The Grantee will allow regular reviews by the RIT, CEPF Secretariat, or their outside experts to review implementation of the Pest Management Plan and adherence with World Bank standards, international best practice, and local law.

Roles and Responsibilities

During preparation

Proponents are responsible for:

- Writing plans, following plans and updating them when necessary, reporting against plans and informing potentially affected communities.

The CEPF Secretariat is responsible for:

- Training Regional Implementation Teams in the use and application of these guidelines.
- Screening projects to determine if they trigger applicable safeguards and require a pest management plan prior to formal approval.
- Informing proponents of these guidelines.
- Assessing the pest management plans, including the adequacy of the assessment of sub-project impacts and the proposed measures to address issues pertaining to invasive species removal. If environmental or social impacts outweigh the potential benefits, CEPF cannot support the project.
- Providing clearance on every PMP that proposes to use pesticides. AFD guidance will also be sought in cases proposing use of class 1 or class 2 pesticides.

During implementation

Proponents are responsible for:

- Reporting to affected communities, local authorities, and CEPF on project progress and on any unexpected and unintended events affecting local communities.

- The costs of clean-up or mitigation measures due to unintended negative impacts of pesticide use.

The CEPF Secretariat is responsible for:

- Review of project-specific PMPs during implementation. If CEPF finds that a proponent is not following a pest management plan or local requirements, then CEPF's responsibility is to withhold payment, or suspend or cancel the grant as appropriate.

Grievance mechanism

As a first stage, grievances should be made to the applicant or grantee, who should respond to grievances in writing within 15 working days of receipt. Claims should be filed, included in project monitoring, and a copy of the grievance should be provided to the CEPF Secretariat. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response, the grievance may be submitted to the CEPF Executive Director at cepfexecutive@conservation.org or by mail to: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Conservation International, Attn: Executive Director, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA. CEPF will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in official project files.

Disclosure

The Pest Management Plan and/or the documents required in countries where adequate policies exist are public documents. The Grantee should share them with local authorities and with potentially affected communities. Once the final documents have been approved, the Grantee will be required to disclose them, again, locally, and CEPF will place them on its website, www.cepf.net.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The CEPF Secretariat, using information from each grantee and appropriate RIT, will provide an update on pest management activities in its quarterly reporting.

Budget

The budget for M&E is included in the overall CEPF Secretariat budget for overall supervision. Each RIT will similarly supervise pest management as part of its regular supervision budgets. The grantee must include the full costs associated with the preparation, implementation and monitoring of their PMP in their application (either as a cost to be charged to CEPF or as co-financing).

OM 3.6.4

Environmental and Social Management Framework **Section D: Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework**

This Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been prepared to ensure that the World Bank’s Indigenous Peoples policy is applied to CEPF-supported projects. The objectives of the policy are to avoid adverse impacts on Indigenous Peoples and to provide them with culturally appropriate benefits. A parallel Process Framework describes requirements to address social impacts from restrictions of access to natural resources as per the Involuntary Resettlement Policy ([OP 4.12](#)).

The Indigenous Peoples policy recognizes the distinct circumstances that expose Indigenous Peoples to different types of risks and impacts from development projects. As social groups with identities that are often distinct from dominant groups in their national societies, Indigenous Peoples are frequently among the most marginalized and vulnerable segments of the population.¹¹ As a result, their economic, social, and legal status often limit their capacity to defend their rights to lands, territories, and other productive resources, and restricts their ability to participate in and benefit from development. At the same time, the policy, together with the Involuntary Resettlement policy, recognizes that Indigenous Peoples play a vital role in sustainable development and emphasizes that the need for conservation should be combined with the need to benefit Indigenous Peoples in order to ensure long-term sustainable management of critical ecosystems.

The IPPF describes the policy requirements and planning procedures that applicants for CEPF grants and subsequently grantees will follow during the preparation and implementation of CEPF projects. It also describes the role of CEPF.

CEPF and Indigenous Peoples

Many of the biodiversity hotspots where CEPF will invest overlap with lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by Indigenous Peoples. The convergence of critical areas for conservation with millions of people who are highly dependent on healthy ecosystems for their survival is also most evident in the hotspots.

¹¹ [OP 4.10](#) uses the term Indigenous Peoples to refer to a distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees: (i) self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others; (ii) collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories; (iii) customary cultural, social, economic, social or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and (iv) an indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region. Other terms used in different countries to refer to these groups include “indigenous ethnic minorities,” “aboriginals,” “hill tribes,” “minority nationalities,” “scheduled tribes,” and “tribal groups” ([OP 4.10](#), para 4).

