ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report - for field projects

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 *(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 and 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	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:	☐ 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'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). 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 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. 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. 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. 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.
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	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.).
Required assessments or tools	☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) ☐ Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA) ☐ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) ☐ Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) ☐ Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) ☒ Other: Methodological description of ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process

ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts	**Trigger**	**Required tools or plans**
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	☐ yes ☐ no ☒ TBD	☐ Resettlement Action Plan ☐ Resettlement Policy Framework ☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction ☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples	☒ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage	☒ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	☒yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☐ Pest Management Plan

Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

As one of the eleven Child Projects ofThe Restoration Initiative (TRI), this project has been developped to contribute towards global efforts in support of the Bonn Challenge for Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR).

The Cameroon country-level purpose of this TRI is to contribute to the restoration of degraded lands, conservation of indigenous biodiversity, Sustainable Land Management (SLM), Sustainable Management of locally controlled Tree resources and Forest (SFM), and to provide resilient livelihoods to communities while ensuring vulnerable groups (women, indigenous peoples) in the pilot sites derive maximum benefits and are not impacted on, negatively.

The project will focus on four pilot sites located in four regions of Cameroon affected by deforestation and land degradation; and with opportunities for Bamboo protection and development: These comprise; Centre, SouthWest, Far North, and Northwest. However, it is envisaged that best practices during project mplementation will be easily scaled-out to similar regions of Cameroon.

The project objectives are to be achieved through the implementation of four interrelated components:
(1) Integrating Forest Landscape Management into the Cameroonian legislation,
(2) Supporting restoration programmes and alternative SLM initiatives,
(3) Strengthening institutional capacities and financing arrangements,
(4) Improving knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

The total cost of investment in the project is estimated at 2,323,250 USD of which 1,323,250 USD from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). It is envisaged that through carefully selected pilot locations the results of the project will leveraged and facilitated by on-the-ground government efforts, through co-financing by other complementary IUCN projects and through the efforts of others sister organizations.

Project: Bamboo and other adaptive forest-related species for Cameroon's economic growth: Helping Communities Access Renewable Energy, Address Land Degradation, and Mitigate and Adapt to the Effects of Climate Change		
Project objective: Strengthen the conservation of globally threatened species in Cameroon by improving biodiversity enforcement, resilience and management.		
Component	Outcomes	Outputs
Component 1: Integrating FLR into national legislation and management practices	Outcome 1.Increased national commitment to forest landscape restoration and sustainable land management	Output 1.1: Institutional Capacities are strengthened for an optimal policy making
		Output 1.2: National legislation and strategies on forest and environment issues incorporate clause on biodiversity maintenance obligation for at least 9000 hectares degraded land and for sustainable land management for at least 10 000 hectares forests.
Component 2: supporting restoration programmes and alternative SLM initiatives	Outcome 2. Improved environment and capacities for large-scale FLR and for SLM and GHG emissions reduction	Output 2.1: Large-scale Forest Landscape Restoration are undertaken in 11 Community Forests in Centre, NorthWest and SouthWest Cameroon (9 000 ha restored)
		Output 2.2: Community Forests' people capacities are strengthened for Sustainable Land Management and biodiversity maintenance in Centre, NorthWest and SouthWest regions for at least 10 000 ha
		Output 2.3: Cameroon has contributed to Climate Change mitigation by promoting renewable energy
Component 3: Strengthening institutional capacities and financing arrangements to allow for and facilitate large-scale land restoration and maintenance	Outcome 3. Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements in place to allow for and facilitate large-scale restoration and maintenance of selected pilot sites in Cameroon	Output 3.1: Technical staff of line ministries (MINFOF/MINEPDED) and civil society organizations have been trained on restoration management
		Output 3.2: Innovative financing mechanisms (PES, small credit schemes, voluntary carbon market) are established to raise value of resource for SLM and FLR and to consistently promote SLM and FLR projects
Component 4: Support and generate knowledge products from lessons learned to facilitate information sharing and capacities of stakeholders in FLRs initiatives and project management	Outcome 4.Improved knowledge of best practices on restoration among key external audience	Output 4.1.1: Stakeholders are informed on the project's progress, and the M&E is improved and easier to access
		Output 4.1.2: Information and other knowledge products on FLR and SLM is consistently made more accessible to stakeholders

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

1. Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only interests and influence of stakeholders but also whether there are any stakeholders that might be affected by the project? Does the stakeholder analysis disaggregate between women and men, where relevant and feasible?

