

## ESMS Questionnaire and Screening Report – for non-field projects

This template has been designed for **non-field projects** such as projects which support policy making, strategy development or upstream planning processes or provide knowledge through capacity building or knowledge products. While these projects in themselves can be considered to have no direct potential environmental or social risks, the risks of the future implementation of policies, strategies or plans or of knowledge provided through capacity building or knowledge products may be significant. This is why these types of projects are included in the ESMS's scope of application. While the future implementation of such plans, strategies etc. may be outside IUCN's managerial responsibility, projects should take environmental and social risks related to their implementation into consideration. A different template is available for **field projects**.

Very small projects such as organizing workshops, meeting or conferences, position papers, scientific paper, reports, preparation of scientific materials for subsequent use in conferences or communication are outside the scope of the ESMS and don't require the completion of the ESMS Questionnaire.

### Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

|   |  |                                |               |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Project Title:                                      | Fostering Partnerships to Build Coherence and Support for Forest Landscape Restoration (CPF) |                                |               |
| Project proponent:                                  | GFCCP; Carole Saint-Laurent  |                                |               |
| Executing agency:                                   | IUCN, CBD, CIFOR, FAO, ICRAF, ITTO, IUFRO, UNDP, UN Environment, UNCCD, World Bank, UNFF     |                                |               |
| Funding agency:                                     | GEF  |                                |               |
| Country:  | Global   | Contract value (add currency): | \$681,250 USD |
| Start date and duration:                            | May 7, 2018  | Amount in CHF:                 | 669,512       |
| Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before? | <input type="checkbox"/> yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no                       | Provide details, if yes:       |               |

### 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:                            | Joshua Schneck, Project Manager  | 4/25/2018                                    |
| ESMS Screening is<br><i>(tick one of the three options)</i> | <b>1. <input type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000</b><br><b>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (&lt; CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risk issues when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</b><br><b>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not required because project budget is &lt; CHF 500,000 and no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire (or only low risks that are fully addressed by the project activities); this is confirmed below by naming the staff member who carried out the self-screening.</b> |  |
| <i>Only applicable when option 3 is ticked above</i>        | Name and function of individual representing project proponent   | <b>Risk category</b>                         |
| Self-screening of ESMS risks completed by:                  | Joshua Schneck, Project Manager  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> low risk |

## 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       | 18.11.2018 |
|   |  |                        |            |
|   | Title  |                        | Date       |
| Documents submitted at Screening stage: | GEF6 CEO Endorsement Request_CPF FLR_Fostering Partnerships_June_7_2018_CLEAN        |                        | 7.6.2018   |
|   | GEF6-IUCN-MSP-LD-Global-Fostering Partnerships to Build Coherence and Support on FLR |                        | 10.7.2018  |
|   |  |                        |            |

| ESMS Screening Report  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Risk category:</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> low risk <input type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk   |
| <p><b>Rationale:</b> Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization</p> <p>See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:</p> <p><b>Section A</b> for findings about the stakeholder engagement process,<br/> <b>Section B</b> on the 4 Standards,<br/> <b>Section C</b> on other E&amp;S impacts and<br/> <b>Section D</b> on risk issues related to Climate change</p> | <p>The project is considered low risk as it will assess and report principally at the global, regional and national levels. While ultimately the assessment and advice given should lead to improved forest landscape management on the ground, the pathway between the project and the action on the ground is considered very indirect. However, it is recommended to take key ESMS principles into consideration when drafting reports, developing outreach, advising on strategies or providing guidance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder engagement – ensure that the selection of actors to be involved in FLR decision making processes (planning and design of the actual intervention, implementation and monitoring) is inclusive (e.g. local communities and specific sub-groups);</li> <li>• Providing for cultural appropriate engagement strategies for indigenous peoples and using free, prior and informed consent where rights and livelihood might be affected;</li> <li>• The need to diligently assess social and environmental risks prior to any future FLR intervention and to provide for appropriate risk management strategies (avoidance and mitigation), in particular for             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential negative impacts on different groups (in particular vulnerable, marginalized groups, including women, indigenous people),</li> <li>○ inadvertent unsustainable use of resources,</li> <li>○ potential risks to cultural heritage and risks from FLR interventions failing to adequately consider effects of climate change;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensuring recognition of rights of local communities (including customary rights);</li> <li>• Improving governance of forest resources (more inclusive forms, increased transparency etc.) and seeking opportunities for improving land tenure conditions for small holders and local community members;</li> </ul> |
| <b>Required assessments</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |
| <b>Required actions for gender mainstreaming</b>   | Inclusive engagement strategies as mentioned above should provide for meaningful engagement of women and for increasing the voice, participation, representation and leadership of women. Gender equality and women's and girls' rights and empowerment  |