In this way CEPF projects can provide valuable long-term opportunities for sustainable development for Indigenous Peoples and other local communities. However, a number of particular risks are relevant for the type of projects supported by CEPF:

- Customary and Indigenous Peoples' rights. Particular rights of Indigenous Peoples are recognized in international agreements, and for World Bank-supported projects by the Bank's own policy. Such rights may also be recognized in national legislation. CEPF projects would always need to identify and recognize these rights to ensure that activities are not adversely affecting such rights. This is particularly the case for projects that support the development of management plans and other forms of land and natural resource use planning. Projects that support policy development may also affect Indigenous Peoples' rights.
- Loss of culture and social cohesion. Given Indigenous Peoples' distinct cultures and identities and their frequent marginalization from the surrounding society, interventions may run the risk of imposing changes to or disruption of their culture and social organization, whether inadvertently or not. While indigenous communities may welcome and seek change, they can be vulnerable when such change is imposed from external forces and when such change is rushed. Moreover, since many indigenous communities' culture and social organization are intertwined with their land and natural resource use practices, changes to these practices may result in unintended and unexpected changes in culture and social organization which may lead to social disruption and conflicts within and between communities and other stakeholders. This is relevant for all types of projects, but particularly for projects that aim to change livelihood and natural resource use practices and projects that create new institutional structures at the local level. Similarly, ecotourism activities may bring adverse impacts to indigenous communities, particular communities with little previous contact with people from the outside (this may be the case even for projects that aim at valuing local culture).
- Dependency on external support. Interventions supporting alternative livelihoods and new institutional structures may lead to indigenous communities' dependency on continued support. Indigenous Peoples, for instance, may experience difficulties engaging with the market economy through alternative livelihood activities that they may be unable to sustain, at least on an equitable basis, while foregoing traditional practices. They may also become dependent on new livelihoods that are not sustainable environmentally as well as socially, perhaps because they were developed without due consideration of their social and cultural context. New institutional structures may displace existing structures with both positive and negative impacts typically depending on the level of participation in and control over the process.
- Inequitable participation. The costs (e.g. in time and resources) of participating in project activities such as protected area management activities, monitoring and

enforcement, even in cases of co-management, may outweigh the benefits to local communities. Participation design may not include appropriate capacity building (when needed) or take into consideration local decision-making structures and processes with the risk of leading to alienation of local communities or even conflicts with and/or between local communities. Participation design may not include appropriate representation of Indigenous Peoples in decision-making bodies.

- Poorly planned changes in natural resource use. Traditional resource use practices of Indigenous Peoples are often marked by suspicion and stereotypes of both positive and negative character. One particular controversial aspect of many indigenous communities' land use practices is shifting cultivation (it takes many forms and is also referred to as swidden farming, rotational agriculture and slash and burn). Many consider this practice environmentally unsustainable, while others consider it to be sustainable and the best land use form under certain geographic, environmental, and social circumstances. Shifting cultivation is in many places under transition, often through government controlled processes and in many places in relation to biodiversity conservation. This commonly translates into reduction of areas under shifting cultivation if not outright restrictions, and sometimes with adverse social (e.g. decreased food security) as well as environmental consequences (e.g. over-exploitation of remaining land use areas). CEPF projects should address changes in natural resource use (and restrictions to this, if contemplated) based on a thorough understanding of both biological and social evidence, and consultation with local communities. Preferences in land use, including shifting cultivation, should be taken into account and loss of fallow areas should be included when assessing social impacts.

Projects affecting Indigenous Peoples, whether adversely or positively, therefore, need to be prepared with care and with the participation of affected communities. The requirements include social analysis to improve the understanding of the local context and affected communities; a process of free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities in order to fully identify their views and to obtain their broad community support to the project; and development of project-specific measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance culturally appropriate benefits. These requirements are described below and should be read together with the Process Framework detailed in the next section. The full World Bank policies on Indigenous Peoples and Involuntary Resettlement are also available on the World Bank Web site at <http://go.worldbank.org/WTa1ODE7To>.

Policy Requirements

The level of detail necessary to meet the requirements is proportional to the complexity of the proposed sub-project and commensurate with the nature and scale of the proposed sub-project's potential effects on the Indigenous Peoples, whether adverse or positive. This needs to be determined based on an assessment of project activities, circumstances of local communities, and project impacts. Minimum requirements for projects working in areas with Indigenous Peoples are identification of Indigenous Peoples and assessment of project impacts, consultations with affected communities, and development of measures to avoid adverse impacts and provide culturally appropriate benefits. Further detail may also be required by CEPF as part of the proposal review process.

