



ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report - for field projects

a) Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

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

b) Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

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

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Louis Putzel, Lead International Consultant	June 4, 2017
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is \geq CHF 500,000</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p>	

c) Step 2: ESMS Screening

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

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator, IUCN HQ	11 Aug 2017
	Scott Perkin	Head, Natural Resources Group, IUCN Asia Regional Office	11 Aug 2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	7-5-17 TRI China PRODOC		5 July 2017

ESMS Screening Report ¹	
Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk
<p>Rationale: Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization</p> <p><i>See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:</i></p> <p>Section A for findings about the stakeholder engagement process, Section B on the 4 Standards, Section C on other E&S impacts and Section D on risk issues related to Climate change</p>	<p>The project aims to improve the flow of ecosystem services from selected forest landscapes, and is expected to enhance livelihoods, build climate resilience and conserve biodiversity. Environmental and social impacts are expected to be largely positive, as the project intends to restore forest landscapes and employ the FLR/ROAM methodology - a tested model for forest restoration processes that entails strong stakeholder participation.</p> <p>Applying the FLR/ROAM process means that it is not possible at the project design stage to flesh out all project activities as these will be decided after having undertaken consultations and analyses at each site. The strength of the FLR approach is that the restoration strategies are locally designed together with relevant stakeholders and developed through a combination of advanced ecological technical expertise, situation analysis and understanding of local interests (across scales and sectors). In order to ensure that the restoration strategies / project activities are compliant with the ESMS, the Prodoc will need to include a methodological description of the ROAM process that demonstrates adherence to ESMS principles and standards. This should include a “mini-screening” in order to detect potential environmental or social risk issues. Such an ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework is considered equivalent to an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which would usually be required in circumstances where project activities will only be defined during the implementation phase.</p> <p>While the risks are generally considered relatively low, the fact that concrete restoration activities have not yet been identified and that at least one Standard is triggered (with some probability that others will be triggered as well) requires the classification of the project as a moderate risk project. This will allow for the provision of adequate ESMS supervision during project implementation.</p>
Required assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Methodological description of the ESMS-enhanced ROAM Process Framework
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	<p>It is recognized that an effort was made to actively involve women in the stakeholder consultations during the PPG phase. Unfortunately the focus groups were strongly dominated by men, which of course can partly be attributed to general characteristic of the forest sector (male dominance).</p> <p>The fact that a few activities were explicitly designed with a gender focus (e.g. gender disaggregated situation analysis, disaggregated analysis in the FR/ROAM process) is well received. It is further acknowledged that the pilot area advisory boards are intended to be formed in a gender balanced way. This will need to be monitored during implementation, though. The chapter on safeguards refers to principles to ensure Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women; however, it remains unclear how these principles are concretely applied and reflected in the overall prodoc.</p> <p>While the monitoring and evaluation plan (table 25) refers to using gender disaggregated data, the results framework so far only presents one indicator as gender disaggregated- this should be improved. Likewise, the stakeholder engagement plan would be a good place to demonstrate a gender-balanced approach; so far the targets have not been disaggregated.</p>

¹For projects below CHF 500,000 where no risks have been identified the screening report is completed by the project proponent; low risk projects don't require assessments - hence only the section on the rationale needs to be completed.

ESMS Standards	Trigger	Required tools or plans
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions <i>(see section B1 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples <i>(see section B2 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage <i>(see section B3 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources <i>(see section B4 for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

d) Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

To be completed by project proponent -Please summarise the project briefly using 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.

The Project is organized in four main components, as follows:

Component 1: Implementation of Restoration Programs and Complementary Initiatives;

Component 2: Policy Development and Integration;

Component 3: Institutions, Finance and Upscaling; and

Component 4: Knowledge, Partnerships, Project Monitoring and Assessment.

The main content of the four components is summarized as follows:

Component 1 has three main outcome targets around which outputs and activities are planned. First, the Project will work with national experts to develop technical capacity at the provincial level, working with teams of forestry experts from provincial research institutions and universities, which will be required to implement forest landscape restoration. The work will start by changing the way China's State Forest Farms (SFFs) develop and implement their own sustainable forest management and restoration (or FMR) plans, starting with seven pilot SFFs in the three project areas to create the enabling conditions to support FMR plans to be implemented in the following years. The process will be replicated in 3-8 additional SFFs at the level of each of the three City prefectures, using the new capacity of the provincial technical teams. The expected outcome of this work is that the SFF system will implement sustainable forest management and restoration (FMR) plans incorporating FLR and targeting delivery of specific ecosystem services (including conservation of biodiversity) contributing to the national goal of SFF reform.

