

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Bamboo and other adaptive forest-related species for Cameroon's economic growth: Helping Communities Address Land Degradation, and Mitigate and Adapt to the Effects of Climate Change		
Project proponent:	Implementing agency: IUCN Executing agencies: International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR)		
Funding agency:	GEF		
Country:	Cameroon	Total costs (indicate currency):	\$US 1,323,250
Estimated start date and duration:		Total costs in CHF:	
		Exchange rate (if applicable):	
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	NO		

Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the questionnaire is presented in Annex A

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Kenneth ANGU ANGU, Regional Forest Programme Coordinator	7/28/2017
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 <u>and</u> the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p>	

Step 2: ESMS Screening

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

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	07sep2017
	Remi Jiagho	Programme Officer	
	Title: Coordinator Environmental & Social Management System (ESMS)		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	ESMS Questionnaire		
	GEF 9264 ProDoc Cameroun TRI		06 jul 2017

ESMS Screening Report

Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk
Rationale Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization <i>See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:</i> Section A for findings about the stakeholder engagement process, Section B on the 4 Standards, Section C on other E&S impacts and Section D on risk issues related to Climate change	<p>The project's goal is to contribute to the restoration of degraded lands and forests through SLM and SFM, and to provide resilient livelihoods to communities in Cameroon. It involves work at the policy level (component 1: legislation and capacity building), at institutional level (component 3: improving capacities and financing mechanisms for promoting SLM and SFM) as well supporting concrete restoration programmes and SLM initiatives in four pilot sites with the focus on promoting the use of indigenous bamboo species (component 2) . The latter will involve concrete field interventions and be guided by the ROAM methodology (Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology).</p> <p>Social and environmental impacts are expected to be largely positive as the ROAM methodology is a tested model for guiding forest restoration processes and is designed with a strong focus on stakeholder engagement. Positive social impacts are expected from the project through diversification of revenue and subsistence opportunities (in areas such as</p>

	<p>agroforestry and non-timber forest products) and improvements in energy efficiency through the provision of cook stoves and training in bamboo charcoal production. There are a few minor risks delineated in section C that will need to be addressed in the project document. One conceptual recommendation relates to the approach taken vis-à-vis vulnerable groups. If the project intends to focus the social benefits primarily on vulnerable groups, as expressed in the executive summary, this would need to be reflected more strongly in the project's results framework and project activities.</p> <p>The status of the Standards is indicated below, the justification can be found in the respective sections of the questionnaire (B1 to B4). These sections also outline requirements related to the respective standards to be addressed or articulated in the project document. For some Standards the trigger decision will depend on the outcome of the ROAM process.</p> <p>Despite expecting overall positive environmental and social impacts, there is a need for caution as the application of the ROAM methodology process implies that the restoration interventions will only be decided after having undertaken respective consultation and analysis in each site. In order to ensure that the project activities are compliant with the ESMS, the project document will need to provide a methodological description of the ROAM process that demonstrates adherence to ESMS principles and standards. This should include a "mini-screening" in order to detect potential environmental or social risk issues. Such ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework is considered equivalent to an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) which would usually be required in circumstances where project activities will only be defined during the implementation phase.</p> <p>Because the project's concrete restoration interventions and their sites are not known yet combined with the fact that stakeholder engagement at the local level has been quite limited so far and that at least three Standards are triggered, resulted in the classification of the project as a moderate risk project.</p>	
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	<p>A gender mainstreaming plan has been developed that demonstrates relevant gender actions related to the different outputs. It is recommended, though, to have these intentions more strongly articulated in the project results framework through indicators disaggregated by gender, in particular for component 2 (e.g. engagement in ROAM process, access to training and other benefits, etc.).</p>	
Required assessments or tools	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Methodological description of ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process</p>	
ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts	Trigger	Required tools or plans
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

Step 3: ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

The fields below are completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer at Clearance stage

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	7.2.2019
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:	ESMS enhanced ROAM Cameroon_FINAL		20.12.2017
	GEF ProDoc TRI Cameroon 28 02 18		28.2.2018
	GEF6-Cameroon-IUCN-TRI-CEO endorsement request		28.2.2018
Have findings from ESIA triggered any changes (e.g. risk level or Standards triggered)	no		
CLEARANCE DECISION			
<input type="checkbox"/> Cleared	<i>The conclusions are positive and the project proposal meets all requirements with regards to avoiding or reducing environmental and social risks: the proposal is accepted.</i>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conditionally cleared	<i>The conclusions call for improving one or more ESMS activities and/or for important re-formulation of some mitigation measures. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance rejected	<i>Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, critical mitigation measures have not been incorporated or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.</i>		
Rationale – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected)	The project has been screened on environmental and social risks which resulted in the classification of the project as a moderate risk project due to a limited number of social risks but most importantly due to the fact that concrete restoration activities and associated livelihood strategies will only be decided during implementation. Because the identified social risks are overall considered minor and the fact that in this project risks would be exclusively associated with the FLR interventions under outcome 2 - defined through the ROAM planning process - motivated the decision to enhance the methodological guidance of the ROAM planning process by incorporating key principles and provisions of the ESMS. The ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework has been reviewed and its equivalence to an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which would usually be required in circumstances where project activities will only be defined during project implementation, has been confirmed.		
Clearance conditions (when conditionally cleared, e.g. tasks to be completed during inception phase):	The project is cleared on the basis that the process outlined in the Process Framework is fully adhered to following the institutional arrangements described in chapter IV of the Process Framework. This needs to be evidence in the technical reporting and during the supervision missions. If risks of agreed FLR intervention have been identified the Project Coordinator needs to establish an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and report on its implementation which should be integral part of the project's monitoring procedure (see chapter V).		
Approval ESMS Clearance			
Name	Function	Date	Signature
Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	Director IUCN GEF/GCF	7.2.2019	