To be completed by project proponent

Yes, a Comprehensive Stakeholder Analyses has been performed; facilitated by a preparations process; stakeholder mapping, sites pre-selection, selections, local and national stakeholders consultations, due diligence; holding of an Inception and validation workshops. Furthermore as a first step during implementation, a sub national Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology – ROAM has been built-into project implementation to be performed in relevant sites, to pin-point and articulate local level stakeholder needs; facilitate gender/sex differentiation, identification and analyses of indigenous people's specific needs and priorities; and involve them in participatory Monitoring ad Evaluation of project outcomes, impacts and threat mitigation. Typically, the ROAM analysis uses Gender-sensitive approaches combining IUCN's gender tools with WOCAN's criteria for ensuring participation and empowerment of women's groups and of other groups traditionally marginalized in natural resources management. Although disaggregation between men and women was an overall strategy in the proposal development process such as consultation of women and men and integration of gender as a cross-cutting theme, this will further be analysis during our ROAM that has been earmarked during the early phase of the implementation of the Project.

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

The project document includes a table referred to as stakeholder analysis, but the table does not provide information about stakeholders' interests, influence and potential impacts they might experience from the project - which is asked for by IUCN's project document template. Instead the table provides a scaling of the stakeholders' strengths and weakness (without justification of the assigned scales) and describes the future role in the project. It hence figures more as an engagement table rather than a stakeholder analysis. It is also noticed that the list of stakeholders lacks key actors (e.g. ANAFOR, IRAD, ICRAF, etc.) as well as actors at the community level in the selected sites (e.g. specific community organisations, private sector etc.). **Action**: please complete the list of relevant stakeholders and provide analysis of interests, influence and project effects on the stakeholder.

2. Has information about the project – and about potential risks or negative impacts – been shared with relevant groups? Have consultations been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept? Did the consultations include stakeholders that were identified as potentially affected? Have women been consulted? Has this been done in a culturally appropriate way to allow a meaningful engagement of affected groups and women?

To be completed by project proponent

Yes, information about the project was fully shared during local level consultations carried out in four field sites and nationally, at Ministry level. So far, Local level actors and even stakeholders only potentially affected by the project, including IUCN colleagues, INBAR, and Central Ministries are now fully aware of the information about the project. Local level consultations targeted resource user groups, decentralized government services and women and indigenous people's groups directly concerned by the project. ey women's groups were consulted at local level and will be intensified during the sub national ROAM exercises and subsequent analyses. Consultations were facilitated by local organizations during the preparatory stages and this will be continued to ensure that ROAM level consultations continue to be implemented in culturally accepted ways and to make sure that the interests of local communities are fully integrated and internalised during the implementation phase.

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

It is understood that the implementation of the ROAM methodology will provide for additional involvement of stakeholders in each of the sites selected for restoration interventions.

Action: when completing the project document it will be important to describe the stakeholder consultation carried out during the PPG phase, e.g. in form of a table disaggregating different stakeholder groups and how they were involved during the PPG phase. Please note that the documentation of stakeholder engagement during PPG phase is different from the SH engagement plan – the latter describing the planned roles stakeholder will assume during implementation.