At the same time, another team with advanced skills in developing ecological and biodiversity monitoring systems will develop indicators and protocols for data collection and analysis, establish and train community monitoring teams, collect baseline data and leave in place a system to monitor change in forest conditions and the ecosystem services identified as priorities for the given area. The methods and systems put in place will generate data that will be of use to national agencies involved in ecosystem assessment and valuation (and Gross Ecosystem Product accounting), which is key data for the implementation of national ecocompensation payment schemes and the potential development of market-based private or non-governmental payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes. The upscaling of the monitoring methodologies will therefore occur as the system generates data to inform national models and payment systems.

The monitoring and evaluation of each ecosystem service/biodiversity target identified as priorities by each SFF and pilot county/City requires a separate protocol. These protocols will likely include measurement and valuation methodologies for: forest extent, forest composition and biomass, wildlife, water quality and flow, soil erosion and soil quality, aesthetic value of landscape. The scales of monitoring include the SFFs and county/City landscapes. The protocols will be developed by the ROAM consultant team based on their work in each pilot landscape. Monitoring will be implemented by community monitoring teams composed of an equal number of men and women representing all local ethnic groups and age groups [age 16+] as both monitors and team leaders. Participation in monitoring activities is the main vehicle for sharing of economic benefits with local community members, and therefore the recruitment process must aim to be transparent and equitable.

At the same time as initiating the development of FMR Plans for the 7 pilot SFFs, the Project will assist the forestry departments of cities (in Bijie, Guizhou and in Chengde, Hebei) and counties (in Ganzhou, Jiangxi) together with SFFs to engage across sectors through cross-sector capacity building and the development of broader FLR plans with SFFs as core areas for transformation of the surrounding landscape. This endeavor will be upscaled through adaptation of FLR planning/ROAM to the particular circumstances of China and promoted nationally through the publication of a handbook under Component 3.

Component 2 involves the development and integration of policies from the scale of the SFF system to the scale of national forestry policy, central government policies that span sectors, and finally links the partners to global policy development. First, the tools and approaches that are developed in Components 1 and 3 will be tested and refined and integrated into the national SFF system via internal policy revision. Second, national and provincial legal frameworks that affect FLR planning will be reviewed and recommendations will be developed to

promote policy and legal reform within the canon of forestry laws over which the State Forestry Administration has influence. This will institutionalize the new role of SFFs as public benefit institutions through the design of new policies, laws and regulations that need to be established at relevant scales to facilitate the implementation of forest landscape restoration and sustainable forest management.

The next step will be to analyze Central Government policies that govern broader inter-sectoral planning and strategies will be prepared and ready by 2020, when the Central Government will be calling on all sectors to report on their progress under the 13th FYP and develop plans for the 14th FYP. These activities will rely on pre-existing professional and academic policy and legal capacity, but will also empower the partners to proactively engage with policy makers.

Finally, the SFF administration will seek to occupy a seat at the table with global partners to contribute to ongoing FLR and climate change-related processes. The Project will draw on China's experience to play a greater role in advancing the approaches, theories and mechanisms through which partners engage globally to promote and build capacity for forest landscape restoration at the global level.

Component 3 is focused on increasing the business viability of the SFF system by building the capacity of SFFs and local experts to analyze the key attributes of each SFF, identify sustainable business development pathways to develop, and build partnerships across land and natural resource sectors and with commercial enterprises. The tools developed in this component will help to analyze and reorganize the governance structures and human resources of the SFF system at the national level.

The associated output is an SFF-level business plan based on the specific attributes of each SFF in terms of its facilities, the capacities of its personnel, the needs of stakeholders and/or the demand from the market for specific goods, ecosystem services, or experiences. This output is the means through which the capacity of SFFs to seek PES and other financing partners, grants, and collaborations will be achieved. It will guide them in addressing key problems they are facing, such as lack of qualified staff to take on new roles – such as outreach, community engagement, facilitation, business management – that will be necessary to achieve the vision of SFF reform.

A second set of activities will be focused on building capacity for outreach. One of the gaps identified during the preparation phase of the China TRI project was insufficient communication and coordination among sectoral agencies at all scales and between scales. During this phase, the project team began to identify the existing channels of communication between the SFF administration, within the forestry administration and with other sectors. This process will be continued and documented, to outline a process of coordination that will underpin efforts to accomplish and measure the impacts of FLR at all scales from the local to national level.

The system will therefore become more proactive and actively seek opportunities and partners who will have access to better information due to the monitoring and valuation work of Component 1, to market non-timber forest products developed as part of the FMR planning also done in Component 1, and to develop capacity to package and market bankable initiatives through grant seeking and public-private partnerships. This component will help to develop new capacity at the City level to take advantage of maximize the benefit flows from restored forests.

