

Simplified Approval Process

Annex 12: Environmental and social action plan



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Environmental and Social Policy Statement	5
Environmental and Social Safeguard Principles	6
Definition of the ESMS.....	8
Role and Responsibility of MCT	8
Confirmation of Category C Project	9
Environmental and Social Action Plan	11
Annex 1: Environmental and Social Screening Checklist	16
Annex 2: MCT Environmental and Social Screening Template	21

Introduction

The Micronesia Conservation Trust's (MCT) Environmental and Social (E&S) Safeguards Policy is adopted to ensure that adverse environmental and social impacts are avoided or, when unavoidable, minimized and appropriately mitigated and/or compensated.

A key principle of MCT's E&S Safeguards Policy is to prevent, minimize and mitigate any harm to the environment and to people by incorporating environmental and social concerns as an intrinsic part throughout MCT's project cycle. The E&S Safeguards Policy applies to all stages of the project cycle from design and implementation to monitoring and evaluation. All MCT projects will comply with applicable national and international laws.

FSM Environmental Laws

The FSM Constitution provides a high-level framework for environmental compliance in FSM including the following general provisions:¹

- **Preamble.** States, in part, “[t]o make one nation of many islands, we respect the diversity of our cultures. Our differences enrich us. The seas bring us together, they do not separate us. Our islands sustain us, our island nation enlarges us and makes us stronger.” Article XIII Contains additional provisions, including some that relate to the environment.
- **Section 2.** Provides that “radioactive, toxic chemical, or other harmful substances may not be tested, stored, used, or disposed of within the jurisdiction of the Federated States of Micronesia without the express approval of the national government of the Federated States of Micronesia.”
- **Section 4.** In terms of land use, “[a] noncitizen, or a corporation not wholly owned by citizens, may not acquire title to land or waters in Micronesia.”
- **Section 5.** Prohibits a lease agreement for the use of land for an indefinite term by a noncitizen, a corporation not wholly owned by citizens, or any government is prohibited.
- **Section 113 of the General Provisions [Title 1].** Empowers the High Commissioner to restrict or forbid non-citizens from acquiring interests in real property and in business enterprises.

The State constitutions provide more detail for environmental quality and particularly parameters for the enforcement of standards. Across the four State constitutions high-level descriptions of the rights and requirements for environmental quality are delineated. These provisions are similar across the State Specific State-level provisions include:

- **Chuuk** – Article XI of the Chuuk Constitution requires the legislature to “provide by law for the development and enforcement of standards of environmental quality, and for the establishment of an independent State agency vested with responsibility for environmental matters.” Article XI of the Chuuk Constitution also gives the State Government the power to take an interest in land for public interest purposes subject to negotiations and the payment of compensation.
- **Kosrae** – Article XI of the Kosrae Constitution addresses land and environment matters. It grants the people the right to “a healthful, clean and stable environment”. The State government is required to “by law protect the State’s environment, ecology, and natural resources from impairment in the public interest.” The Constitution prohibits nuclear, chemical, gas or biological weapons and hazardous radioactive material being in the State. The Constitution provides “[t]he

¹ SPREP Legislative Review 2018; Available at: <https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/EMG/sprep-legislative-review-fsm.pdf>

waters, land, and other natural resources within the marine space of the State are public property, the use of which the State Government shall regulate by law in the public interest..." Rivers and streams may be designated by law as public property for use in the public interest. The State Government may acquire land for public purposes without the interested parties' consent, subject to the payment of fair compensation and good faith attempt at negotiation. Title to State land may only be acquired by Micronesian citizens who are Kosraean by descent.

- **Pohnpei** – Under the Pohnpei Constitution, the State Governor must establish and administer "comprehensive plans for the conservation of natural resources and the protection of the environment". Article 12 states that only Ponapean citizens, who are also pwilidak of Pohnpei, may acquire a permanent interest in real property. The Constitution also prohibits leases of more than 25 years and indefinite land-use agreements. The Government of Pohnpei may acquire land for public purposes following consultation with local government, owners and an offer for payment of a purchase price or compensation. Article 13 of the Pohnpei Constitution prohibits the introduction, storage, use, test and disposal of nuclear, chemical, gas and biological weapons, nuclear power plants and related waste materials from Pohnpei.
- **Yap** – The Yap Constitution states that the "state Government may provide for the protection, conservation and sustainable development of agricultural, marine, mineral, forest, water, land and other natural resources." It also prohibits testing, storing, using or disposing of radioactive and nuclear substances within the State. Land ownership and uses are restricted under the Yap Constitution. The State recognises traditional rights and ownership of natural resources and areas within the marine space of the State up to 12 miles from island baselines.

The National Environmental Law in FSM mostly centres on Title 25, Environmental Protection. Title 25 has three principal components:

1. **Chapter 5/Subtitle 1:** This subtitle sets out Micronesia's public policy on the environment. Section 102 provides: "It is the policy of the Federated States of Micronesia to use all practicable means, consistent with other considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate governmental plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the inhabitants of the Federated States of Micronesia may: (a) fulfil the responsibilities for each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations; (b) enjoy safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetical and culturally pleasing surroundings; (c) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable or unintended consequences; (d) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our Micronesian heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice; and (e) remain responsible members of the global community by complying with the international legal obligations accepted by the Federated States of Micronesia upon ratifying or acceding to international environment agreements."
2. **Chapter 6/Subtitle 2:** Section 208 states that the Director of the Office of Environment and Emergency Management must provide an annual environmental quality report to the President and Congress. This Act establishes the Environmental Protection Office with the following roles as set out in section 209: "The Office shall have the power and duty to protect the environment, human health, welfare, and safety and to abate, control, and prohibit pollution or contamination of air, land, and water in accordance with this subtitle and with the regulations adopted and promulgated pursuant to this subtitle, including measures undertaken to prohibit or regulate the testing, storage, use, disposal, import and export of radioactive, toxic chemical, or other harmful substances. The Office shall balance the needs of economic and social development with those of environmental quality and shall adopt regulations and pursue policies which, to the maximum extent possible, promote both these needs and the policies set forth in section 102 of this

subtitle”. Section 210 grants the Environmental Protection Office a number of powers and duties in order to achieve the purposes set out in section 209. For example, the Environmental Protection Office may create regulations to implement international environment treaties, collect fees for permits or licences, administer nationwide programs “for the protection of the environment, human health, welfare and safety” of Micronesia.

3. **Chapter 7/Subtitle 3:** This deals with enforcement and environmental impact assessment. Importantly, section 302 states that: “(1) Any person, prior to taking any action that may significantly affect the quality of the environment within the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Federated States of Micronesia, or within the boundaries of the National Capital Complex at Palikir, must submit an environmental impact statement to the Director, in accordance with regulations established by the Director. (2) The environmental impact statements required by subsection (1) of this section are public documents, and must include a detailed statement on: (a) the environmental impact of the proposed action; (b) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented; (c) the alternatives to the proposed action; (d) the relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and (e) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.”

FSM also provides regulations specific to Environmental Impact Assessments.² The Environmental Impact Assessment (ESIA) process is intended to help the general public and government officials make decisions with the understanding of the environmental consequences of their decisions, and take actions consistent with the goal of protecting, restoring, and enhancing the environment. However, given the expected negligible impact and negligible risk activities for the present project, this ESIA process will not be triggered, but it does provide some context for how E+S considerations are handled in FSM.

Environmental and Social Policy Statement

Social and environmental sustainability are fundamental to the achievement of MCT’s mission “To provide sustainable financing and support for biodiversity conservation, related sustainable development and environmental education.” and shall be mainstreamed into MCT’s project management cycle. Opportunities to strengthen environmental and social sustainability shall be identified at the earliest stage of project design, realised through implementation, and tracked through monitoring and evaluation.

MCT projects adhere to the objectives and requirements of its Environmental and Social Principles. In so doing, they will seek to i) strengthen the social and environmental outcomes of projects; ii) avoid adverse impacts where possible, and where unavoidable, apply the mitigation hierarchy of minimisation, mitigation and compensation / offset; and iii) strengthen MCT and its executing entities, grantees, sub-grantees and partners’ capacity for managing social and environmental risks and impacts.

MCT will only support projects which comply with national law and obligations under international law, and will apply the more stringent standard. MCT will work in a collaborative manner with regional, national, and local partners.

² FSM Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations; Available at: <http://www.fsmlaw.org/fsm/regulations/envimp.htm>

MCT will ensure that grievance mechanisms are in place so that individuals and communities potentially affected by MCT supported programmes have access to effective mechanisms and procedures for raising concerns about the social and environmental performance of a project.