B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards			
B1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Will / might the project involve relocation or resettlement of people? **if yes, answer a-b below**	NO	*Shaded cells do not need to be filled out*	
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement?		No resettlement is required	
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?		No resettlement activities have been included in the Project	
2. Does the project include activities that involve restricting access to land or natural resources? (e.g., establishing new restrictions, strengthening enforcement capacities through training, infrastructure, equipment or other means, promoting village patrolling etc.); **if yes, answer a-g below**	NO		It seems that this risk cannot be categorically excluded at this stage as it will be up to the ROAM exercise to select the restoration sites and define the respective restoration interventions; and that there is a potential that the selected sites might currently be used for grazing, timber harvesting or other livelihood purposes and that the restoration intervention would require these to be restricted.
3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? **if yes, answer a-g below**	NO		Same as above
4. Does the project create situations that make physical access more difficult to livelihood resources (e.g. to multiple use zones, to schools or medical services etc.)? **if yes, answer a-g below**	NO		
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.			
b. Explain the project's level of influence: will it define restrictions, put in place restrictions, strengthen enforcement capacities or promote restrictions indirectly (e.g., through awareness building measures or policy advice)?			
c. Has the existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource (incl. traditional rights) been analysed, broken down by different groups including women, if applicable?			
d. Explain whether the country's existing laws recognise traditional rights for land and natural resources; are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not recognised?			
e. Have the implications of access restrictions on people's livelihoods been analysed, by social group? Explain who might be affected and describe the impacts. Distinguish social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples) and men and women.			
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access? If yes, specify measures. Are they feasible,			

culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?			
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?			
5. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources, land, or territories through measures other than access restrictions?	NO		Agreed. It is suggested that the project should seek further opportunities (e.g. in outcome 1) to influence policies that regulate land tenure with the aim to improve tenure security or community-rights in the context of FLR.
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	NO		
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	TBD	At the current state of planning there is no indication that project activities would involve physical or economic displacement with implication to people's livelihoods. However, as the sites and concrete restoration interventions will only be decided as part of the ROAM exercise, this risk cannot be fully ruled out. It is understood that the identification of restoration sites and decisions about concrete restoration investments will be done with involvement of relevant local stakeholders (representatives of communities, indigenous peoples and women's organization etc.) and take local needs and priorities into consideration. Hence the risk of access restrictions is considered as relatively low. Nevertheless this risk needs to be assessed when the restoration activities have been defined.	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assesed?		As part of ROAM exercise it needs to be assessed whether the proposed restoration interventions might involve use restrictions and whether these would impact communities, in particular vulnerable groups.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a	
B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples[1]			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in an area inhabited by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples or to which these groups have a collective attachment? **If yes, answer questions a-j**	YES	Preliminary sites selection has been completed and local actors, including Indigenous people with activities in those sites have been identified.	We understand that the sites for pilot testing the restoration activities have not been determined yet and will only be determined during the ROAM exercise. Hence this question will need to be revisited after site selection - as well as the questions below if this question here is confirmed.
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still affect their rights and livelihood? **If yes, answer questions a-j**	YES		
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.			
a. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		Indigenous Peoples and Minority groups	IPs are recognised in Cameroon and Cameroon's law promotes protection and safeguard of interests of IPs and establishes Free Prior Informed Consent as an underlying principle on engagement of IPs. If some of the project target