Component 4 will create systems for knowledge development and increase the flow of information throughout the national SFF system and at the local level in pilot project areas. The main activities include the translation of project learning into accessible media and the development of a state-of-the-art online communications platform and social network through which to channel the outputs (knowledge, capacity building tools, methods and approaches and policies) developed by the other three components. In addition, this component will engage a relatively large number of SFF personnel in provincial, national and international knowledge exchange. Project monitoring and impact assessment will be conducted as part of the work of this component.

A lack of awareness of the relationship between forest (and in particular forest functionality) and ecosystem services is a potential threat to the success of FLR. Whilst many stakeholders in the project areas have an understanding of linkages between the environment and human wellbeing, such understanding is highly variable between and within groups. Whilst increasing awareness does not automatically result in changed behavior or lead to inspiring people to support FLR, a lack of awareness is a definite barrier to change.

This outcome focuses on using knowledge gained from the project and elsewhere (including through the Global TRI Project and academic and research partners) to build awareness of stakeholders in the three pilot landscapes. The approach to awareness raising will draw on the project's stakeholder analysis to ensure that the tools, language (e.g. technical versus general) and methods used are the most appropriate for each stakeholder group.

A communication and knowledge management strategy will be developed that ensures the project staff and partners are learning effectively and that knowledge is used to develop policy-relevant lessons for national policy development and lessons are shared through the global TRI project.

Additional explanation on the ROAM/FLR process:

The Forest Management and Restoration Planning will be conducted by the NEA on the state lands over which it has full responsibility and authority. The FLR/ROAM capacity building and development of FLR plans will be conducted with cross-sector participants at the county/municipal level, where adoption depends on the authority of the county/municipal governments.

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

1. Has a project **stakeholder analysis** been carried out and documented – identifying not only interests, needs 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? It is recommended to add the stakeholder analysis to the documents submitted at screening stage.

To be completed by project proponent

The stakeholder analysis was developed based on field visits and consultations in six project sites (the seventh was added subsequently but is close to the other 2 sites in Hebei province). During the project planning phase, the Project's design team conducted stakeholder key informant interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) in the three project pilot areas, at the City level and State Forest Farms (SFF), and separate consultations with village leaders from the vicinity to understand the interests of local people living outside the area of direct intervention who might be affected or benefit from the project. At the City level, two FGDs were held per City, one with forestry officials from the City, county, SFF and provincial level; the other with City officials from relevant environmental, social and service sectors. At the district/county level we held FGDs in Guizhou (Qixingguan District and Zhijin County) and in Jiangxi (Fengning County, Anyuang County, and Xunwu County). In addition to City and county administrative officials, the sectors represented in these FGDs included the following bureaus: Forestry, Land and Resources, Agriculture and Husbandry, Development and Reform, Finance, Environmental Protection, Civil Affairs, Women's Union, Investment Promotion, Water Protection, Water Services, Culture, Tourism. In all, 168 officials participated in these FGDs, of which ca. 21% were women.

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 and risks? Provide details about the groups involved. Have women been consulted (provide details)? Did the consultations include stakeholders that were identified as potentially affected? Has this been done in a culturally appropriate way to allow meaningful engagement of women and/or potentially affected groups? Have results from the consultations been taken up and influenced project design?

To be completed by project proponent

Information about the project has been shared with relevant groups at all project scales. Discussion of the project concept, workplan, risks and potential negative impacts was conducted in a workshop of core stakeholders in Beijing on June 19, 2017. 21% of participants in cross-sector FGD discussions at city and county levels were women. Consultations included SFF personnel and village leaders at 6 of 7 of the main project sites. The FGDs were led by Chinese facilitators following discussions with the lead project consultant (Louis Putzel) as to cultural appropriateness of questions, especially as regards gender and ethnicity. Results of the consultations informed the design of the entire project.

IUCN ESMS Reviewer (to both questions)

Stakeholder Analysis: The stakeholder analysis presented in the Prodoc identified eight stakeholder groups, but these are quite generic and do not reflect the specific conditions of the seven selected project sites. It is generally recommended that the analysis undertaken during the PPG phase be done at the level of the selected intervention sites in order to provide for a better understanding of specific stakeholder interests, needs and concerns. However, because the project will employ a ROAM process for each site, which includes a SH analysis as an explicit first step, it is considered acceptable to postpone such detailed analysis until the implementation phase.