- Screening for Indigenous Peoples. Many, if not most, CEPF grant applicants will know if Indigenous Peoples are present in project areas and can proceed to the social assessment and consultations (see next section). However, if this is not the case CEPF applicants are required to screen for the presence of Indigenous Peoples early on in project preparation. This could be done when preparing the Letter of Inquiry. The characteristics of Indigenous Peoples mentioned in [OP 4.10](#) will be used as included in the footnote on the first page of this section. If it is uncertain whether local communities can be considered as Indigenous Peoples, applicants should consult with the communities, local NGOs, knowledgeable experts, and government representatives as appropriate. In situations of disagreements or controversy they may seek guidance from CEPF, who may seek guidance from the World Bank and AFD as needed.
- Social assessment. Once it has been determined that Indigenous Peoples are present in the project area, the applicant assesses the particular circumstances of affected indigenous communities and assesses the project's positive and adverse impacts on them. Again, the level of detail of the assessment depends on project activities and their impacts on local communities. If the project is small and has no or few adverse impacts, this assessment is done as part of early project preparation by the applicant, mainly based on secondary sources and the applicants own experience working in the area. In larger and more complex projects, the assessment may be a separate exercise done by the applicant or contracted experts as appropriate and may include primary research. In all cases the assessment will be based on consultations with the affected communities.

The main purpose of the social assessment is to evaluate the project's potential positive and adverse impacts on the affected Indigenous Peoples. It is also used to inform project preparation to ensure that project activities are culturally appropriate, will enhance benefits to target groups, and is likely to succeed in the given socioeconomic and cultural context. In this way, the assessment informs the

preparation of the design of the project as well as any particular measures and instruments needed to address issues and concerns related to Indigenous Peoples affected by the project.

The findings of the social assessment are described in a separate report and reflected in the project proposal application. For small scale projects with no direct impacts on indigenous communities, the report is short and includes a brief overview of the indigenous communities affected by the project, project activities as they relate to the local communities, how project implementation will address the particular circumstances of Indigenous Peoples, and how they will participate and be consulted during implementation. For more complex projects a more elaborate report is required and should include the following elements, as needed:

- A description, on a scale appropriate to the project, of the legal and institutional framework applicable to Indigenous Peoples.
- Baseline information on the demographic, social, cultural and political characteristics of the affected indigenous communities, and the land and territories which they traditionally owned, or customarily used or occupied and the natural resources in which they depend.
- Description of key project stakeholders and the elaboration of a culturally appropriate process for consultation and participation during implementation.
- Assessment, based on free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities, of the potential adverse and positive effects of the project. Critical to the determination of potential adverse impacts is an analysis of the relative vulnerability of, and risks to, the affected indigenous communities given their distinct circumstances, close ties to land, and dependence on natural resources, as well as their lack of opportunities relative to other social groups in the communities, regions, or national societies they live in.
- Identification and evaluation, based on free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities, of measures to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits under the project and measures necessary to avoid adverse effects, or if such measures are not feasible, identification of measures to minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects.

- Free, prior and informed consultation. The Applicant undertakes a process of free, prior and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities during project preparation to inform them about the project, to fully identify their views, to obtain their broad community support to the project, and to develop project design and safeguard instruments. In most cases, this process is

best done as part of the social assessment although consultations are likely to continue after its completion.

The extent of consultations depends on the project activities, their impacts on local communities and the circumstances of affected Indigenous Peoples. At a minimum (for projects with no impacts or direct interventions with the indigenous communities), local communities are informed about the project, asked for their views on the project, and assured that they will not be affected during project implementation. For projects affecting indigenous communities, whether positively or adversely, a more elaborate consultation process is required. This may include, as appropriate:

- Inform affected indigenous communities about project objectives and activities.
- Discuss and assess possible adverse impacts and ways to avoid or mitigate them.
- Discuss and assess potential project benefits and how these can be enhanced
- Discuss and assess land and natural resource use and how management of these resources may be enhanced.
- Identify customary rights to land and natural resource use and possible ways of enhancing these.
- Identify and discuss (potential) conflicts with other communities and how these might be avoided.
- Discuss and assess food security and how it might be enhanced through project interventions.
- Elicit and incorporate indigenous knowledge into project design.
- Facilitate and ascertain the affected communities' broad support to the project.
- Develop a strategy for indigenous participation and consultation during project implementation, including monitoring and evaluation.

All project information provided to indigenous peoples should be in a form appropriate to local needs. Local languages must always be used and efforts should be made to include all community members, including women and members of different generations and social groups (e.g. clans and socioeconomic background).

The applicant is responsible for the consultation process. If the indigenous communities are organized in community associations or umbrella organizations, these should always be consulted. In some cases, it may be appropriate or even necessary to include or use in the process independent entities that have the

affected communities' trust. The experience of (other) locally active NGOs and Indigenous Peoples experts may also be useful.

When seeking affected indigenous communities' support to project activities, two aspects should be considered: Who and what is the "community," and how is "broad support" obtained. Communities are complex social institutions and may be made up of several fractions; it may be difficult finding persons who are seen as representatives of the community. Interest in the project may vary among different groups (and individuals) in the community, and they may be affected differently. It is important to keep this in mind during the consultation process, and in some cases, it may be more appropriate to consider the needs and priorities of sub-communities rather than those of a whole village.¹²

When seeking "broad community support" for the project, it should be ensured that all relevant social groups of the community have been adequately consulted. When this is the case and the "broad" majority is overall positive about the project, it would be appropriate to conclude that broad community support has been achieved. Consensus building approaches are often the norm, but "broad community support" does not mean that everyone has to agree to a given project. The agreements or special design features providing the basis for broad community support should be described in the Indigenous Peoples Plan; any disagreements should also be documented.