|  | should be championed as well as equitable access to, use of, control over and benefits from forest resources. Opportunities for harnessing knowledge, practices, values and innovations of women and men for forest resource management should be sought. |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>ESMS Standards and other E&amp;S Impacts</b>  | <b>Trigger</b>  | <b>Required tools or plans</b>   |
| Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions<br><i>(see section B1 for details)</i>                | <input type="checkbox"/> yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no<br><input type="checkbox"/> TBD  | <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan<br><input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework<br><input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction<br><input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework |
| Indigenous Peoples<br><i>(see section B2 for details)</i>  | <input type="checkbox"/> yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no<br><input type="checkbox"/> TBD  | <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan  |
| Cultural Heritage<br><i>(see section B3 for details)</i>   | <input type="checkbox"/> yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no<br><input type="checkbox"/> TBD  | <input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures  |
| Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources<br><i>(see section B4 for details)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> yes<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no<br><input type="checkbox"/> TBD  | <input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan  |

# Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

## Project summary

*To be completed by project proponent - Please summarise the project briefly (if possible no more than one page). The summary can be in form of bullet points. Include goal/objectives, expected results/outcomes, outputs (project deliverables) and main activities.*

This project, a Joint Initiative of the CPF, positions the CPF to play a catalytic role in strengthening national and international support and engagement on FLR. It will do this by making full use of the CPF's role, unique membership, and position within the UN system to enhance coherence and effective engagement among CPF member FLR programs, to strengthen coherence and integration of FLR within national and international policy including REDD+ policies, and by facilitating the mobilization of additional and needed finance for FLR.

This project will play a key role in supporting effective implementation of the United Nations Strategic Plan for Forests 2017-2030 (UNSPF) and its six Global Forest Goals and associated targets, particularly Global Forest Goal 6, "enhance cooperation, coordination, coherence and synergies on forest-related issues at all levels, including within the UN System and across CPF member organizations". The UNSFP identifies CPF Joint Initiatives and joint programming as critical means for implementation of the UNSPF.

**Project Objective:** To enhance synergies in the global FLR process and assist countries and stakeholders to scale up and to strengthen implementation of FLR at national and sub-national levels.

**Project Outputs** are as follows:

- Output 1.1.1: Global report on the potential contribution that FLR can make towards achieving commitments under the UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD, UNFF and the SDGs, providing examples from champion countries where synergies are being optimized.
- Output 1.1.2: Awareness raising and knowledge sharing/learning events in collaboration with the Global Landscapes Forum, Convention COPs, and/or other relevant fora.
- Output 1.2.1: Series of thematic reports and learning events at the regional and national levels identifying high-value opportunities for reform of normative, fiscal and other financial policies and incentives.
- Output 1.2.2: Outreach campaign to support mainstreaming of FLR into national policy frameworks.
- Output 2.1.1: Support to the development of bankable project proposals in collaboration with the Global Forest Financing Facilitation Network (GFFFN), with facilitated smallholder/private-sector engagement.
- Output 2.2.1: Identified opportunities for enhanced synergies and partnership among emerging cross-national programs on FLR from the GEF, GCF, LDN Fund, BIOFIN and others
- Output 3.1.1: Regular communication amongst the CPF-FLR Steering Committee of contributing organizations and twice-yearly convening of all participating CPF members to reinforce coherence and capture of synergies among CPF member FLR programs.
- Output 3.1.2: Analysis of CPF member programs on FLR and identified opportunities for capturing synergies.
- Output 3.1.3: Identified actions by which members of the CPF could provide useful support to countries to foster forest landscape restoration, including developing technical and scientific capacities and forming partnerships on science, technology and innovation.
- Output 3.1.4: Links and interoperability between open data platforms to facilitate the sharing and synthesis of information on FLR.

**Anticipated impacts:** The project will indirectly contribute to the achievement of global environmental benefits and socio-economic benefits through facilitated expanded implementation of FLR, complementary measures to avoid further forest loss and deforestation, and contributions that restored forested ecosystems can make to the generation of ecosystem services and restored wildlife species. This includes benefits to biodiversity and to climate – through enhanced sequestration and reduced emissions, and from expanded application of sustainable land management in production systems, particularly forested landscapes.