Environmental and Social Safeguard Principles

MCT's social and environmental safeguard principles have been developed to meet the intent of the GCF as well as the 2012 International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Performance Standards. While the Principles adopted align with IFC's performance standards they have been modified to suit the needs and scale of MCT's projects, programs, and activities.

Principle 1: Human Rights

MCT recognizes the centrality of human rights to sustainable development and ensuring fair distribution of development opportunities and benefits. MCT shall both refrain from providing support for activities that may contribute to violations of a State's human rights obligations and the core international human rights, treaties, and seek to support the protection and fulfilment of human rights. Projects will not exacerbate existing inequalities, particularly with reference to marginalized or vulnerable groups. MCT will uphold the principles of accountability and the rule of law, participation and inclusion, and equality and non-discrimination. MCT will also ensure the meaningful, effective and informed participation of stakeholders in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of its activities.

Principle 2: Gender

MCT supported projects and activities will be gender-responsive in their design and implementation. The different needs, constraints, contributions and priorities of women, men, girls and boys will be identified and built into MCT's programming. MCT supported projects will ensure that both women and men are able to participate meaningfully and equitably, have equitable access to project resources, and receive comparable social and economic benefits.

Principle 3: Child Protection

MCT is committed to protecting children from exploitation and abuse of all kinds in all of its programme and project activities as outlined in MCT's *Child Protection Policy* (June 2014). MCT applies a zero-tolerance approach to child exploitation and abuse and will not knowingly engage – directly or indirectly – anyone who poses an unacceptable risk to children. A risk-based approach will be used to assess all activities which have contact with children. If high-risk activities are undertaken, steps will be undertaken and documented to reduce or remove these risks.

Principle 4: Climate Change

MCT will not support any projects which result in any significant or unjustified increase in greenhouse gas emissions or other drivers of climate change.

Principle 5: Labor Rights and Working Conditions

MCT will identify and manage any risks to the core labor standards of the International Labor Organisation (ILO).

Principle 6: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention

MCT will design and implement projects in a way that meets applicable international standards for maximizing energy efficiency and minimizing material resource use, the production of wastes, and the release of pollutants.

Principle 7: Community Health, Safety, and Security

MCT will not design and implement projects that exacerbate a sensitive local situation or stress local resources. Risks of community health, safety and security arising from land, water, air and noise pollution will be minimized and mitigated to acceptable levels, otherwise MCT will not undertake the project.

Principle 8: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement

MCT will design and implement projects in a way that avoids or minimizes the need for involuntary resettlement. When limited involuntary resettlement is unavoidable, due process should be observed so that displaced persons shall be informed of their rights, consulted on their options, and offered technically, economically, and socially feasible resettlement alternatives or fair and adequate compensation, otherwise MCT will not undertake the project.

MCT in project design, implementation and execution is committed to involve affected individuals and communities in planning processes aimed at avoiding and limiting the use of involuntary resettlement and access restriction, and at identifying and designing mitigation plans and measures that are socially and economically beneficial to affected communities and that are culturally appropriate.

Principle 9: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources

MCT will design and implement projects in a way that avoids any significant or unjustified reduction or loss of biological diversity or the introduction of known invasive species. MCT will not support any projects that involve unjustified conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those that are:

- Legally protected;
- Officially proposed for protection;
- Recognized by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, including as critical habitat; or
- Recognized as protected by local communities.

Principle 10: Physical and Cultural Heritage

MCT will design and implement projects in a way that avoids the alteration, damage, or removal of any physical cultural resources, cultural sites, and sites with unique natural values recognized as such at the community, national or international level. Projects should also not permanently interfere with existing access and use of such physical and cultural resources.

Principle 11: Indigenous Peoples, Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups

MCT will not design or implement projects that are inconsistent with the rights and responsibilities of Indigenous Peoples. and other applicable international instruments relating to indigenous peoples. There is no universally accepted definition of “Indigenous Peoples”, however under this principle, it is

used in a generic sense to refer to a distinct social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
- Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
- Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of mainstream society or culture; or
- A distinct language or dialect, often different from the official language of languages of the country or region in which they reside

MCT will assess and consider particular impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups and shall avoid imposing any disproportionate adverse impacts on these groups.

Definition of the ESMS

An Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) refers to a set of management processes and procedures that allow an organization to identify, analyse, control and reduce the environmental and social impacts of its activities in a consistent way and to improve performance in this regard over time.

This ESMS is a broad operational framework specific to the GCF project “Climate resilient food security for farming households across the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)” that allows MCT to incorporate environmental and social considerations into its decision-making and operations. The ESMS is underpinned by MCT’s overarching environmental and social policy that describes how MCT will implement the ESMS and achieve improvements in environmental and social outcomes while addressing any adverse impacts from GCF financed activities.

The ESMS is intended to be fully aligned with GCF’s Environmental and social management system: environmental and social policy as per GCF/B.19/06.

Role and Responsibility of MCT

As the AE, GCF shall require that MCT undertakes all necessary measures to ensure that activities are implemented in such a manner that:

- (i) Ensures that environmental and social management plans, and all measures to mitigate and manage environmental and social risks and impacts and to improve outcomes are implemented, monitored and continuously improved; and
- (ii) Ensures that the progress and performance are monitored and reported to GCF and its stakeholders throughout the implementation of the GCF-financed activities, in accordance with the monitoring and accountability framework and allowing GCF or GCF-authorized third-party verification of such reports.

In relation to environmental safeguards, the GCF will require MCT as the AE to:

- confirm that the measures to manage environmental and social risks and impacts, including, as relevant, information disclosure, stakeholder engagement, and grievance redress, are incorporated in the agreements with executing entities including tendering documents and contracts;

- take all necessary measures to ensure the compliance with all applicable laws, including the laws, regulations, and standards of the country in which the activities are located, and/or obligations of the country or countries directly applicable to the activities under relevant international treaties and agreements;
- undertake all necessary measures to ensure that the communities affected or potentially affected by the activities (including vulnerable populations, local communities, groups and individuals including women, children, people with disabilities, people marginalized by virtue of their sexual orientation and gender identity, indigenous peoples and other marginalized groups of people and individuals) are properly consulted in a manner that facilitates the inclusion of local knowledge in the design of the activities, provides them with opportunities to express their views on risks, impacts and mitigation measures related to the activities, and allows the accredited entities to consider and respond to their concerns. In ensuring the meaningful and effective consultation and participation of the affected communities and vulnerable populations, the accredited entities will align their stakeholder engagement processes to best practices and standards and will make publicly available the relevant information on the activities according to the requirements of the Information Disclosure Policies of GCF and MCT.

Hence, in addition to GCF requirements, project partners will also adhere to other MCT policies as listed below:

- MCT Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy
- MCT Anti-money Laundering and Anti-terrorist Financing Policy
- MCT Gender Policy
- MCT Fraud Prevention and Whistle Blower Protection Policy
- MCT Procurement Policy
- MCT Disclosure Policy

Confirmation of Category C Project

The proposed project would be the first comprehensive national effort to focus on increasing the resilience of FSM's most vulnerable communities to food insecurity in the face of climate change. Specifically, the proposed project will work to:

1. Establish an enabling environment for adaptive action and investment including strengthening the evidence base for adaptation, mainstreaming climate risk into development planning, and disseminating actionable climate information to community and state decision makers.
2. Enhance the food security of vulnerable households by introducing climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices³
3. Strengthen climate-resilient value-chains and market linkages across the agriculture sector

Specifically, the project will finance the following activities:

- Development of institutional coordination mechanism

³ An approach that helps to guide actions needed to transform and reorient agricultural systems to effectively support development and ensure food security in a changing climate.

- Climate vulnerability assessments
- Integration of climate change considerations into national and state agricultural policies
- Development of State-level farmer's associations
- Dissemination of weather and climate information
- Establishment of traditional agro-forestry systems
- Capacity building for extension agents
- Developing nurseries and food banks for bridging capacity
- Market support for local produce
- Food processing and preservation
- Awareness building for the benefits of local produce

ESS Category C Activities are defined by the GCF as those with minimal or no adverse environmental and/or social risks and/or impacts.