[1] 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

			areas are homes and farm areas of IPs this will require a thorough socio economic assessment of the selected sites. Un guide CLIP (FPIC) a été élaboré et adopté par le gouvernement dans le cadre du mécanisme REDD+. Cet outil peut être exploité lors des activités du projet pour mieux impliquer les populations autochtones
b. How do these groups identify themselves?		Indigenous Peoples and Minority groups	National IP network representing interests of the indigenous peoples over the national territory
c. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence and influence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.		1. Mbororos; Though nomadic but occurring mainly in the Northern Savannahs and are mainly cattle herders 2. Baka and Bagyelis (Pygmy);	The Mbororos are present in the North and in the Humid Savannah Highlands in the West). The Baka et Bagyelis peoples are present in distinct forest regions. It seems, though, that the pilot sites overlap only with Mbororo territory, not with areas inhabited by Baka or Bagyelis.
d. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' livelihood through access restrictions? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.	NO	Quite the Contrary. The project aims to work through local CSOs to help restore pasture lands for Mbororos, with their participation. In the case of the Baka and Bagyeli's, the project hopes to support sustainable supply of indigenous Bamboo and other agroforestry products to strengthen local income and promote education.	There is no evidence yet that restrictions on use of natural resources will be put in place. However, see comment in Section B1 on the need to re-assess this after site and activity selection.
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' material or non-material livelihoods in ways other than access restrictions (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)?	NO	In cases of possible restoration of degraded lands, the precise locations of investments such as restoration of degraded pasture and agricultural lands will emerge during the ROAM exercises. Restoration investments will be implemented based on local needs and priorities and it is therefore highly likely that local communities, indigenous peoples and women's organization will select restoration sites that are of the greatest benefits to them economically, socially and culturally; and not in conflict with their Cultural heritages. The project aims to help add value to cultural livelihoods, by addressing indigenous people's concerns about sustainable management of indigenous resources for their own benefits.	It is expected that the restoration investments will generate social benefits. And as mentioned earlier, decisions about restoration interventions are taken with involvement of communities and taking their needs and priorities communities into consideration. It will be essential that this process provides for culturally adequate involvement of representatives of indigenous groups.
f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	YES	It will affect them positively (improve livelihoods, sustain their cultural traits and practices, etc), meaning it is not a risk.	While the executive summary refers to vulnerable groups as beneficiaries (e.g. "to provide resilient livelihoods to the most vulnerable communities in Cameroon"), this intention is not consistently reflected in the theory of change and in the project's result framework. The specific needs of vulnerable groups should be assessed as part of the socio-economic assessment at the beginning of the ROAM exercise in each pilot site in order to avoid any unintended impact on these groups. Utiliser aussi le guide CLIP pour mieux évaluer les besoins des populations vulnérables
g. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	YES	But this will be carried-out by the indigenous peoples themselves, based on comprehensive value chain analyses of relevant indigenous forest products.	In case it is decided that the project will involve commercial development of resources on land or territories claimed by IP, FPIC is required from legitimate rights holders.
h. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	YES	On the contrary Indigenous Property rights, such as Local Knowledge systems will be capitalised by the project for the benefits of communities. Development of comprehensive value chains as recommended by the validation Workshop starts with full	As stated by the proponent the project intends to promote the use of indigenous people's knowledge. Hence, it needs to be ensured that consent from legitimate knowledge holders is obtained (following FPIC principles).

		knowledge of the resources base. Without local/indigenous knowledge this cannot be complete. Therefore traditional local and indigenous knowledge is indispensable to a successful value chain analysis.	
i. Has any process been started or implemented to achieve the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples to activities directly affecting their lands/territories/resources?	YES	Sites selection and mapping; participation in inception and validation workshops of local stakeholder regarding priorities, benefits and costs of possible restoration interventions or value chains benefits are all steps toward acquiring formal or informal FPIC of local and indigenous peoples. So far results have been very positive.	See comments to questions h. and g.
j. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	NO	The project does not intend to be active in zones where stakeholders live in voluntary isolation. All project stakeholders have willingly participated in all consultations and workshops.	
k. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a culturally appropriate and gender inclusive way?	YES	This response is already provided above. Project investments and interventions are driven by the priorities of local actors; and some of these are women and indigenous peoples. Value chain development leading to better resource, income and revenue control and improved pastures are some of the expected benefits.	It will be essential that the ROAM process provides for culturally sensitive involvement of representatives of indigenous groups and for sufficient analysis to ensure that benefits will be culturally adequate and gender inclusive.
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	YES	The presence of indigenous peoples has already been confirmed at the scale of the larger regions; however there is a need for a site-specific socio-economic assessment as part of the ROAM process once the sites for restoration interventions have been selected. It will be essential that the ROAM process provides for culturally sensitive involvement of representatives of indigenous groups in order to ensure that their interests and concerns are appropriately taken into account. In case it is decided that the project will include the commercial development of resources on land or territories claimed by IP or the use of traditional knowledge, the project needs to ensure that FPIC is obtained from the relevant rights holders (see question g and h above).	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assesed?		Aside from confirming the presence of indigenous groups in the project sites, the assessment should describe socio-economic conditions of the identified groups, provide for recognizing potential negative impacts from project activities and make recommendations for culturally adequate involvement strategies for these groups.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		In case the above mentioned assessment identifies risk, these need to be addressed with mitigation measures.	