## A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

*Section A is not applicable for non-field projects*

## B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards

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

|   | <b>Project proponent</b>                          | <b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>  |
|---|---|--|
|   | Yes, no, n/a, TBD                                 |  |
|   | <i>Answer question and provide further detail</i> | <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>   |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might lead to future relocation or resettlement of people? <b>if yes, answer a-b below</b>   | No  | <i>Shaded cells do not need to be filled out</i>   |
| a. Describe the project activities that might prompt relocation or resettlement of people   |   |  |
| b. Have risks been considered and advice been given to minimise adverse impacts? If yes, explain.   |   |  |
| 2. Is there a risk that advice or knowledge provided by the project might lead to future restrictions on access to land or natural resources or changes in the use and management of natural resources and associated negative impacts on people? <b>if yes, answer a-b below</b> | No  |  |
| a. Describe how project activities might prompt access restrictions and negative impacts on people.   |   |  |
| b. Have these risks been considered and advice been given to minimise adverse impacts? If yes, explain how.   |   |  |
| 3. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might negatively influence current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources or land through measures other than access restrictions?   | No  |  |
|   |   | Project will assess and report principally at the global, regional and national levels, and there is no identified pathway where by providing advice or knowledge the project might negatively influence current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources or land through measures other than access restrictions. |

### Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer<sup>1</sup> on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

|   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| <b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>   | No | The project does not include any activities that would require physical or economic displacement. Hence the Standard is not triggered. |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> |    |  |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   |    |  |

<sup>1</sup> If the project budget is < CHF 500,000 this field (and the equivalent fields below) needs to be completed by the proponent (instead of the IUCN ESMS Reviewer).

| <b>B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples<sup>2</sup></b> |   |                          |  |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|
|   |   | <b>Project proponent</b> | <b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>  |
|   |   | <i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i> | <i>Answer question and provide further detail</i>  |
|   |   |                          | <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>   |
| 1.  | Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might indirectly affect the rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples? Consider material and non-material impacts on livelihoods (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)? | No                       | Project does not provide advice or knowledge that might indirectly affect the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples. Project promotes best practices in FLR, that include express recognition and support for livelihoods of indigenous peoples, and free, prior, and informed consent. |
| 2.  | Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?  | No                       | Project has no field components nor work that would prompt the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples.   |
| 3.  | Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project prompt the use of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples?   | No                       | Possibly – best practice FLR, as promoted by the Project, certainly includes bringing indigenous peoples into the process of planning, implementing, and monitoring forest landscape restoration, using best practice free, prior and informed consent.  |
| 4.  | Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to promote culturally appropriate and gender inclusive benefits to indigenous peoples.  |                          | Project has no field components and does not, as a objective, seek to promote culturally appropriate and gender inclusive benefits to indigenous peoples.  |

### **Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples**

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| <b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>   | No | The project does not include any activities that would negatively impact, or present risks to, Indigenous Peoples in any way. Hence the Standard is not triggered |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> |    |   |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   |    |   |

| <b>B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage<sup>3</sup></b> |  |                          |   |
|--|--|--------------------------|---|
|  |  | <b>Project proponent</b> | <b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>                         |
|  |  | <i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i> | <i>Answer question and provide further detail</i> |
|  |  |                          | <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>        |
|  |  |                          |   |

<sup>2</sup>The coverage of indigenous peoples includes: (i) peoples who identify themselves as "indigenous" in strict sense; (ii) tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and (iii) traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services

<sup>3</sup> Cultural heritage is defined as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resource or site with paleontological, archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community, or natural feature or resource with cultural, religious, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature.

|   |    |  |  |
|---|----|--|--|
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger physical interventions that affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?   | No | Project will assess and report principally at the global, regional and national levels, and there is no identified pathway where by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger physical interventions that affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources.   |  |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt access restrictions to cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance (relevant for local users)? | No | Project will assess and report principally at the global, regional and national levels, and there is no identified pathway where by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt access restrictions to cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance (relevant for local users). |  |
| 3. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project prompt the development of economic or social benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?                                 | No | Extremely unlikely - Project has no field components and there is no identified pathway where by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt the development of economic or social benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance.   |  |

**Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage**

|   |    |  |  |
|---|----|--|--|
| <b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>   | No | The project does not include any activities that would negatively impact, or present risks to, cultural resources. Hence the Standard is not triggered |  |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> |    |  |  |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   |    |  |  |

