Template -
ESMS Manual

**Environmental & Social
Management System
(ESMS)**

Date: 02 Dec 2016

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Building Climate Resilient Green Infrastructure: enhancing ecosystem services of planted forests in China through forest landscaperestoration and governance innovation
Project proponent:	IUCN China
Executing agency:	State Forest Administration of the People's Republic of China
Funding agency:	GEF-6
Country:	China	Contract value (add currency):	USD 7,200,000
Start date and duration:	January 1, 2018; 4 years	Amount in CHF:	
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	☒ yes ☐ no	Provide details, if yes:	The IUCN ESMS unit (L. Klare) performed a quick screening based on review of an early draft on May 6, 2017.

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:	Louis Putzel, Lead International Consultant	June 4, 2017
ESMS Screening is *(tick one of the three options)*	1. ☒ required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000 2. ☐ required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire 3. ☐ 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	

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, IUCN HQ	11 Aug 2017
	Scott Perkin	Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office	11 Aug 2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	7-5-17 TRI China PRODOC		5 July 2017

ESMS Screening Report			
Risk category:	☐ low risk	☒ moderate risk	☐ high risk

Rationale: Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization *See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:* **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*	The project aims to improve the flow of ecosystem services from selected forest landscapes, and is expected to enhance livelihoods, build climate resilience and conserve biodiversity. Environmental and social impacts are expected to be largely positive, as the project intends to restore forest landscapes and employ the FLR/ROAM methodology - a tested model for forest restoration processes that entails strong stakeholder participation. Applying the FLR/ROAM process means that it is not possible at the project design stage to flesh out all project activities as these will be decided after having undertaken consultations and analyses at each site. The strength of the FLR approach is that the restoration strategies are locally designed together with relevant stakeholders and developed through a combination of advanced ecological technical expertise, situation analysis and understanding of local interests (across scales and sectors). In order to ensure that the restoration strategies / project activities are compliant with the ESMS, the Prodoc will need to include 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 an 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. While the risks are generally considered relatively low, the fact that concrete restoration activities have not yet been identified and that at least one Standard is triggered (with some probability that others will be triggered as well) requires the classification of the project as a moderate risk project. This will allow for the provision of adequate ESMS supervision during project implementation.
Required assessments	☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) ☐ Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) Ⲭ Other: Methodological description of the ESMS–enhanced ROAM Process Framework
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	It is recognized that an effort was made to actively involve women in the stakeholder consultations during the PPG phase. Unfortunately, the focus groups were strongly dominated by men, which of course can partly be attributed to general characteristic of the forest sector (male dominance). The fact that a few activities were explicitly designed with a gender focus (e.g. gender disaggregated situation analysis, disaggregated analysis in the FR/ROAM process) is well received. It is further acknowledged that the pilot area advisory boards are intended to be formed in a gender balanced way. This will need to be monitored during implementation, though. The chapter on safeguards refers to principles to ensure Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women; however, it remains unclear how these principles are concretely applied and reflected in the overall prodoc. While the monitoring and evaluation plan (table 25) refers to using gender disaggregated data, the results framework so far only presents one indicator as gender disaggregated- this should be improved. Likewise, the stakeholder engagement plan would be a good place to demonstrate a gender-balanced approach; so far the targets have not been disaggregated.

ESMS Standards	**Trigger**	**Required tools or plans**
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions *(see section B1 for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no X TBD	☐ Resettlement Action Plan ☐ Resettlement Policy Framework ☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction ☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples *(see section B2 for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no X TBD	☐ Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage *(see section B3 for details)*	☐ yes ☐ no X TBD	☐ Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources *(see section B4 for details)*	X yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ 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 China		29.11.2017
	TRI China_ProDoc_Revised_Jan 16 2018		16.1.2018
	GEF6 CEO Endorsement-TRI China - Revised Final draft		16.1.2018
Have findings from ESIA triggered any changes (e.g. risk level or Standards triggered)	no		

CLEARANCE DECISION	
☐ **Cleared**	*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.*
☒ **Conditionally cleared**	*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.*
☐ **Clearance rejected**	*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.*
Rationale – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected)	ESMS relevant activities are primarily implemented under component 1 which aims at building the capacity of China's State Forest Farms (SFFs) to develop and implement sustainable forest management and restoration (FMR) plans incorporating FLR and piloting this in selected project areas. In order to ensure that the FRM plans developed by the pilot SFFs and the city & county FLR plans designed during the FLR/ROAM exercise are compliant with the ESMS, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been developed. The ESMF describes the process for screening, assessing, addressing and managing safeguard issues for project activities that will only be known during project preparation; it also provides for ESMS review of the policies and legal frameworks supported by the project under component 2 in order to facilitate possible application of safeguard instruments as risk prevention. The ESMF has been reviewed and cleared.
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 ESMF is fully adhered to following the institutional arrangements described in chapter III d) of the ESMF. 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 Management Office (PMO) led by the national Project Manager 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 III e).

Approval ESMS Clearance			
Name	**Function**	**Date**	**Signature**
Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	Director IUCN GEF/GCF	7.2.2019	