Stakeholder consultation during project design: Even though local communities are second on the list of stakeholder groups, it appears that this group has not been sufficiently involved in the design process so far. While it is acknowledged that the project aims to work with SFFs as the main implementing partners, engagement of communities living adjacent to the SFF areas is highly desirable. This would not only improve the intervention's sustainability and enhance broad-based support for the project, but also, would enable understanding of community needs and concerns (e.g. to what extent do local communities use the resources of SFFs?).

Stakeholder engagement during project implementation: The Prodoc presents a well-developed SH Engagement plan. However, as with the SH Analysis, it remains generic and does not identify specific stakeholders in each of the selected pilot sites. It is recognised that the Prodoc specifies principles for stakeholder engagement that should guide the process for each site. These include, among others: adherence to the ESMS principle on stakeholder engagement; the aim of achieving a gender ratio of 50:50 by sex and a target ratio reflecting the ethnic composition of the relevant stakeholder community; and a commitment to following a participatory approach for planning, implementation and monitoring. It is recommended that the ESMS-enhanced description of the ROAM process provide further methodological guidance on how stakeholders will be selected and involved in the process.

The suggestion of creating an advisory board (AB) for each pilot area can be seen as a promising approach for increasing engagement of local communities. However, the assigned role appears to be rather limited (contribute, provide feed-back, help raise awareness etc.); in addition, no meeting frequency is mentioned. This could be further improved.

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	<i>Shaded cells do not need to be filled out</i>	
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement?			
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?			
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		
3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? if yes, answer a-g below	Yes		
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.		<p>The project implementation area is within forest reserves established in the 1950s and 1960s. No new restrictions will be imposed, and some boundaries are likely to be softened.</p> <p>In the pilot SFFs, except the SFF accessed by Inner Mongolian herders, during consultations the project design team had no indication of illegal or semi-legal use of forest resources. There were authorized uses of forest resources that are unlikely to be affected by project implementation.</p> <p>In the case of the SFF near inner Mongolia, access restriction is already there, and it is within the authority of the government to enforce it. What the project is proposing is not enforcing the access restriction, but negotiating temporal and spatial co-management.</p>	<p>It is understood that the project's scope is limited to SFF (hence to state land) and that any prevalent use restrictions were already in place prior to project start.</p> <p>Regarding the sites near the Inner Mongolian Plateau which are said to be affected by overgrazing by migrant herders, the project suggests negotiated temporal and spatial co-management. This is considered a "light" form of access restrictions and should be preceded by an assessment of social impacts and provision of mitigation, where relevant.</p>

<p>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)?</p>		<p>N/A: The change in management regimes occurs within state lands only; the project is likely to increase access, not reduce it.</p>	<p>It is understood that any potential restrictions would be based on voluntary decisions (co-management agreements) by the community or affected groups.</p>
<p>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?</p>		<p>Yes. The legal framework regulating land tenure of the project implementation area is clear. Surrounding the project implementation area, collective forests are undergoing a process of allocation to individual households, in which male and female heads of household receive rights certificates.</p>	
<p>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?</p>		<p>China's forest tenure reform reallocates collective land to households regardless of ethnicity. Local people hold residency permits that secure their rights to land.</p>	
<p>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.</p>		<p>N/A: The change in management regimes occurs within state lands only; the project is likely to increase access, not reduce it.</p>	<p>As stated under point a above, a light form of access restrictions may be implemented as part of the negotiation of the co-management arrangements. While this does not trigger the Standard in a strict sense as long as it can be demonstrated that it is a voluntary agreement, social impacts should nevertheless be assessed in the preparation of the agreements, together with the affected groups. It should be taken into account that pastoralist groups are frequently misunderstood and are often confronted with prejudices, sometimes based on ill-designed policies implemented in the past. These issues would need to be taken into consideration in this assessment.</p>
<p>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?</p>		<p>N/A: The change in management regimes occurs within state lands only; the project is likely to increase access, not reduce it.</p>	<p>In the event that the above-mentioned assessment identifies negative impacts, these should be mitigated with culturally appropriate measures agreed by the affected groups.</p>
<p>g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?</p>		<p>The change in management regimes occurs within state lands only; the project is likely to increase access, not reduce it; in the course of the project, however, there are activities designed to improve interactions between the managers of state lands and adjacent communities and groups who access the reserves for various reasons. These activities will begin with discussions, and at this time, FPIC should be sought.</p>	<p>Agreed. The requirement and conditions for FPIC (e.g. required for situations where actors have legal rights, including customary rights) should be stated clearly in the Prodoc and in the ROAM Process Framework.</p>
<p>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</p>		<p>No.</p>	