B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage

	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection?	YES		Some of the interesting rattan sites are found in south Cameroon precisely Dja biosphere reserve a designated WHS; so this question should be revisited after selection of the restoration sites.
2. Does the project area harbour cultural resources such as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resources with archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community (e.g., burial sites, buildings, monuments or	NO		This can only be answered after site selection

cultural landscapes)?			
3. Does the project area harbour a natural feature or resource with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature (e.g., sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas or sacred species)?	YES	Almost all indigenous people have sites considered to be sacred; from sacred forests to sacred species and burial grounds. All these are not part of a national registry, managing such heritages are a matter of local priorities and such specific questions will be raised and addressed during local level ROAM exercises.	This can only be answered after site selection and should be built into the situation analysis done as part of ROAM
4. Will the project involve infrastructure development or small civil works such as roads, levees, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation or buildings such as visitor centre, watch tower?	NO		
5. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	NO		
6. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items 4–5 might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	NO		
7. Is there a risk that the project might affect cultural practices or sites with cultural value through activities other than physical interventions or access restrictions?			The project aims to restore sacred forest (Activity 2.1.2). This activity will need to be planned with ample involvement of the respective groups or rights holders in order to understand the specific features of these sites and that the restoration process is done in a culturally appropriate way.
8. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	NO		
9. Will the project promote the use or development of economic or social benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	YES	Development of NTFPs and other value chains of naturally occurring underutilized species, including Bamboo will invariable use local, indigenous knowledge systems; both for sustainability and for adding value. Therefore, to the extent local and indigenous people are willing and able to apply local knowledge for their benefits and that of the project, these will be solicited.	This question relates to cultural resources or natural features with cultural importance. The issue of using traditional knowledge is already captured in Section B2.
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	Yes	It is not expected that project activities associated with the reforestation or restoration of degraded land will include physical interventions involving earth movement with the potential to affect buried cultural resources. However, the Standard is triggered as there is the intention to restore sacred forest areas. While this is expected to provide positive social outcomes, it will be important to ensure that relevant rights holders are appropriately involved in this process.	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assesed?		n/a	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a	
B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? **If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d**	YES	Situation of project interventions would be encouraged where restoration of habitats would be an additional benefit. These is likely to be protection of watersheds against exposure and erosion, and near wetlands where mangroves are intensely exploited by local population.	Dja biosphere reserve is a WHS with surrounding buffer areas having vast rattan forests. Waza – Logone is a Ramsar site and Waza a biosphere reserve.
2. Is the project located in or near to areas recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	YES	Same as above	
3. Is the project located in/near to areas which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value[2]? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	YES	Same as above	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.			
a. If the project aims to establish or expand the protected area (PA), is there a risk of adverse impacts caused by the project on natural resources on areas beyond the PA?	NO	The project would not seek to expand any protected area; but to promote sustainable use of adjacent resources to both reduce pressure on nearby protected area; and or to restore habitats outside protected areas for the benefits of local and indigenous populations.	Agreed that this is not a risk but an environmental benefit.
b. If the project aims at changing management of a PA, is there a risk of adverse direct and indirect impacts on other components of biodiversity?	NO	Project does not aim to change management of a protected area.	
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourisms facilities, access roads) or for other purpose (e.g. small scale water infrastructure climate change adaptation), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity, (consider the construction and use phases)?	NO	Project does not aim to change management of a protected area.	
d. If the project promotes ecotourism, is there a risk of adverse impacts to biodiversity, e.g., due to water/waste disposal, disturbance of flora/fauna, overuse of sites, slope erosion etc.)?	NO	Project does not aim to promote ecotourism	
4. Will the project introduce or translocate species as a strategy for species conservation or ecosystem restoration (e.g. erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation)? **If yes, provide details and answer**	YES	They project aims to promote use and sustainable management of diverse underutilized indigenous species. Therefore, there is likelihood of translocation of species from	