- Indigenous Peoples Plan. Based on the consultation and social assessment processes, project design is refined and particular measures and instruments are prepared to address issues pertaining to Indigenous Peoples. This may be done in combination with instruments addressing involuntary restrictions on access to natural resources (a Process Framework) as described in the separate CEPF Process Framework section. The documents are prepared with the participation of affected indigenous communities during the consultation process.

The instrument to address the concerns and needs of Indigenous Peoples is always an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP). CEPF will review and approves sub-project specific IPPs and other measures addressing Indigenous Peoples issues. In cases where Indigenous Peoples are the sole or the overwhelming majority of direct project beneficiaries, the elements of an IPP should be included in the overall

¹² There may also be non-indigenous neighborhoods or communities affected by the project. In such cases, all vulnerable people may be included in the consultation process and development of project design based on the requirements of [OP 4.10](#) and the interests of the various social groups affected. It is important, though, to ensure that any customary rights or other entitlements or claims of particular social groups such as Indigenous Peoples are identified.

project design, and a separate IPP is not required. In this case the project application provides more details as to how Indigenous Peoples' issues are addressed during implementation.

The contents of the IPP depend on the project activities and impacts on Indigenous Peoples. A suggested outline is provided Table 3.6.4.A, but few CEPF projects are likely to need such an elaborate plan. It may be appropriate to include a process of further social analysis and consultations during project implementation to determine specific activities (this is particularly so given the limited funds for preparing CEPF projects). At minimum the IPP should include a description of the Indigenous Peoples affected by the project; summary of the proposed project; detailed description of the participation and consultation process during implementation; description of how the project will ensure culturally appropriate benefits and avoid or mitigate adverse impacts; a budget (this could be an explanation of how the overall budget incorporates costs related to Indigenous Peoples); mechanism for complaints and conflict resolution; and the monitoring and evaluation system that includes monitoring of particular issues and measures concerning indigenous communities.

The following elements and principles may be included in the IPP, as appropriate:

- Specific measures for implementation, along with clear timetables of action, and financing sources. These should be incorporated into the general project design as appropriate. Emphasis should be on enhancing participation and culturally appropriate benefits. Adverse impacts should only be contemplated when absolutely necessary.
- Formal agreements reached during the free, prior, and informed consultation during project preparation.
- Clear output and outcome indicators developed with affected Indigenous Peoples.
- Programme design should draw upon the strengths of Indigenous Peoples Organizations and the affected communities and take into account their languages, cultural and livelihood practices, social organization and religious beliefs. It should avoid introducing changes that are considered undesirable or unacceptable to the Indigenous Peoples themselves.
- Efforts should be made wherever possible and appropriate to make use of, and incorporate, Indigenous knowledge and local resource management arrangements into project design.
- Special measures for the recognition and support of customary rights to land and natural resources may be necessary.

- Special measures concerning women and marginalized generational groups may be necessary to ensure inclusive development activities.
- If the grantee does not possess the necessary technical capacities, or if their relationship with Indigenous Peoples is weak, the involvement of experienced local community organizations and NGOs may be appropriate; they should be acceptable to all parties involved.
- Capacity building of other implementing agencies should be considered.
- Capacity building activities for the indigenous communities to enhance their participation in project activities may be useful or necessary; this may also include general literacy courses.
- Grievance mechanism taking into account local dispute resolution practices.
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises adapted to the local context, indicators, and capacity.

Disclosure

Before finalizing an IPP (or IPPF) a draft should be disclosed together with the social assessment report (or its key findings) in a culturally appropriate manner to the Indigenous Peoples affected by the project. Language is critical and the IPP should be disseminated in the local language or in other forms easily understandable to affected communities – oral communication methods are often needed to communicate the proposed plans to affected communities.

After CEPF has reviewed and approved the IPP as part of the overall proposed project for funding, the grantee shares the final IPP (or IPPF) again with affected communities. The final IPP (or IPPF) is also disclosed at the CEPF Web site.

Roles and Responsibilities

Applicants, and subsequently grantees, are responsible for following the requirements of this Framework. They will ensure that Indigenous Peoples are consulted and benefit in culturally appropriate ways. They will avoid adverse impacts on indigenous communities, or where this is not possible develop with the participation of affected communities, measures to mitigate and compensate for such impacts. Finally, they are responsible for reporting to both affected indigenous communities and CEPF on project progress and any unexpected and unintended events affecting Indigenous Peoples.