The activities envisioned by the project include only activities that have minimal or no expected environmental and/or social risks and impacts. The project activities are not constructing new facilities, but rather utilizing existing facilities for storage and market activities. Further, the project CSA packages are all focused on small-scale deployments that are primarily low touch, low impact, non-technology strategies (consisting of "crop rotation/spacing, temperature and salt-resistant seeds and varieties, soil tilling, organic farming, integrated water management, etc.) for smallholder farmers (majority of landowners operate on less than 2 acres), so the potential for negative impact from the applications is negligible. The project also incorporates organic farming training and awareness building into its CSA packages which will work to proactively reduce fertilizer usage for smallholder farmers.

For water usage, **agriculture in FSM is almost exclusively rain-fed.**⁴ Groundwater resources are at times used on the outer atolls however, the project is only focusing on the 4 main island States of FSM (i.e. outer atolls are not a target and therefore even though they may use groundwater their usage. All four of the main islands have coastal mangrove fringes and intermittent development along their coasts. The natural vegetative cover is dense on all islands and has not generally been disrupted for intensive agriculture use. Whether planned or fortuitous, this has protected the watersheds, helping to reduce the rapid runoff and maintaining a reasonable recharge opportunity for the aquifers.⁵

Surface water on the islands is in the form of small, intermittent streams that drain catchments areas of limited aerial extent. The streams are dry for about 20% of the year. The development of surface water as a water supply or for use as a source for agriculture is inherently expensive, since it requires the construction of dams to impound the surface runoff for use during dry periods. The topography in the stream basins is not conducive to the construction of economical dams. Furthermore, surface water

⁴National Integrated Water Resource Management Diagnostic Report for FSM, <https://www.pacificwater.org/userfiles/file/GEF%20IWRM%20Final%20Docs/MR0636fsm.pdf> (Section 4.1.1., p. 23)

⁵ Federated States of Micronesia IWRM Outlook Summary and NWTF Report; https://www.preventionweb.net/files/27083_fsmwatsanoutlook.pdf

requires extensive and costly treatment, largely to reduce high turbidity, undesirable taste and odours, and to remove all microorganisms.⁶

For the above reasons, neither ground water nor surface water is utilized as sources of water for agriculture across FSM's 4 main islands States. The project activities will not change this current dynamic and therefore surface and groundwater usage are a zero to negligible risk for the project.

The project is focusing on introducing CSA practices as well as traditional agro-forestry practices the project is expected to support the reduction in water usage for farming. Traditional agroforestry does not divert or impact streams. In terms of effective water resource management, the project is structured to work with farmers to use less water – i.e. drought resilient crops that do not require daily watering. These strategies are further outlined and detailed in the pre-feasibility study, Annex 13 through the section on the “Assessment of Appropriate Climate Resilient Agriculture Practices” (pp.70-75).

In conclusion, the project activities do not present significant environmental and social impacts (see Annex 1 for GCF risk screening template and Annex 2 for MCT supplementary risk screening). Annex 7 of the full proposal details a broader risk assessment and Annex 4 specifically targets the gender risks of the project. Additionally, there is additional information on past similar projects to further justify the Category C designation available in Annex 13 of the FP. On this basis, MCT has confirmed the project status as a Category C project, subject to a number of exclusion criteria.

Environmental and Social Action Plan

The Environmental and Social Action Plan below summarizes the key risks for project activities, mitigation planning for those risks, the parties responsible, the cost, and the expected results.

⁶ National Integrated Water Resource Management Diagnostic Report for FSM, <https://www.pacificwater.org/userfiles/file/GEF%20IWRM%20Final%20Docs/MR0636fsm.pdf> (Section 3.1.1., p. 14)

Summary of risks	Mitigation measures	Risk significance	Responsible party/person	Schedule	Expected results	Cost/Budget
<i>This contains the description of risks and can be derived from the responses to the screening questions in Part B2.</i>	<i>Options to avoid, reduce, mitigate risks and impacts. This may also indicate additional due diligence and specific management plans</i>	<i>This contains a description of the overall level of risk*</i>	<i>Individual person, unit, or entity tasked to carry out the mitigation measures</i>	<i>Timing of implementation of measures including any additional due diligence and management plans and may depend on the stage of implementation</i>	<i>Expected outputs of the measures</i>	<i>Estimated cost of carrying out the measures</i>
Climate (GHG emissions)	<p>Stakeholder engagement and training to target agro-forestry practices appropriately and avoid the clearing of additional land.</p> <p>Use existing structures for food banks and market instruments</p> <p>Utilize the most efficient transport vehicles available</p>	Negligible – Additional GHG emissions as a result of project activities are negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities	Negligible residual likelihood of GHG emissions	Minimal – expected to be included in project activities and stakeholder engagement
Groundwater	Ensure effective water resource management procedures are in place for agro-forestry activities.	Negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Negligible	<p>Agriculture is rain-fed in the project areas, so the risk to groundwater resources is negligible.</p> <p>The project is actively promoting</p>

						water conservation as part of its CSA deployments which will further limit impact any potential on groundwater resources. Please see Annex 13- Pre-Feasibility Study (pp. 70-75) for the specific CSA criteria – including drought resistant crops and improved soil management.
Surface water	Ensure effective water resource management procedures are in place for agro-forestry activities.	Minor	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Unlikely residual likelihood	<p>Similar to groundwater risk, the risk is negligible because farmers on the 4 targeted main islands utilize rainwater to water crops.</p> <p>Project beneficiaries will receive training on CSA packages to promote the reduction in water usage. Packages will include drought resistant seeds, cropping and grown techniques to promote the conservation of</p>

						rainwater already in use by household farmers
Biodiversity (flora and fauna, terrestrial and marine)	Stakeholder engagement and training to target agro-forestry practices appropriately and avoid the clearing of additional land.	Negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Low residual likelihood	
Noise	If any noise inducing activities are needed (none planned at the moment), community engagement will be conducted to effectively time and coordinate activities to minimize harmful and nuisance noise impacts on communities	Negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Negligible	Negligible
Air quality	If any negative air quality inducing activities are needed (none planned at the moment), community engagement will be conducted to effectively time and coordinate activities to minimize air quality impacts	Negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Negligible	Negligible
Clearing of vegetation	Stakeholder engagement and training to target agro-forestry practices appropriately and avoid the clearing of additional land.	Minor	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Low residual likelihood	Minimal – expected to be included in project activities and stakeholder engagement

Soil contamination	If any soil contaminating activities are needed (none planned at the moment), community engagement will be conducted to effectively time and coordinate activities to minimize soil quality impacts	Negligible	MCT	During initial targeting of project activities and establishment of agro-forestry systems	Negligible	Negligible
--------------------	---	------------	-----	---	------------	------------

**Risk significance. The probability of occurrence is the likelihood for a risk to occur and can be characterized in terms of the degree to which it will happen (for example, the UNDP screening procedure uses “expected, highly likely, moderately likely, not likely, and slight”). The impact or magnitude of risks is the description of how severe the impacts would be if it were to occur (for example, “critical, severe, moderate, minor, and negligible”). A significance value of the risk (for example low, medium, high) can be obtained by combining the probability and impact values. The risk significance indicates the relationship between probability and severity or magnitude of impacts. The entities or organizations that will be implementing the proposed activities are best positioned to define the probability of occurrence and severity or magnitude of impacts.*

There is no single technique to determine the significance of risks nor will it apply in all situations. The entities and organizations that will be implementing the activities will need to determine which technique will work best for each situation. Determining risk significance would require an understanding of activities and locations, the urgency of situations, and objective judgment.

Annex 1: Environmental and Social Screening Checklist

Part A: Risk Factors

The questions describe the “risk factors” of activities that would require additional assessments and information. Any “Yes” response to the questions will render the proposal not eligible for the Simplified Approval Process Pilot Scheme. Proposals with any of the risk factors may be considered under the regular project approvals process instead.