[2] Areas important to threatened species according to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, important to endemic or restricted-range species or to migratory and congregatory species; areas representing key evolutionary processes, providing connectivity with other critical habitats or key ecosystem services; highly threatened and/or unique ecosystems (e.g. to be determined in future by the evolving IUCN Red List of Ecosystems); areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and subsets such as important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), important Plant Areas (IPAs), important Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity or Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites.

questions a-d		healthy to degraded areas.	
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	YES	The project would not involve development of monocultures per se, but would encourage agro-forestry, where there is a clear added value to owner livelihoods or to species performance.	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 4 or 5 above.			
a. Does this project involve non-native species or is there a risk of introducing non-native species inadvertently?	NO	Only indigenous species will be used.	It is understood from the project document that the project will promote the use of certain species that are not native to Cameroon or the respective pilot site; however as these species have been introduced to Cameroon already decades ago they are assumed to have little risks to develop invasive characteristics.
b. If a.is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?	n/a		
c. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of faciliatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	NO		
d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood?	NO		
6. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water flows on-site or downstream (including increases or decreases in peak and flood flows and low flows) through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or through other activities?	NO		On the contrary, the project is expected to influence water basin positively in particular in the mountainous zones.
7. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g., water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.	NO		Agreed, no risks are expected. When identifying sites for the restoration activities one criterion would be to look at opportunities to protect watersheds against exposure and erosion (as mentioned by the proponent in the answer to question 1), in order to improve water infiltration.
8. Is there a risk that the project affects water quality of waterways (e.g., through diffuse water pollution from agricultural run-off or other activities)?	NO		
9. Is there a risk that the project affects ecosystem functions and services not covered above, in particular those on which local communities depend for their livelihoods?	NO		If there were potential risks it is expected that during the restoration opportunity mapping of the ROAM process such risks would be identified.
10. In case the project promotes the use of living natural resources (e.g., by proposing production systems or harvest plans), is there a risk that this might lead to unsustainable use of resources?	YES	Working with some Pygmies, Mbororos and local populations in the Project sites would potentially require working according to local guidelines for sourcing and managing Bamboo and other NTFPs from around the Bakossi and Kimbi National Parks. The project will specifically use traceability metrics (to be incorporated in M&E systems) for all Bamboo and natural	When promoting the use of natural resources such as NTFP it always needs to be ensured that this is done in a sustainable way, e.g. by providing appropriate guidelines and ensuring their adherence (during the life of the project and beyond).

		forest products emanating from these spheres of indigenous people to ensure that IUCN's recommendations for Protected areas are respected. A monitoring system will be developed as a part of the project, with a sound baseline established at the outset. Both the natural resource base and the value chains of products will be monitored.	
11. Ensured that this is done in a sustainable way. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b**	NO		
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
12. In case the project intends to use biological pest management techniques, has the potential of adversely affecting biodiversity been ruled out?	NO	Project does not intend to use biological pests	
13. Is there a risk that the project will cause adverse environmental impacts in a wider area of influence (landscape/ watershed, regional or global levels) including transboundary impacts?	NO		If there were potential risks, it is expected that during the restoration opportunity mapping such risks would be identified and addressed.
14. Is there a risk that consequential developments triggered by the project will have adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services? Is there a risk of adverse cumulative impacts generated together with other known or planned projects in the sites?	NO		Same as comment above.
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	Yes	While overall the project is expected to have positive impacts by addressing a number of biodiversity/ecosystem issues, two minor risks have been identified: risks related to the promotion of NTFP which could lead to unsustainable harvest rates if not appropriately guided; and risk related to the use of non-native species. While both risks seem not very probable, the Standard is still considered triggered as the risks need to be monitored.	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assessed?		n/a	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a	