CEPF is responsible for the implementation of this Framework, and will ensure that the participation of Indigenous Peoples in project activities in culturally appropriate ways is encouraged. CEPF responsibilities include:

- Inform applicants and other stakeholders, including local communities, of this Framework and policy requirements;

- Assist applicants, and subsequently grantees, in the implementation of the Framework and policy requirements;
- Screen for projects affecting Indigenous Peoples;
- Review and approve project proposals, ensuring that they adequately apply the GCF's, AFD's and the World Bank's Indigenous Peoples Policy;
- Assess the adequacy of the assessment of project impacts and the proposed measures to address issues pertaining to affected indigenous communities. When doing so project activities, impacts and social risks, circumstances of the affected indigenous communities, and the capacity of the applicant to implement the measures should be assessed. If the risks or complexity of particular issues concerning affected communities outweigh the project benefits, the project should not be approved as proposed;
- Assess the adequacy of the consultation process and the affected indigenous communities' broad support to the project—and not provide funding until such broad support has been ascertained; and
- Monitor project implementation, and include constraints and lessons learned concerning Indigenous Peoples and the application of this IPPF in its progress and monitoring reports; it should be assured that affected indigenous communities are included in monitoring and evaluation exercises.

Grievance Mechanism

Indigenous Peoples and other local communities and stakeholders may raise a grievance at all times to applicants, grantees, and CEPF about any issues covered in this Framework and the application of the Framework. Affected communities should be informed about this possibility and contact information of the respective organizations at relevant levels should be made available. These arrangements should be described in the project-specific frameworks and action plans along with the more project-specific grievance and conflict resolution mechanism.

As a first stage, grievances should be made to the applicant or grantee, who should respond to grievances in writing within 15 working days of receipt. Claims should be filed, included in project monitoring, and a copy of the grievance should be provided to the CEPF Secretariat. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response, the grievance may be submitted to the CEPF Executive Director at cepfexecutive@conservation.org or by mail to: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Conservation International, Attn: Executive Director, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA. CEPF will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring.

Table 3.6.4.A: Standard Outline for an Indigenous Peoples Plan¹³

The Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) is prepared in a flexible and pragmatic manner, and its level of detail varies depending on the specific project and the nature of effects to be addressed.

The IPP includes the following elements:

- a) A summary of the legal and institutional framework applicable to Indigenous Peoples in the area and a brief description of the demographic, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities, the land and territories that they have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied, and the natural resources on which they depend.
- b) A summary of the social assessment.
- c) A summary of results of the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities that was carried out during project preparation and that led to broad community support for the project.
- d) A framework for ensuring free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities during project implementation.
- e) An action plan of measures to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, including, if necessary, measures to enhance the capacity of the project implementing agencies.
- f) When potential adverse effects on Indigenous Peoples are identified, an appropriate action plan of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for these adverse effects.
- g) The cost estimates and financing plan for the IPP.
- h) Accessible procedures appropriate to the project to address grievances by the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities arising from project implementation. When designing the grievance procedures, the Applicant takes into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms among the Indigenous Peoples.
- i) Mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the implementation of the IPP. The monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should include arrangements for the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities.

¹³ Based on [OP 4.10](#), [Annex B](#)

OM 3.6.5

Environmental and Social Management Framework

Section E: Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions

Process Framework for Involuntary Restrictions

This Process Framework describes CEPF requirements to address social impacts from restrictions of access to natural resources as per the World Bank's Involuntary Resettlement Policy ([OP 4.12](#)). A parallel Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework describes CEPF requirements related to Indigenous Peoples consistent with the World Bank's Policy on Indigenous Peoples ([OP 4.10](#))¹⁴. The Process Framework also addresses the needs of GCF's policy on involuntary resettlement.

The objectives of this Framework are to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potentially adverse effects of restrictions of access to natural resources, and ensure that affected communities are consulted with and participate in meaningful ways in project activities affecting them.

The Framework describes the requirements and planning procedures for grant applicants and subsequently grantees in the preparation and implementation of related projects, as well as the role of CEPF in ensuring compliance with this Framework.

CEPF and Access Restrictions

CEPF projects triggering the World Bank's policy on Involuntary Resettlement include projects that introduce involuntary restrictions of access to legally designated parks and protected areas or support efforts to improve enforcement of existing restrictions. This typically includes projects that support the development and implementation of management plans for protected areas and may also involve resources such as wildlife, non-timber forest products, and production areas.

In all such cases, it is necessary to follow the planning process described in this Framework, including the development of a Process Framework during project preparation and a Plan of Action during implementation. In any case, adverse social impacts on local communities should be avoided or appropriately mitigated.

The Framework does *not* apply to projects that provide incentives to change livelihood and natural resource use practices on a voluntary basis.

¹⁴ Additional information can be found in the sourcebook for each policy at www.worldbank.org.