Exclusion criteria	YES	NO
Will the activities involve associated facilities and require further due diligence of such associated facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities involve trans-boundary impacts including those that would require further due diligence and notification to downstream riparian states?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities adversely affect working conditions and health and safety of workers or potentially employ vulnerable categories of workers including women, child labour?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities potentially generate hazardous waste and pollutants including pesticides and contaminate lands that would require further studies on management, minimization and control and compliance to the country and applicable international environmental quality standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities involve the construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation of critical infrastructure (like dams, water impoundments, coastal and riverbank infrastructure) that would require further technical assessment and safety studies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the proposed activities potentially involve resettlement and dispossession, land acquisition, and economic displacement of persons and communities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities be located in protected areas and areas of ecological significance including critical habitats, key biodiversity areas and internationally recognized conservation sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities affect indigenous peoples that would require further due diligence, free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and documentation of development plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities be located in areas that are considered to have archaeological (prehistoric), paleontological, historical, cultural, artistic, and religious values or contains features considered as critical cultural heritage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Part B: Specific environmental and social risks and impacts

Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts	YES	NO	TBD
Has the AE provided the E&S risk category of the project in the concept note?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the AE provided the rationale for the categorization of the project in the relevant sections of the concept note or funding proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are there any additional requirements for the country?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the identification of risks and impacts based on recent or up-to-date information?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Additional Comments</u>			

Labour and Working Conditions	YES	NO	TBD
Are the proposed activities expected to have impacts on the working conditions, particularly the terms of employment, worker's organization, non-discrimination, equal opportunity, child labour, and forced labour of direct, contracted and third-party workers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the proposed activities pose occupational health and safety risks to workers including supply chain workers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Additional Comments:</u>			

Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention	YES	NO	TBD
Are the activities expected to generate (1) emissions to air; (2) discharges to water; (3) activity-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emission; and (5) waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the activities expected to utilize natural resources including water and energy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will there be a need to develop detailed measures to reduce pollution and promote sustainable use of resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Additional Comments</u>			
The project activities will focus on agriculture and so will by definition be utilizing water resources. Water resources used in the project will be solely focused on growing crops			

and procedures will be put in place for promoting water efficiency and ensuring Category C compliant use.

Community Health, Safety, and Security	YES	NO	TBD
Will the activities potentially generate risks and impacts to the health and safety of the affected communities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will there be a need for an emergency preparedness and response plan that also outlines how the affected communities will be assisted in times of emergency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will there be risks posed by the security arrangements and potential conflicts at the project site to the workers and affected community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

Especially as it relates to flooding and climate change impacts, emergency preparedness procedures will need to be developed for managing and securing assets as best can be done. This will be particularly relevant for the nurseries and market activities, as well as some of the climate early warning systems.

Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement	YES	NO	TBD
Will the activities likely involve voluntary transactions under willing buyer-willing-seller conditions and have these been properly communicated and consulted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

A few project activities will be contingent on voluntary transaction or the anticipation of those, namely the market development pieces and the nursery development. MCT will work directly with communities to develop agreements for the use of land for community nurseries and market development to the extent that new areas need to be procured.

Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources	YES	NO	TBD
Are the activities likely introduce invasive alien species of flora and fauna affecting the biodiversity of the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the activities have potential impacts on or be dependent on ecosystem services including production of living natural resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

Indigenous Peoples	YES	NO	TBD
Are the activities likely to have indirect impacts on indigenous peoples?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will continuing stakeholder engagement processes and a grievance redress mechanism be integrated into the management / implementation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

MCT has a grievance mechanism (below) in place as part of its project operations manual, and that will be communicated and made available to all stakeholders as part of project engagement.

Grievance Mechanism

MCT's Whistle Blowing Policy provides people affected by any projects with an accessible, transparent, fair and effective process for raising complaints about environmental or social harms caused by any such project.

Stakeholders can lodge a complaint via MCT's website (www.ourmicronesia.org). Formal complaints can also be forwarded to the Executive Director (director@ourmicronesia.org) who shall handle as appropriate.

Appropriate authority levels as specified in MCT's governance structure will handle all complaints, in a professional and timely way.

Cultural Heritage	YES	NO	TBD
Will the activity allow continuous access to the cultural heritage sites and properties?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will there be a need to prepare a procedure in case of the discovery of cultural heritage assets?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

Sign-off: *Specify the name of the person responsible for the environmental and social screening and any other approvals as may be required in the accredited entity's own management system.*

Annex 2: MCT Environmental and Social Screening Template

Environmental and Social Screening Template

Key Project Information			
Project Name	Climate resilient food security for farming households across the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)		
Estimated Project Duration	Start: 2020	Completion: 2025	Months: 60
Primary Donor (s) & amount	Green Climate Fund	Total Project Grant \$: 10 million	
MCT’s Role	Implementing Agency: MCT	Executing Agency:	
Executing Partner			
Key Partners (in delivery)			
Beneficiary/ies (FSM state, other countries, village/town, etc.)	FSM national and state governments,		
Has a screening or ESIA been done before?	No		
Screening Questionnaire completed by:	N/A		
Screening Questionnaire reviewed by:	N/A		

Part I - Potential impacts related to E&S Policy			
<p>Important considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project activities are screened for their inherent social and environmental risks before applying mitigation and management measures. It is important to form a clear picture of potential inherent risks in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented or fail Screening for potential adverse social and environmental impacts must consider all activities with potential direct and indirect impacts across the Project's Area of Influence (including primary facilities, associated facilities, and areas and communities affected by cumulative impacts or induced impacts) 			
	To be completed by Project Proponent		MCT Reviewer
	Yes, No, n/a, TBD	If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimizing adverse impacts (if applicable)	Comments, additional observations
Principle 1 Human Rights			
1	Could the project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights of the	No	

	affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?			
2	Is the project likely to have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly vulnerable or marginalized groups?	No		
3	Is there a risk that potentially affected stakeholders might be prevented from participating fully in decision that may affect them?	Yes	Not actively prevented, but to the extent that policy decisions are being made, particularly on National and State-level agriculture policies it will be critical to conduct appropriate stakeholder engagement throughout the policy development process to ensure that the new policies are reflective of the needs and priorities of those communities they will be affecting.	
4	Have local communities or individuals been given the opportunity to raise concerns regarding the project during the stakeholder engagement process?	Yes		
5	Is there a risk that the project would exacerbate conflicts among and / or the risk of violence to projected affected communities or individuals?	No		
Principle 2: Gender Equality				
1	Is there a likelihood that the project will have adverse impacts on gender equality, and / or the situation of women and girls?	No		
2	Have women's groups / leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No		
3	Will the project potentially limit women's ability to access or use natural resources upon which they depend for a livelihood?	No		
Principle 3: Child Protection				
1	Will the project involve the employment of children?	No		
2	Is there a risk of child exploitation or abuse linked to the project?	No		
Principle 4: Climate Change				

1	Will proposed project result in significant greenhouse gas emissions?	No		
Principle 5: Labor and Working Conditions				
1	Is there a potential that the project will require the labor of migrant workers for its construction or implementation?	No		
2	Will the project include a requirement for accommodation services for workers?	No		
3	Does the host country allow union activity and permit workers to bargain collectively?	Yes		
4	Is there potential for the project to apply adverse discriminatory practices?	No		
5	Will the project present unsafe or unhealthy working conditions?	No		
Principle 6: Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention				
1	Is the project likely to release pollutants?	No		
2	Will hazardous waste materials be generated by the project?	No		
3	Are chemical pesticides likely to be used by the project?	No		
Principle 7: Community Health, Safety and Security				
1	Will the project require the construction or rehabilitation or any structural components which could pose a risk to Affected Communities?	No		
2	Does the project involve the construction or rehabilitation of a dam?	No		
3	Is the project likely to increase community exposure to disease (water borne, water based, water related and vector borne diseases as well as communicable diseases)?	No		
4	Will the project retain security workers to protect its property?	No		
5	Is there a risk that security personnel could be responsible for unlawful and abusive acts against Affected Communities?	No		
Principle 8: Land Acquisition Involuntary Resettlement				
1	Will / could the project involve the physical relocation of people?	No		
2	Will / could the project rely upon expropriation to resettle people?	No		
3	Is it likely that the project will need to acquire land from individuals and households, causing them to experience economic displacement?	No		
4	Will the project restrict access to natural resources and areas used by Affected	No		

	Communities resulting in economic displacement?			
5	Is there a possibility that the project will affect land tenure arrangement or community-based property rights to land, territories, or resources?	No		
Principle 9: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources				
1	Is the project likely to affect biodiversity or ecosystem services?	No		
2	If the project is expected to impact natural habitat, are plans in place to ensure that no net loss of biodiversity is achieved?	No		
3	Is the project expected to affect critical habitats?	No		
4	Is the project located in a legally protected area or internationally recognized area?	No		
5	Is the project likely to introduce invasive alien species to the project area?	No		
6	Will the project have an impact on priority ecosystem services?	No		
Principle 10: Physical and Cultural Heritage				
1	Will project result in interventions that could potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)?	No		
2	Does project propose utilizing tangible or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No		
Principle 11: Indigenous Peoples, Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups				
1	Will the project be implemented in lands or territories transitionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples?	No		
2	Will the project potentially adversely affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas)?	No		
3	Is it likely that the project will exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular vulnerable or marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No		
4	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No		