**B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources**

|   | Project proponent        | IUCN ESMS Reviewer   |
|---|--------------------------|--|
|   | <i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i> | <i>Answer question and provide further detail</i>  |
|   |                          | <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>   |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might inadvertently affect biodiversity in areas of high biodiversity value? Consider risks related to the development of infrastructure for PA management or to ecotourism.                 | No                       | The project will provide reports and information on forest landscape restoration benefits and best practices. Conservation and enhancement of biodiversity is one objective of restoration to be considered in designing any best-practice FLR intervention. |
| 2. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project trigger risks for biodiversity related to the introduction or translocation of species (e.g. development invasive characteristics) or other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through | No                       | The project will provide reports and information on forest landscape restoration benefits and best practices. Addressing and mitigating any risks related to the introduction or translocation of species or other pathways for spreading                    |

|  |    |   |  |
|--|----|---|--|
| creation of corridors, introduction of facilitatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?   |    | invasive species would necessarily need to be considered in designing any best-practice FLR intervention.   |  |
| 3. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger activities that negatively affect the hydrological cycle, water flows, river connectivity or water quality? | No | Project has no field components and there is no identified pathway where by providing advice or knowledge the project might trigger activities that negatively affect the hydrological cycle, water flows, river connectivity or water quality. |  |
| 4. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt an unsustainable use of living natural resources?  | No | Project promotes increased knowledge and application of best practices FLR, that promotes the sustainable use of natural resources.   |  |
| 5. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt uncontrolled application of pest management techniques?  | No | Project promotes increased knowledge and application of best practices FLR, that promotes the sustainable use of natural resources.   |  |

### Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

|   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| <b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>   | No | The Project does not include any field intervention; hence no negative direct impacts on biodiversity components are expected. Moreover, best practice FLR – the kind promoted by this Project – has as one objective the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, and promotion of sustainable use of natural resources. |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> |    |  |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   |    |  |

### C. Other social or environmental impacts

#### C1: Other social impacts

|  | Project proponent |   | IUCN ESMS Reviewer                  |
|--|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
|  | Yes, no, n/a, TBD | Answer question and provide further detail  | Comments, additional considerations |
| 1. Will / might the advice or knowledge provided by the project trigger risks related to human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? | No                | No risks related to human rights will arise due to Project activities.  |                                     |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt or aggravate inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the livelihood conditions of women or girls in other ways?  | No                | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project – includes designing and implementing restoration in a gender sensitive way, that does not prompt or aggravate inequalities between women and men or adversely impact the livelihood conditions of women or girls. |                                     |
| 3. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?  |                   | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project – includes designing and implementing  |                                     |



|   |    |   |  |
|---|----|---|--|
|   |    | restoration in a gender sensitive way, that seeks opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women.  |  |
| 4. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?  |    | Best practice restoration – the kind promoted and supported by the project –seeks opportunities to provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources. |  |
| 5. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt risks for vulnerable groups <sup>4</sup> in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation? | No | No risks related to vulnerable groups in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or the discrimination or marginalisation of these groups will arise due to Project activities.   |  |
| 6. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might prompt conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.                        | No | The project will provide information on forest landscape restoration experiences and best practices. There is little to no chance that advice/knowledge provided by the Project would prompt conflict among communities, groups or individuals. |  |
| 7. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?        | No | There is no risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems.  |  |
| 14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?  | No |   |  |
| 15. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?   | No |   |  |

## C2: Other environmental impacts

|  | Project proponent        | IUCN ESMS Reviewer                                |
|--|--------------------------|---|
|  | <i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i> | <i>Answer question and provide further detail</i> |
|  |                          | <i>Comments, additional considerations</i>        |
| 1. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to? | No                       | Project has no field component.                   |
| 2. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?                                      | No                       | Project has no field component.                   |

## Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts

<sup>4</sup> Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

|   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| <b>Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?</b>   | No  | This Project does not include any field intervention and negative direct or indirect impacts are not expected. |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> | N/A |  |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   | N/A |  |

**D. Climate change risks** (Risks caused by a failure to adequately take the effects of climate change on people and ecosystem into consideration)

|   | Project proponent  |  | IUCN ESMS Reviewer                  |
|---|--------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
|   | Yes,no,<br>n/a,TBD | Answer question and provide further detail   | Comments, additional considerations |
| 1. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future climate variability and changes (e.g., through risks and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding or droughts)? | No                 | Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the vulnerability of local communities to current and future climate variability and changes.   |                                     |
| 2. Is there a risk that by providing advice or knowledge the project might increase the vulnerability of the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes?  | No                 | Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the ecosystems to current and future climate variability and changes.   |                                     |
| 3. Explain whether the project seeks opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?   |                    | Yes - Project promotes best practice restoration of degraded landscapes – thereby decreasing the vulnerability of local communities to current and future climate variability and changes and increasing the adaptive capacity of these communities. |                                     |

**Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Climate Change Risks**

|   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| <b>Are negative impacts expected from the project?</b>  | No  | No negative impacts are expected from this Project |
| <b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b> | N/A |  |
| <b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>   | N/A |  |