Policy Requirements

Projects affecting local communities in terms of their access to local resources need to be prepared with care and with the participation of affected communities. The requirements of the World Bank's policy include:

- The development of a project-specific Process Framework during project preparation that describes the project and implementation process, including: (a) how specific components of the project were prepared and will be implemented; (b) how the criteria for eligibility of affected persons will be determined; (c) how measures to assist the affected persons in their efforts to improve or restore, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels, their livelihoods while maintaining the sustainability of the park or protected area will be identified; and (d) how potential conflicts involving affected persons will be resolved. It also provides a description of the arrangements for implementing and monitoring the process.
- The development of a Plan of Action during project implementation that describes the agreed restrictions, management schemes, measures to assist the displaced persons and the arrangements for their implementation. This could be in the form of a natural resources or protected areas management plan.

Preparation of a Process Framework

Participation of affected communities is the key element of the Process Framework. Affected communities have the right to participate in deciding the nature and scope of restrictions and the mitigation measures.

Affected communities should also participate in the drafting of the Process Framework. Typically, the Applicant will prepare a draft Framework that will then be shared and discussed with local communities and other relevant stakeholders. Based on the consultations, a final Framework will be prepared. CEPF may provide guidance on development of the Framework and will review and approve the final Framework prior to approving the final project proposal application.

The level of details of the Framework may vary depending on project activities, characteristics of restrictions and their impacts, and the number of persons affected. In some cases, the Applicant may prepare a simple Framework with input from local communities, leaving more detailed analysis for implementation. In more complex or larger projects, the preparation of the Framework may be supported by social analysis or surveys during preparation to assess the local context, particularly the circumstances of local communities and their land and natural resource use and management systems.

Content of the Process Framework

The Process Framework will describe the project and how restrictions of access to natural resources and measures to assist affected communities will be determined with the participation of affected communities. The Process Framework should include the following elements:

- Programme background. The Framework will briefly describe the project and local context, how the project was prepared, including the consultations with local communities and other stakeholders, and the findings of any social analysis or surveys that informed design. It will describe project activities and potential impacts from these.
- Participatory implementation. This section will detail the participatory planning process for determining restrictions, management arrangements, and measures to address impacts on local communities. The roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders and the methods of participation and decision-making should be described; decision-making may include the establishment of representative local structures, the use of open meetings, and involvement of existing local institutions. Methods of consultation and participation should be in a form appropriate to local needs.

Decisions should be based on well-founded understandings of the biological and socioeconomic contexts. It is thus common to include some form of participatory social assessment to inform the decision-making process. Such an assessment could develop a more in-depth understanding of: (a) the cultural, social, economic, and geographic setting of the communities in the project areas; (b) the types and extent of community use of natural resources, and the existing rules and institutions for the use and management of natural resources; (c) identification of village territories and customary use rights; (d) local and indigenous knowledge of biodiversity and natural resource use; (e) the threats to and impacts on the biodiversity from various activities in the area, including those of local communities; (f) the potential livelihood impacts of new or more strictly enforced restrictions on use of resources in the area; (g) communities' suggestions and/or views on possible mitigation measures; (h) potential conflicts over the use of natural resources, and methods for solving such conflicts; and (i) strategies for local participation and consultation during project implementation, including monitoring and evaluation.

Similarly, biological and ecological assessments are commonly undertaken to develop a well-founded understanding of existing biodiversity and natural resources and threats to these. Threats analysis is a useful tool to ascertain that restrictions will be informed by real threats rather than assumptions about the

impacts from local communities' natural resource use practices, which sometimes can be viewed in stereotypical ways.

It is important to also pay particular attention to land tenure issues, including traditional land rights and obligations and use of natural resources by different local communities. For instance, areas used to collect non-timber forest products and for shifting cultivation, including fallow areas, under traditional farming systems should not be exposed to restrictions unless this is necessary for the conservation of important biodiversity and appropriate agreements with local communities can be made.

- Criteria for eligibility of affected persons. The Framework describes how the local communities will participate in establishing criteria for eligibility for assistance to mitigate adverse impacts or otherwise improve livelihoods. In cases with significant consultations and social analysis during preparation, these criteria may be included in the Framework. However, in most cases they will be developed, or at least refined, during implementation. This would typically be done as part of a participatory social assessment process described above.

The eligibility criteria would determine which groups and persons are *eligible for assistance* and mitigation measures, not groups affected by the project. That is, the criteria may exclude certain persons or groups from assistance because their activities are clearly illegal, unsustainable, and destructive (e.g. wildlife poachers, dynamite fishers). The criteria may also distinguish between persons utilizing resources opportunistically and persons using resources for their livelihoods, and between groups with customary rights and non-residents or immigrants.

The Framework should identify vulnerable groups and describe what special procedures and measures will be taken to ensure that these groups will be able to participate in, and benefit from, project activities. Vulnerable groups are groups that may be at risk of being marginalized from relevant project activities and decision-making processes, such as groups highly dependent on natural resources, forest dwellers, Indigenous Peoples,¹⁵ groups or households without security of tenure, mentally and physically handicapped people or people in poor physical health, and the very poor.