Determining Significance of Risk

Use the risk matrix below to determine the overall “Risk Rating” (severe, high, medium or low)

		Consequence				
		Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Critical
Likelihood	Almost Certain	Low	Medium	High	Severe	Severe
	Likely	Low	Medium	Medium	High	Severe
	Possible	Low	Low	Medium	High	Severe
	Unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High
	Rare	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High

What are the potential social and environmental risks (as identified through the screening process in Part I)?		What is the likelihood and consequence of the risk before mitigation measures are applied?	What is the significance of the risk? (low, medium or high)?
1	Lack of policy representation for Agriculture Policy development	Possible	Minor
2	Unequal opportunity and benefits for women	Possible	Minor
3			
4			
5			
6			

Part II: What is the overall project categorization based on the potential risk and impact profile?	
	Comments
Category A - Projects with the potential to cause significant adverse social and / or environmental impacts that are diverse, irreversible or unprecedented.	
Category B – Projects with the potential to cause limited adverse social and/or environmental impacts that are few in number, generally site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed through mitigation measures	
Category C – Projects that include activities with minimal or no risks of adverse social and environmental consequences	The project is a Category C project because it has minimal environmental and social risks and the two principal risks identified (policy representation, gender inequality) are actively mitigated by project design. For the policy representation significant stakeholder engagement and

	<p>grassroots conversations will be applied in order to provide connectivity and continuity to the national policy advocacy. For the gender concerns, the project has worked extensive with women's groups in the project design and will continue to do so in the design of new business opportunities and provide targeted capacity building and training to ensure that opportunities and benefits are directly accessible by vulnerable women. Further the project will be concentrating its selection on female-headed households as project participants to ensure gender balanced project outcomes. Additional information on the project's extensive gender action plan can be seen in Annex 4 of the overall proposal.</p>
--	---

Annex 3: Stakeholder Analysis and Engagement Plan

Introduction

This stakeholder analysis and engagement plan provides an overview of current stakeholder engagement to date and a stakeholder engagement plan for the duration of the “Climate resilient food security for farming households across the Federated States of Micronesia” project. Specifically, this annex will provide an overview of:

1. Key stakeholders and engagement plan
2. Stakeholder engagement and risk management throughout the project lifecycle.
3. Stakeholder engagement for specific project outputs
4. Grievances and resolution mechanism

Background

This project is one of fourteen selected priority projects under the Green Climate Fund Country Program (CP) for the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). The Country Program was prepared under the direction of the NDA for the GCF in consultation with the four states of Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei and Yap. The Readiness Program team developed the CP using a four-part (introductory, validation, confirmation, and endorsement) workshop series over a nine-month period. Consultations were undertaken with a whole-of-society approach, including stakeholders from state and national government agencies, civil society, non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, and the private sector. This process was implemented from late 2016 to mid-2017. From its inception, this proposal was developed based on the ambitions of FSM stakeholders.

MCT has continuously consulted with the stakeholders to ensure that the proposal meets the needs of the specific agencies, NGO's, communities, women's groups and other organizations. Through MCT's ongoing engagement across the country, the Executive Director and other program staff have been engaging with identified stakeholders over many years, and therefore were already well aware of the food security and resource management needs of the communities around the FSM and this experience informed the development of the project concept and proposal. Moreover, this consultation has included discussions with the highest-level officials in the Municipal, States, and National governments, including discussions with governors, legislatures, secretaries and directors of relevant departments.

After the NDA requested that MCT take the lead and develop the project proposal for the GCF, MCT met with the NDA and National Government authorities on July 3, 2018 to begin formal consultations. This led to four statewide consultations in Pohnpei (July 5th), Yap (July 9th), Chuuk (July 12th) and Kosrae (July 16th) with a total of 129 participants across the four meetings. All meetings were jointly held as inception for the MCT Adaptation Fund project and consultation for this GCF Concept. Those in attendance included: National, State and Municipal government authorities representing all areas of governance, NGOs, women's organizations, farmers' organizations, resource managers, community members, regional organizations and more. Moreover, MCT presented the concept at the FSM National Government Department of Resources and Development Conference on August 13-17, 2018.

Additional stakeholder meetings have taken place throughout 2019 and 2020 during the full development of the SAP proposal. In April of 2019, the concept note was presented in a series of meetings to key stakeholders. Input from stakeholders allowed for the refinement of the three components of the project with a specific request from farmers for (i) Inclusion of State-level formalized farmer's associations, including provisions for ensuring these were set-up for long-term success; and (ii) requests for more tailored long-term (3-month) weather information to allow farmers to better plan. These requests from farmers were directly integrated into Component 1 of the project specifically outputs 1.4 and 1.5. During these series of meetings, the government agencies, including State Departments of Agriculture/Agriculture Divisions R&D departments requested that the project include support for integrating climate change across the national and State-level agriculture policies. This request is specifically being supported by output 1.2.

The 2019 meetings included participants from the following entities:

1. FSM Department of Resources and Development (R&D)
2. FSM Department of Finance (GCF National Designated Authority)
3. Micronesia Conservation Trust (AE)
4. FSM Department of Environment, Climate Change and Emergency Management (DECEM)
5. National and State College of Micronesia (COM-FSM)/Cooperative Research Extension Service (CRE)
6. State Departments of Resources and Development/Management Authorities
7. State Departments of Agriculture/Agriculture Divisions
8. State Environmental Protection Agencies
9. State Marine Resources Authorities
10. State Governors and Legislators
11. FSM and State Weather Services
12. Private Sector/Market Actors
13. Farmers' Cooperatives and Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) groups
14. Representatives from Local Governments
15. Local and Regional NGO's and other Civil organizations

Importantly as well, in 2019 and 2020, MCT and partners conducted nationwide consultations for the National State-Wide Assessments and Resource Strategies (SWARS) (now called Forest Action Plans) for the FSM. The FAP are tools for nations to identify their highest priorities use and conservation of their forest and terrestrial resources. The plans include strategies, indicate partnerships and identify the necessary resources to implement the plan. The first SWARS/FAP for the FSM was completed in 2010. In 2019, MCT was contracted to support the Department of Resources and Development to update the document and outline the 2020-2030 strategy.

As such, the MCT team joined the Department of Resources staff in the 4 states of the FSM (Chuuk, Pohnpei, Yap and Kosrae) to conduct 3-day workshops to update and complete the plans. The workshops were held in Chuuk (October 28th – 31st, 2019), Yap (November 25th -27th, 2019), Kosrae (December 10th – 13th, 2019) and Pohnpei (January 8-10, 2020), with a total of 89 participants including 21 female and 68 male participants (see appendix for list of participants).

Of the 7 Main Themes identified in the FAP for the FSM, two are directly related to this proposal: the use of terrestrial resources in the context of Food Security in Adaptation to Climate Change and Capacity Building. As such, the MCT team continued consultations for the GCF proposal while supporting the development of the FAP priorities in all 4 states. This was done through presentations as a review of the GCF project, revisiting priorities for the use in each state of the terrestrial resources with regards to food security and climate change through a SWOT analysis and continued discussions about the key needs for the FSM.

In 2020, several Zoom meetings have been held particularly with the NDA and executing entities to better detail project activities and budgetary requirements.

Building from previous engagements, this project will work to continue to engage these stakeholders and other stakeholders who have yet to be consulted to secure their support and to take ownership of this project in order to successfully implement activities and outcomes. A summary of the different stakeholders and how they were/will be engaged is provided in table below.