C. Other social or environmental impacts

C1: Other social impacts

	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is there a risk that the project affects 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? Differentiate between women and men, where	NO		The ROAM process provides for gathering socio-economic features and for ample consultation with relevant stakeholders as part of the decision making on restoration investments; it is hence assumed that potential stakeholder

applicable.			concerns or risks would come up as part of this process.
2. Is there a risk that the project creates or aggravates inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the situation or livelihood conditions of women or girls?	NO	The project will use the ROAM methodology, which facilitates analyses of diverse stakeholder needs; including those of women. Deliberate steps will be taken to strengthen decision-making and participation by women, girls and men. Currently standards for enhancing benefits and participation of women and girls, such as the WOCAN and IUCN standards would be built into the project.	It will be important that all steps in the ROAM process ensure culturally appropriate and balanced involvement of both women and men and that sufficient opportunity is provided to express any potential concern with proposed restoration strategies. The gender mainstreaming plan is well received; 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.)
3. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	YES	Same as above	The project includes a number of activities that are expected to benefit women particularly, e.g. provision of energy efficient cook stoves, the promotion of NTFP and the strengthening of women producer organizations. The use of bamboo charcoal for cooking and other heating purposes is expected to reduce respiratory health issues to which women are particularly exposed (if compared to wood burning). It is recommended, though, that these intentions are reflected in the result framework through appropriate indicators in order to be able to monitor achievements.
4. Explain whether the project provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?	YES	In addition to the WOCAN and IUCN standards for involving women and girls, a key institutional partner in the project is the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and the Family.	The project document identifies the problem of discriminatory practices restricting women's access to land (chapter 4.12), but does not propose any action. The proponent is encouraged to explore opportunities for strengthening local practice of recognizing land rights, e.g. in the pilot sites.
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action?[3]	NO	Participatory monitoring will be used in implementing the project	
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups[4] in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?	NO		While the executive summary refers to vulnerable groups as beneficiaries (e.g. "to provide resilient livelihoods to the most vulnerable communities in Cameroon"), this intention is not reflected in the theory of change, in the project's activities and its result framework. The specific needs of vulnerable groups should be assessed as part of the socio-economic assessment at the beginning of the ROAM exercise in each pilot site in order to prevent the risk that restoration activities might inadvertently affect these groups.

[3] Affirmative action is a measure designed to overcome prevailing inequalities by favouring members of a disadvantaged group who suffer from discrimination. However, if not designed appropriately these measures could aggravate the situation of ä previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

[4] 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.

7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.	NO		The project includes the delivery of 4,000 cook stoves to be given to families. It will be important that fair and transparent eligibility criteria are established to prevent social conflicts arising through a perception of unfairness in their distribution.
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human–wildlife conflicts)?	NO		The production of charcoal is often associated with air emissions (in particular charcoal dust) that can disperses quickly into the air and can cause respiratory illnesses of people who are particularly exposed to the fumes - unless a clean technology is used. The proposal refers to training of five pilot local communities on bamboo charcoal production, but does not specify whether the project will provide clean technology (e.g. equipment).
9. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	NO		
10. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	NO		
11. Is the project likely to induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?	NO		
12. Is there a risk that the project could negatively affect the livelihoods of local communities indirectly or through cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts.	NO		
13. Is there a risk that the project affects the operation of dams or other built water infrastructure (reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals) e.g., by changing flows into those structures? If yes, has an inventory of existing water resources infrastructures in the project area been compiled and potential impacts analysed?	NO		
14. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	YES	In some cases the project is likely to strengthen the tenure of women, where these have been previously weak. Overall this would be a good thing, although constant communication will be used to minimize any bruised egos.	If this is an intention, it needs to be reflected in the project document.
C2: Other environmental impacts			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Will the project lead to increased waste production, in particular hazardous waste?	NO		
2. Is the project likely to cause pollution or degradation of soil, soil erosion or siltation?	NO		
3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	NO		Charcoal production emits gaseous emissions such as carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO2), methane,