- Measures to assist the affected persons. The Framework should describe how groups or communities will be involved in determining measures that will assist

¹⁵ If Indigenous Peoples are affected, the applicant will also prepare an Indigenous Peoples Plan (or similar instrument) as described in the separate CEPF Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework.

affected persons in managing and coping with impacts from agreed restrictions. The common objective is to improve or restore, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels, their livelihoods while maintaining the sustainability of the park or protected area. However, in some circumstances affected communities may agree to restrictions without identifying one-for-one mitigation measures as they may see the long-term benefits of improved natural resource management. They may also forego practices in place of obtaining more secure land tenure and resource use rights. Possible measures to offset losses may include:

- Special measures for the recognition and support of customary rights to land and natural resources.
- Transparent, equitable, and fair ways of more sustainable sharing of the resources.
- Access to alternative resources or functional substitutes.
- Alternative livelihood activities.
- Health and education benefits.
- Obtaining employment, for example as park rangers or eco-tourist guides.
- Technical assistance to improve land and natural resource use.

These measures should be in place before restrictions are enforced, although they may be implemented as restrictions are being enforced. The Plan of Action should be approved by CEPF before implementation.

- Conflict resolution and complaint mechanism. The Framework should describe how conflicts involving affected persons will be resolved, and the processes for addressing grievances raised by affected communities, households or individual regarding the agreed restrictions, criteria for eligibility, mitigation measures and the implementation of these elements of the Process Framework.

The roles and responsibilities concerning conflict resolution and grievances of different stakeholders, including the Grantee, affected communities and relevant government agencies, will be described. The roles of mediation entities or institutions will be described. The procedures should take into account local dispute resolution practices.

- Implementation Arrangements. The Framework should describe the implementation arrangements. The roles and responsibilities concerning project implementation of different stakeholders, including the grantee, affected communities, and relevant government agencies, will be described. This includes agencies involved in the implementation of mitigation measures, delivery of

services and land tenure, as appropriate and to the extent that these are known at the time of project preparation.

Monitoring and evaluation arrangements will also be described in the Framework, with more specific details for the Plan of Action designed during implementation. The Framework should include a budget for its implementation.

Plan of Action

During implementation, a Plan of Action is developed together with affected communities to describe the agreed restrictions, management schemes, measures to assist the displaced persons and the arrangements for their implementation. The action plan can take many forms. It can simply describe the restrictions agreed to, persons affected, measures to mitigate impacts from these restrictions, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements. It may also take the form of a broader natural resources or protected areas management plan.

The following elements and principles may be included in the plan, as appropriate:

- Programme background and how the plan was prepared, including consultations with local communities and other stakeholders.
- The socio-economic circumstances of local communities.
- The nature and scope of restrictions, their timing as well as administrative and legal procedures to protect affected communities' interests if agreements are superseded or rendered ineffective.
- The anticipated social and economic impacts of the restrictions.
- The communities or persons eligible for assistance.
- Specific measures to assist these people, along with clear timetables of action, and financing sources.
- Protected area boundaries and use zones.
- Implementation arrangements, roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders, including government and non-government entities providing services or assistance to affected communities.
- Arrangements for monitoring and enforcement of restrictions and natural resource management agreements.
- Clear output and outcome indicators developed in participation with affected communities.
- Special measures concerning women and vulnerable groups.
- Capacity building of the grantee or other implementing agencies.
- Capacity building activities for the affected communities to enhance their participation in project activities.
- Grievance mechanism and conflict resolution taking into account local dispute resolution practices and norms.

- Participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises adapted to the local context, indicators and capacity. Monitoring will include the extent and significance of adverse impacts as well as the outcome of mitigation measures.

Disclosure

A draft Process Framework is shared with (potential) affected communities to inform them about the project and get their input to project design and the Framework. Once the project, with the Process Framework, has been approved, the final Framework is again disclosed locally as well as at the CEPF Web site, <http://www.cepf.net/>.

The Plan of Action is prepared with the participation of affected communities. A draft should be disclosed together with the findings of any social analysis that may inform the plan in a culturally appropriate manner to the persons affected by the project. Language is critical and the Framework should be disseminated in the local language or in other forms easily understandable to affected communities – oral communication methods may be needed to communicate the proposed plans to affected communities.

After CEPF has reviewed and approved the Plan of Action, the Grantee discloses the final plan to affected communities and other stakeholders. The final Plan of Action is also disclosed at the CEPF Web site.

Roles and Responsibilities

Applicants, and subsequently Grantees, with projects that restrict access to natural resources are responsible for complying with this Framework. Such applicant will prepare a Process Framework during preparation with the participation of affected communities. If the project is approved, during implementation the Grantee will prepare a Plan of Action with the informed and meaningful participation of affected communities. Applicants and Grantees will ensure that local communities are consulted and participate in culturally appropriate ways during preparation and implementation. They will avoid adverse impacts on affected communities or, where this is not possible, develop with the informed participation of affected communities measures to mitigate such impacts. Finally, they are responsible for reporting to both affected communities and CEPF on project progress and any unexpected and unintended events affecting local communities.