Table 1: Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Stakeholder	Interest in the Project	Proposed Role on the Project	Engagement strategy	Engagement Timing
National Government Institutions (Departments and relevant Divisions)	The Government of FSM is a primary beneficiary of the project as well as one of the executing entities through R&D and DECEM, in particular Component 1: <i>Establish an enabling environment for adaptive action and investment including strengthening the evidence base for adaptation, mainstreaming climate risk into development planning, and disseminating actionable climate information to community and state decision makers.</i>	<p>The support of the FSM government will be essential to the success of the project.</p> <p>National agencies and policymakers are responsible for designing national policy and programs, particularly those related to agriculture and climate change and key officials involved in this process will be a critical factor for the success of the entire project, in particular active engagement for Component 1.</p> <p>The active engagement of key agencies, FSM Department of Resources and Development (R&D), the FSM Department of Finance , and the FSM Department of Environmental, Climate Change and Emergency Management (DECEM). will be critical to the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Participating in meetings and workshops to develop and refine a National Ag Policy integrating climate change into the strategy/policy for Climate Services; Participation development of overall program for agricultural sector climate change risk reduction awareness building 	<p>Engagement will be ongoing throughout the project starting from month 1, specifically through the following outputs and project administrative processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Steering Committee – FSM Department of Finance (NDA), R&D and DECEM will all be part of the project steering committee • The PMU will be housed at R&D with qualified personnel to lead the project’s day-to-day work • Output 1.1: Institutional coordination mechanism established – <i>regular meetings to take place initially quarterly and then 2 per year for duration of project</i> • Output 1.2: Targeted climate change assessments conducted – <i>support to finalize ToR (Q2 of Year 1)</i> 	Starting Q1, Year 1 through Q4 Year 5

		<p>including: (i) development of training curriculum on climate change risk awareness, particularly as it relates to food security (4 pillars) and planning for CSA for national and State-level policymakers and agencies and (ii) develop website for facilitated knowledge and information exchange.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 1.3: Climate change integrated into National and State policy making and planning, particularly in the agriculture sector – <i>meetings, workshops, and approval of changes to policy (Years 1-2)</i> • Output 1.5: Develop and disseminate tailored communications materials leveraging existing climate information streams to support CSA interventions - <i>DECEM is executing entity for this output; website and data will be housed and maintained by DECEM; training of staff; communications etc (Years 1-5)</i> 	
--	--	---	---	--

State Government Institutions (Departments and relevant divisions)	<p>The State-level policy makers are responsible for state-level programs, projects, and policies. These include state governors, legislatures, the State Weather Services, State Department of Resources and Development, State Agriculture and Forestry Divisions, etc. The State Government agencies are a primary beneficiary of the project particularly for Component 1.</p> <p><i>Establish an enabling environment for adaptive action and investment including strengthening the evidence base for adaptation, mainstreaming climate risk into development planning, and disseminating actionable climate information to</i></p>	<p>State-level agencies and policymakers are responsible for designing State-level policy and programs, particularly those related to agriculture and climate change and key officials involved in this process will be a critical factor for the success of the entire project, in particular active engagement for Component 1.</p> <p>The active engagement of key agencies, including State governors, legislatures, the State Weather Services, State Department of Resources and Development, State Agriculture and Forestry Divisions, will be critical to the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Participating in meetings and workshops to develop and refine State Ag Policies integrating climate change into the strategy/policy for Climate Services; -Participation in the development of overall program for agricultural sector climate change risk reduction awareness building including: (i) development of training curriculum on climate change risk awareness, particularly as it relates to food security (4 pillars) and planning for CSA for national and State-level policymakers and agencies and (ii) develop website for facilitated knowledge and information exchange -Establishment and support State-level farmer associations (one for each FSM state) in communities. 	<p>Engagement will be ongoing throughout the project starting from month 1, specifically through the following outputs and project administrative processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Steering Committee, 1 State-representative will be part of the project steering committee during implementation • Output 1.1: Institutional coordination mechanism established – <i>regular meetings to take place initially quarterly and then 2 per year for duration of project</i> • Output 1.2: Targeted climate change assessments conducted – <i>support to finalize ToR and identify community sites (Yr 1, Q1)</i> • Output 1.3: Climate change integrated into National and State policy making and planning, particularly in the agriculture sector – <i>meetings, workshops, and approval of changes to policy Yrs 1-2)</i> • Output 1.4: Develop network of State-level 	Starting Q1 – through end of project
--	---	--	---	--------------------------------------

	<i>community and state decision makers.</i>		farmer associations across FSM -- <i>attend meetings, support association development (Yrs 1-2)</i>	
College of Micronesia (COM-FSM)	COM-FSM is one of 2 Executing Entities for this project. COM-FSM conducts research and oversees a small pilot CSA program as part of as small-scale food security program. COM-FSM has been an executing partner on past food-security projects and has valuable experience to leverage for project success. COM-FSM will be in charge of implementing Components 2 and 3:	Full engagement from the COM-FSM will be essential for undertaking the bulk of the project activities. These all fall under Components 2 and 3.	COM-FSM representatives have been engaged as part of project development and will be an Executing Entity in the implementation of this project. COM-FSM will be part of the steering committee and will lead Components 2 and 3 of the project. COM-FSM will ensure that the following key issues are addressed; 1. Scaling up of the CSA practice from its pilot project into a national program 2. Leverage capacity building for farmers, extension agents and communities implementing the CSA practices and research into climate change resilient seed-varieties	Starting from project inception through end of project implementation

	<p><i>2.Enhance the food security of vulnerable households by introducing CSA practices</i></p> <p><i>3.Strengthen climate-resilient value-chains and market linkages across the agriculture sector</i></p>			
Women's Organizations/ Groups	<p>Key social institutions for empowering women in FSM and providing opportunities for gender mainstreaming and social advancement.</p> <p>Details of the women's groups targeted are included in the Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (Annex 4)</p>	<p>Behavioral change is a key measure of the project's success and executing entities will need the active engagement of communities to undertake almost every activity. Women's groups will be particularly key in carryout the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.4.3 Creating a forum and practice for knowledge sharing and innovation exchange across State-level farmer associations in all four States. - 2.3.1 Establishment of nurseries and seed banks at the State and community levels, which will include procurement of initial provisions of seedlings to the seed banks - 3.2.1 Establish key food processing techniques for households utilizing local climate-resilient produce - 3.3.1 Develop a communications plan for promoting local products 	<p>These organizations or groups will be key partners in engaging households and will be the primary targets for some of the technical and business model trainings envisioned as part of Component 3 (i.e. food processing and storage, local nutrition, school curriculums, etc.). Engagement with these groups will allow for undertaking the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gender mainstreaming of project activities 2. Creating new opportunities for income streams and livelihood advancement for vulnerable groups, particularly women 3. Community outreach and engagement 	<p>Initial consultation to begin with kick-off meeting (Q1, Year 1)); further development of gender action plan (Q1, Year 1)); collection of baseline data (Q1-4, Year 1)</p>

		(demonstrations, local forums, displays, events, school posters and campaigns). -3.3.3 Host community and school workshops at demonstration gardens highlighting the value of local food for families and youths	Details of engagement and specifics of the stakeholder meetings are outlined in the GAP (Annex 4)	
Farmer cooperatives and farmers	Farmers across FSM are the ultimate beneficiaries of the project. Engagement with farmers and existing farmers groups/co-ops is essential for the entire project and to achieve the overall project objective: <i>To improve the climate resiliency of 68,250 beneficiaries in FSM (63% of the population) by providing additional detail, training and coordination on climate change and climate vulnerability</i>	Behavioral change is a key measure of the project's success and executing entities will need the active engagement of farmers to undertake almost every activity. Particularly the following: 1. Awareness and training for CSA techniques 2. Support for importance of adapted livelihoods 3. Training for market connectivity and support 4. Dissemination of information to individual farmers and communicate	Farmers will need to be engaged throughout the project to ensure connectivity and dissemination of promoted CSA measures. Farming households will be targeted in particular for the following outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.4 Develop network of State-level farmer associations across FSM (<i>meetings and workshops to establish 1 State-level farmer association in each States (Yr 1); involvement in creation and attendance at forums for knowledge sharing (Yrs 3-5)</i>) 1.5 Develop and disseminate tailored communications materials leveraging existing 	Initial consultation to begin with kick-off meeting (Q1, Year 1)); Meetings across each State will take place monthly through the first 2 years of implementation (Years 1-2); Once State-level Associations are established (end of Year 2) a transition will be made to utilize State-level Associations as a