			ethane and volatile organic compounds (VOC); as well as emissions of the particulate matter (PM). The project needs to demonstrate that these emissions are controlled and that they are in fact lower than those from current charcoal production (e.g. different technologies) and lower than using wood combustions as energy source.
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions?	NO		The efficiency of charcoal production (amount of charcoal per unit of biomass) and the ability to control GHG emission (e.g.CO2, methane) will be key variables for the GHG balance of the charcoal production process. Both depend on the practices and the efficiency of the available technology/ equipment. While activity 2.3.1 addresses the first (providing training/best practices), it is not specified whether the project will provide funding for improved technology (e.g. improved stationary kilns). The table presented in chapter 4.1 listing the CCM indicators refers to an efficiency of bamboo charcoal production of 60% compared to less than 30% for wood charcoal production. This should be demonstrated for the practices promoted by the project.
5. Is there a risk that the project triggers consequential development activities which could lead to adverse environmental impacts, cumulative impacts due to interaction with other projects (current or planned) or to transboundary impacts (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	NO		
6. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations or provisions of the host country (including legislation requiring environmental impact assessments)?	NO		
Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?	The probability of social risks caused by restoration interventions is considered low as the ROAM process is expected to provide for sufficient ex-ante analysis. Environmental impacts are expected to be overall positive; however the promotion of charcoal production can be associated with air emissions and health risks which need to be addressed through good practices and by employing appropriate technology. The intended climate mitigation benefit of bamboo charcoal production needs to be demonstrated by factual evidence. The gender mainstreaming plan is well received; a stronger articulation of these intentions in form of indicators in the results framework would allow for monitoring these achievements. 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 results framework and the activities. The distribution of cook stove will require transparent and fair eligibility criteria in order to avoid social conflicts.		
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts? What specific topics are to be assessed?	The socio-economic assessment as part of the ROAM exercise should provide for sufficient analysis of impacts of restoration activities on vulnerable groups.		
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	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, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	YES	The project would be cited specifically to address some erosion-prone and drought-prone areas.	
2. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more susceptible than others (e.g., women or vulnerable groups)?	YES	Supporting women and girls as a project strategy would significantly uplift this group as women and girls are traditionally pushed to more marginal lands; more prone to erosion and drought.	
3. Is there a risk that current or projected climate variability and changes might affect the implementation of project activities or their effectiveness and the sustainability of the project (e.g., through risk and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding, or droughts)?	NO		The ROAM exercise involves a dedicated step (restoration opportunity mapping) where the suitability of proposed restoration interventions for selected sites is assessed. This should also take different climate change scenarios into consideration.
4. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities and the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes (e.g., through risks and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding or droughts?	NO	Quite the opposite. The project is designed to address degradation and help vulnerable groups adapt better to the worst effects of climate change	
5. Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	YES	By targeting more marginalized groups the livelihoods strategies; diversifying and strengthening their adaptability. By using underutilized, indigenous species more adapted to local variations and therefore likely to be more resilient to changes; in micro- climatic conditions	
Are negative impacts expected from the project?	No negative impacts are expected, on the contrary, the project seeks to increase the adaptive capacity of the ecosystem to climate change as well as the capacity of vulnerable groups.		
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed	The restoration opportunity assessment should include a dedicated step to probe the proposed intervention's suitability for different climate change scenarios.		
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	n/a		