CEPF is responsible for the implementation of this overall Framework. CEPF responsibilities include:

- Inform applicants and other stakeholders, including local communities and organizations, of the Process Framework and policy requirements.
- Assist applicants, and subsequently grantees, in the implementation of the Process Framework and policy requirements.

- Screen for projects which may affect local communities through restrictions of access to natural resources.
- Assess the adequacy of the assessment of project impacts and the proposed measures to address issues pertaining to restrictions of access to natural resources. When doing so, project activities, impacts and social risks, circumstances of the affected communities, and the capacity of the applicant to implement the measures will be assessed. If the risks or complexity of issues concerning affected communities outweigh the project benefits, the project should not be approved as proposed.
- Assess the adequacy of the consultation process during preparation and implementation.
- Review and approve project-specific action plans prepared during implementation.

Grievance Mechanism

Local communities and other stakeholders may raise a grievance at all times to applicants, grantees, and CEPF about any issues covered in this Framework and the application of the Framework. Affected communities should be informed about this possibility and contact information of the respective organizations at relevant levels should be made available. These arrangements should be described in the project-specific frameworks and action plans along with the more project-specific grievance and conflict resolution mechanism.

As a first stage, grievances should be made to the applicant or grantee, who should respond to grievances in writing within 15 working days of receipt. Claims should be filed, included in project monitoring, and a copy of the grievance should be provided to the CEPF Secretariat. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response, the grievance may be submitted to the CEPF Executive Director at cepfexecutive@conservation.org or by mail to: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Conservation International, Attn: Executive Director, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA. CEPF will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring.

Appendix A. AFD's Environmental and Social Risk Assessment for CEPF showing classification as category C

AFD Pays : Multi pays Agence de : néant	Fiche environnementale et sociale	Division : ARB Chef de projet : T. Leménager
Numéro de projet : CZZ 2599	Adaptation basée sur les écosystèmes dans l'Océan Indien Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)	Spécialiste AES : JD Oth

Objet : Renforcer la gestion durable de l'environnement au sein des hotspots, de biodiversité en finançant des projets émanant de la société civile via le Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF).			
Classement global du projet :	A <input type="checkbox"/> B+ <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Classement environnemental :	A <input type="checkbox"/> B+ <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Classement social :	A <input type="checkbox"/> B+ <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Marqueur CAD – Genre: NA <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>			
Equivalent avis DD : 2			
Classement vulnérabilité au CC :	A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

<p>Avis AES : COSUB électronique 06/04/2020</p> <p><u>sur le classement :</u> Comme pour les trois autres contributions précédentes, AES confirme le classement en C de ce projet qui a pour objet le financement d'actions d'accompagnements en faveur de l'adaptation au changement climatique par les écosystèmes à travers le CEPF et les organisations de la société civile au sein de l'Océan Indien et ce via une délégation de fonds du Fond Vert. Le projet ne finance pas d'infrastructures, n'entraîne pas de déplacements de populations et ne comporte pas de risques E&S particuliers. Le CEPF applique les règles de sauvegarde de la Banque mondiale et du FEM et s'est doté d'une stratégie Genre.</p> <p>Dans le cadre du soutien au développement d'activités génératrices de revenus (AGR) liés à la conservation des écosystèmes pour l'adaptation au changement climatique, le projet devra s'assurer que ces revenus soient partagés entre les différentes parties prenantes. Ces partages de revenus issus de la préservation de biodiversité doivent ainsi constituer un incitatif économique à la conservation de la biodiversité et des ressources naturelles de manière à contribuer à la pérennité de ces activités.</p> <p><u>sur le Genre (notation CAD) :</u> Le projet est noté 1 du point de vue du marqueur CAD égalité FH dans la mesure où le CEPF a adopté en 2015 d'une politique transversale sur le genre ayant pour objectif l'intégration des enjeux égalité F/H à tous les niveaux d'opération. Les résultats obtenus par le CEPF sont à ce propos très positifs.</p> <p><u>sur les diligences environnementales et sociales à entreprendre :</u> NA</p> <p><u>CCR (Extraits de la FPP) :</u> Risques environnementaux et sociaux <i>Agissant dans des zones où les écosystèmes sont soumis à de fortes pressions et où les populations sont souvent vulnérables, le CEPF est extrêmement vigilant à tous les impacts négatifs qui pourraient survenir. Il applique des sauvegardes environnementales et sociales conformes aux risques évalués en la matière, qui restent néanmoins faibles compte tenu des activités menées (petits tickets, absence d'infrastructures importantes, absence de déplacement de populations, etc.).</i></p>
--

Stade d'instruction du projet :	COSUB
Date de mise à jour de la fiche :	06/04/2020