	<i>and providing new opportunities for improved food security through deployment of CSA techniques, improved market access, awareness building for local produce and nutrition, and reserve capacity for bridging periods.</i>		<p>climate information streams to support CSA interventions (<i>input in information needed, through surveys, meetings, workshops and trainings (Yrs 1-3)</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3 Provision of CSA packages including costs for hand tools, compost bin, organic manure, plant nutrients, seeds, and planting materials for individual households (<i>involved in trainings, mentoring workshops to utilize CSA interventions (Yrs 2-5)</i>) 	main conduit of disseminating information and trainings (Years 3-5)
Private sector/Market actors to include restaurants and street food vendors	<p>Operators within the agriculture value chain, particularly those already engaging in established and informal markets for the selling of local produce in FSM will critical to the successful implementation of Component 3 of the project:</p> <p><i>Strengthen climate-resilient value-chains and market linkages</i></p>	<p>These groups will be partners for the market access and linkages components of the project. With limited market availability and operation in FSM, these existing institutions will be key sources of best practices and lessons learned for scaling up agriculture markets and the private sector in FSM. Including engaged to support the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify market access and value chain linkages 2. Partnering with farmer groups 3. Leveraging and scaling up existing operations 	<p>Active engagement of the private sector and market actors that purchase food will be an essential part of Component 3. Specific outputs that will be targeted include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output 3.1 Support for the development of new markets and opportunities to increase the availability and affordability of local food (<i>Consultations to inform study conducted 4-5 times during Yr 1; follow-up consultations and validation workshop in Yr 2</i>) Output 3.2: Connect State-level farmer's associations 	<p>Initial consultation to begin with kick-off meeting (Q1, Year 1); Meetings and consultations to occur at least quarterly (Years 1-2); Validation workshop on business models/market linkages (Year 2); Linking to State farmer's</p>

	<i>across the agriculture sector</i>		with current food programs in FSM (<i>Consultations with local food programs stating in Yr 2 once per month, agreements entered with farmers associations Yrs 4-5</i>)	associations (Years 4-5)
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------

Stakeholder Risks and Risk Mitigation

MCT will continue to engage with key stakeholders and the executing entities and partners including the FSM NR&D, FSM DECEM, FSM's Department of Finance NDA Office, COM-FSM CRE and relevant state agencies, the private sector, NGOs, CSOs, etc. to finalize the project outcomes, outputs, activities and roles of each of the keys stakeholders at every stage or cycle of the project. Key stakeholder risks and planned mitigation strategies for each output are discussed below.

1.1 Institutional coordination mechanism established

Risk:

The project isn't able to establish a national coordination mechanism inclusive of key policymakers, researchers, and representatives from civil society organizations with the political will for advocating for the integration of climate change into national and state policies and planning. This would result in limited government buy-in and coordination of activities and ultimately sub-standard implementation for the ultimate end-users.

Risk Mitigation:

Selection of the national coordination mechanism members will be intensive and include representatives from the key stakeholder groups, strong environmental/conservation advocates, researchers and planners that can effectively incorporate climate change adaptation agriculture practices into national and state policies. Further enabling environment of resilient communities against the impacts of climate change throughout the FSM.

1.2 Targeted climate change assessments conducted

Risk:

Lack of locally available resources, experts, and capacity to conduct descaled climate change assessments in a very vast and diverse region such as the FSM will lead to unreliable data source for climate smart adaptation projects. Limited availability of these assessments will constrain the project's ability to properly target and support specific CSA packages targeting specific areas in the FSM.

Risk Mitigation:

Utilize currently available data and seek support from regional and international agencies such as SPC, USGS, NOAA and institutions of higher education including University Guam and University of Hawaii to support targeted and descaled climate change assessments that can be supportive of CSA decision-making.

1.3 Climate change integrated into National and State policy making and planning in the agriculture sector

Risk:

Policy makers not using the most recently available climate change information to drive decision making or not prioritizing to fully integrate climate change information into national agriculture policies.

Risk Mitigation:

Ensure the project is utilizing and sharing the most recent high-quality information available and particularly tailoring the information to support decision-making even for stakeholders starting with low climate literacy. Conduct workshops, awareness, and face to face meetings to provide policy makers with the most updated scientific information to help them make informed decisions and to advocate for building resilient communities throughout FSM.

1.4 Develop network of farmer association across FSM**Risk:**

Developing one centralized farmers group or cooperative in each state that will be representative of all farmers and Women's groups who will represent the interest of all farmers and women's leaders will be a challenge due to a limited number of small scale farmer groups throughout the FSM. One other risk is small getting the organized PGS groups and the Women's organizations to buy-in formalizing into one larger farmer group due to the past experiences of unsuccessful former farmer's cooperatives.

Risk Mitigation:

Use existing small farmers groups such as the PGS groups and women groups such as the Chuuk Women's Council, Pohnpei Women's Council to formalize one farmers association per state representing all PGS groups and women's organizations. The governing body for this centralized farmer group will be selected from the members of these PGS groups and women's groups and will ensure that the representatives are farmers themselves and help get support of buy-in from all small farmer groups and women's organizations.

There will also be an awareness workshop for farmers in states that do not have existing formal farmers groups and associations like Yap, Kosrae and other Chuuk islands that have yet to be reached. The main objectives for these workshops will include sharing the steps in establishing formal PGS groups, women's groups and farmers associations, advantages of establishing formal PGS groups, women's groups and farmers associations and the benefits of being part of this national project.

1.5 Develop and disseminate tailored communications materials leveraging existing climate information streams to support CSA interventions.**Risk:**

Developing communication materials that may not be applicable locally in some of the States due to the micro-climatic difference. The materials developed may also not reach the targeted audience due to remote locations.

Risk Mitigation:

Utilize currently available data and seek support from national and international agencies such as SPC, UoG, UH, USGS and NOAA to support targeted and descaled climate change assessments down to the local level. Consult with local agencies to translate or develop the communication materials that can reach the last-mile communities and farmers. Also, work with PGS farmers groups, women's groups, and the farmer associations to ensure all relevant stakeholders are reached.

2.1 Promote and establish traditional and climate resilient agroforestry systems appropriate for different island systems and to the climate conditions being faced (linked to findings from Outcome 1 and the CAAR project)

Risk:

Due to lack of understanding of the benefits of traditional agroforestry and CSA practices, local farmers may be reluctant to adopt new or different farming techniques and may not be interested in farming other crops that they are not used to farming.

Risk Mitigation:

Conduct learning exchanges on CSA using demonstration gardens to help develop local farmers' understanding and interest in adopting to CSA practices.

2.2 Build the capacity of FSM households and support channels to utilize climate adaptive farming techniques and effective household nutrition, including women-headed households

Risk:

Relying on households to adopt to CSA practices, identify market value chains and promote effective nutritional programs may be a far reached expectation from small scale farmers

Risk Mitigation:

Utilize extension agents and other partners as mentors and technical advisors for all households or farmers participating in this program to better connect the training on markets and CSA practices to the individual households.

2.3 Development of reserve capacity for overcoming periods of climate disruption

Risk:

Destruction of nurseries and seed banks due to severe weather events such as typhoons or cyclones.

Risk Mitigation:

The project will strategically locate nurseries and seed banks throughout the FSM in multiple locations in each state. Leverage the downscaled vulnerability assessments to identify optimal locations. Further, the project will ensure that the nurseries and seed banks are designed to be as structurally sound as possible.

3.1 Support for the development of new markets and opportunities to increase the availability and affordability of local food

Risk:

Low market demand for crops being cultivated and sold locally.

Risk Mitigation:

Develop market value chains throughout FSM to enable farmers to ship their crops to other FSM states. Further extension agents and other training/advisory mechanisms will help farmers

identify which crops to plant and when to capitalize on market dynamics. Further farmers will be encouraged to diversify their crops based on the needs of the consumers or their market chains.

3.2 Enhanced food processing and preservation

Risk:

Not many farmers may be interested in doing food processing due to lack of capacity and equipment to process food.

Risk Mitigation:

Conduct food training workshops to include demonstrations on processing and packaging. Provide farmer groups with food processing machinery and equipment for all farmers to access.

3.3 Increased consumption of local produce and awareness of benefits of local food

Risk:

Lack of interest in consumption of processed local food or the locally processed food may cost more than the imported processed food

Risk Mitigation:

Conduct nutritional awareness workshops throughout the FSM states highlighting the benefits of locally grown produce whether consumed fresh or processed. The project will also connect the local food to existing programs like the school lunch programs to ensure effective utilization.

Grievance Mechanism for MCT

MCT's Whistleblowing Policy provides people affected by any projects with an accessible, transparent, fair and effective process for raising complaints about environmental or social harms caused by any such project. Stakeholders can lodge a complaint via MCT's website (www.ourmicronesia.org). Formal complaints can also be forwarded to the Executive Director (director@ourmicronesia.org) who shall handle as appropriate. Grievance boxes will be installed at the PMU office and at the EE project office to allow those without internet to drop their grievance letters and these boxes should be checked weekly and contents to be delivered to the MCT office or whoever the letter is addressed to. Appropriate authority levels as specified in MCT's governance structure will handle all complaints, in a professional and timely way.

GCF Independent Redress Mechanism

Any persons or organizations with complaints about the project can also access the GCF's Independent Redress Mechanism. Complaints can be lodged directly through the GCF website at the following site:

<https://irm.greenclimate.fund>

Appendix 1: 2019-2020 Stakeholder Lists

Chuuk State FAP Workshop Attendance

	Name	Title	Organization
1	Kantito Kanas	Chief	Chuuk AG
2	Joakim Wassan	Technician	Chuuk AG
3	Brad Mori	Deputy Directo	Chuuk EPA
4	Marcellus Akapito	Executive Director	CCS
5	Clarice Graham	Finance Officer	CCS
6	Curtis Graham	Director	DMR
7	Maryrose Nakayama	Project Manager	CWC
8	Wisney Nakayam	Member of Chuuk State Legislator	Government
9	Snyther Biza	GIS officer	FSM DECEM
10	Marlyter Silbanuz	PM	FSM R&D
11	Roseo Marquez	MC/Grants Officer	MCT
12	Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio	Conservation Program Manager	MCT
13	Beverly Fred	Chuuk State PAN Coordinator	DMR
14	Roseo Marquez	MC/Grants Officer	MCT
15	Justin Fritz	Chuuk C4Life Coordinator	MCT
16	Kris Kanemeto	Chuuk State Ridge to Reef Coordinator	DMR
17	Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio	Conservation Program Manager	MCT
18	Boyd Mackenzie	Chuuk State Weather Service	NOAA

Kosrae State FAP Workshop Attendance

	Name	Title	Organization
1	Blair Charley	KIRMA	Director
2	Marlyter Silbanuz	PM	FSM R&D
3	Roseo Marquez	MC/Grants Officer	MCT
4	Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio	Conservation Program Manager	MCT
5	Snyther Biza	GIS officer	FSM DECEM
6	Faith Siba	FSM IWR R2R Project Manager	DECEM/KCSO
7	Maxson Nithian	State Forester	Kosrae
8	Hiroki Tanaka	Environmental Educator	KIRMA
9	Iliziva Lonno	Assistant Forester	KIRMA
10	Onniel Nena	Environmental Educator	KCSO
11	Likiak Melander	Administrator	DT&I
12	Erica Waguk	Education Assistant	KIRMA
13	Sam Isaac	Fisheries	DREA
14	Larry Alik	UBR	

15	Marston Luckymis	R2R Project Coordinator	KIRMA
16	Leonard Sigrah	IS Coordinator	KIRMA
17	Gibson Jone		KUB
18	Julie Kun		KUB
19	Austin Albert	Archaeological Survey Aid	KHPO/KIRMA
20	Kenye Livae	President	WIFK
21	Swenson Thomson	Archaeological Survey Aid	KHPO/KIRMA
22	Ezekiel Nena	Agriculture Extension	DREA
23	Jason Livae	Member	UMG

Yap State FAP Workshop Attendance

	Name	Title	Organization
1	Francis Ruegorong	Tech	DAF
2	Marlyter Silbanuz	PM	FSM R&D
3	Valentino Orhaitil	Technician	DAF
4	Christina Fillmed	Executive Director	Yap EPA
5	Martina Fichog	Nursery	DAF
6	Raphaela Tinngin	Coordinator of Volunteers	DAF
7	Tamdad Sulog	Chief	DAF
8	Cyril Yinnifel	member	COP
9	Snyther Biza	GIS officer	FSM DECEM
10	Michelle Chugen	Grant Manager	YSHPO
11	Antonia R. Defan	Grant Accountant	DAF
12	Ernie Y Guswel	Invasive Tehnician	DAF
13	Berna Gorong	Conservation Planner	TNC
14	Roseo Marquez	MC/Grants Officer	MCT
15	Liz Terk	Director of Conservation Science and Planning	TNC
16	Rachael Nash	Independent contractor	
17	Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio	Conservation Program Manager	MCT
18	Andrew Yinnifel	Invasive Species Spray Tech	DAF
19	Joseph Tutuw	Invasive Species Tech	DAF
20	Pius Liyagel	Forestry	DAF
21	Ezekial Kefathlee	Coordinator-Watershed	TRCT
22	Debra Laan	State Coordinator	R2R
23	Barth Yarofaishie	Nursery tech	DAF
24	Sabino Sauchomal	Executive Director	Yap CAP

Pohnpei FAP Workshop

Name	Title	Organization	Email	Date		
				8-Jan	9-Jan	10-Jan

1	Regina Moya	Assistant Coordinator	U&CF	xiexanmoya@gmail.com	x		
2	Santiago Joab	Project Manager	MCT	livelihoods@ourmicronesia.org	x	x	x
3	Jackson Phillip	CRE-COM FSM-Coordinator	Cooperative Research Extension	jphillip1127@gmail.com	x		x
4	Kanio Torres	Agriculture Agent	CRE-COM-FSM	kaniotorres95@gmail.com	x	x	x
5	Bryan Wichap Francisca	Agriculture Agent	CRE-COM-FSM	il.com	x	x	x
6	Obispo	Terrestrial Program Manager	CSP	bw.pnicre@gmail.com	x	x	x
7	Mark Kostka	Chief of Agriculture	R&D Pohnpei	m	x	x	x
8	Smithy Clark	Mayor of Pingelap	Pingelap Government	smithybclark@gmail.com	x	x	x
9	Engly Ioanis Konrad	Administrative Assistant	COM Land Grant program	microneisa.fsm@yahoo.com	x	x	
10	Englberger Tobias	consultant	self	hoo.com	x	x	x
11	Tamerlan Eugene	Extension Agent CRE	CRE-COM-FSM	ppmicroneisa@mail.fm	x	x	x
12	Eperiam	State Forester	NRM	tobias@comfsm.fm	x	x	x
13	Pelson Moses	Specialist	OFA	eeperiam@yahoo.com	x		
14	Clay Hedson Winfred	fisheries specialist	OFA	ofa.state.gov@gmail.com	x		
15	Mudong	SEM Coordinator	MCT	ofa.state.gov@gmail.com	x		
16	Jorg Anson	Coordinator	EPA-R2R	winfredmudong@gmail.com	x		
17	Liz Terk	Director, Conservation Science and Planning	TNC	jorgyanson@gmail.com	x		
18	Brad Soram	Environment Specialist	EPA	eterk@tnc.org	x	x	x
19	Stephen Boland	Senior Policy and Finance Advisor	USAID Climate Ready	bradsoram@gmail.com	x		
20	Patterson Shed	Regional Coordinator	USAID Climate Ready	sboland@pacificclimate.org	x		
21	Snyther Biza	GIS	FSM Decem	pshed@pacificclimate.org	x	x	
22	Saimon Lihpai Marlyter	PNI NRM Chief	FSM Decem	sbiza75@gmail.com	x		x
23	Silbanuz		FSM R&D	saimonlihpai@rockemail.com	x		x

	Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio Roseo	MCT Conservation Program Manager	MCT	conservation@ourmicronesia.org	x	x	x
24				sgo@ourmicronesia.org			
25	Marquez	MCT MC	MCT	director@ourmicronesia.org	x	x	x
26	Willian Kostka	Exectutive Director	MCT	pnistatepan@gmail.com	x		x
27	Douglas Kusto Rosaleen	R&D PAN	PAN	alanberts84@gmail.com	x	x	x
28	Alanzo	Secretary MMG	MMG		x		x
29	Welbert Perez Lucille Apis-Overhoff	MMG Police	MMG		x	x	x
30		Volunteer independent contractor		lu.overhoff@gmail.com	x	x	x
31	Rachael Nash		self	nash.rachael@gmail.com	x	x	x
32	Marciano Imar	FSM SAPS?	FSM R&D	ramsimar18@gmail.com		x	x
33	Justin Lemuel Senard		CSP	justinlemuel415@gmail.com		x	x
34	Leopold Rodasio	Mayor	Nukuoro			x	x
35	Samuel Angel	Conservation Director	USDA NRCS	rodasio.samuel@usda.gov		x	x
36	Jonathan	educator	CSP	angejonathan@gmail.com		x	x
37	Eugene Joseph Gyrone	Director	CSP	eujoeph925@gmail.com		x	x
38	Samuel	Agriculture Agent II	CRE-COM-FSM	gs.pnicre@gmail.com		x	
39	Bejay Obispo Kohsak Keller	Terrestrial	CSP	bejayobispo81@gmail.com		x	
40	Jr	Extension Agent CRE	CRE-COM-FSM	kjr.pnicre@gmail.com		x	