access restrictions?			
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?		Yes, the State Forestry Administration has been involved in “ecological migration” programs to resettle groups living in ecologically vulnerable and usually remote areas in which livelihood security is low. The programs involve financial compensation, new housing, job training, etc. There is no evidence of negative impacts of such activities in the pilot areas visited. At one SFF where a relocation of a village had occurred, residents received subsidies to move to a new village where they were given houses near a main road. They still maintain rights to land within the forest area they left, which they either rent out or use to grow their own crops. One villager interviewed maintains a 2 ha kiwi plantation within the forest area the village was moved from. The notes from this field visit will be added to the prodoc as an appendix.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	TBD	<p>No issues related to access restrictions have been identified related to the project sites in Guizhou/Bijie and Jiangxi/Ganzhou.</p> <p>With regards to the site near inner Mongolia (Hebei/Chengde), it seems likely that the project will seek to restrict what are believed to be unsustainable grazing practices through the use of spatial and temporal co-management agreements. This does not trigger the standard in a strict sense as long as the voluntary nature of these agreements can be clearly demonstrated. Hence, the decision on whether or not this Standard is triggered is still to be determined (TBD).</p> <p>The Prodoc should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process by which the co-management agreements will be reached; • Provide sufficient evidence that the agreements will be pursued through good-faith negotiations and based on informed consent of legitimate representatives of potentially affected groups; • Summarise the steps that will be taken to ensure that the process is guided by a neutral party (e.g. a social scientist, independent from the project executing agency) • Where impacts are expected, summarise the ways in which these will be mitigated with culturally appropriate mitigation measures developed with and agreed by representatives of affected groups.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		The process described above should include a description of the way in which the social impacts of potential restrictions will be assessed.
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		see above

B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples ²			
	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		
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. 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.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ethnic Mongolian herders in Hebei province. 2. Local Miao and Yi communities in Guizhou Province. 3. In Hebei, a significant number of the local people are Manchu people. 	There is a need for more specific information on IPs at the level of each project site - at the townships / village level to be answered by the situation analysis as part of the ROAM process. This assessment will need to identify and describe the cultural difference and land-use pattern of the distinct, government recognized, ethnic minority groups living in Bijie, Guizhou and Chengde, Hebei. Although the Hakka in Jiangxi are usually considered a sub-group of the Han, they also have linguistic and cultural differences which should be analyzed in this assessment. The Yi, Miao and Hui groups identified for the Guizhou pilot area have different languages and cultures, and, also have different land-use patterns – especially their use of forest lands. A deeper socio-economic review should also describe where these groups live, establish proximity and relationships to the forest farms (e.g. employees, users of the forest) and ascertain whether they still practice traditional livelihoods. In the Chengde pilot site, the assessment should include a review of the situation of the Mongolian pastoralists who cross the border from Inner Mongolia into Hebei, searching for grazing for their livestock.
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups?		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Distinct languages/dialect; livelihood strategy. 5. Distinct language/dialect. 	It is necessary to confirm this for the specific communities living in the intervention sites. Do these groups qualify as IP according to IUCN definition (e.g. in terms of social conditions, status, livelihood patterns and practices, and language)?

²The 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

c. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		少数民族 (xiaoshu minzu) or minority nationality/people	
d. How do these groups identify themselves?		Minorities	
e. 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.	<p>1. The project will explore the use of limited enclosures established within state lands to restore the most degraded parts of rangelands, and will negotiate with Inner Mongolian herders to design rotation regimes. These measures are expected to benefit the herders through healthier rangelands and increased fodder.</p> <p>2. The project will explore the use of limited enclosures established outside the boundaries of state lands to restore the most degraded pasture areas, and will negotiate with communities to design rotation regimes. These measures are expected to benefit keepers of livestock through healthier grazing lands and increased fodder. If carefully designed, it is highly unlikely that enclosures of extremely degraded grasslands and application of rotation regimes will have a negative impact on users even in the short term. However, sufficient time and space should be provided if the ROAM process prescribes use of enclosures/rotation regimes that affect livestock management inside or outside the SFFs. Of course, if the ROAM process decides not to engage in these practices, such negotiation will not be necessary</p>	<p>The assessment undertaken as part of the ROAM process referred to above should analyze the complex relationship between past and current government policies towards traditional land-use / pastoralism practised by the Mongolian herders and respective socio-economic effects as well as expected impacts from the new land-use regime promoted by the project.</p> <p>The assessment of project impacts should also take into consideration that, while rotation regimes can be beneficial in the medium term, there may be short-term impacts on herders' livelihoods, as they will no longer be able to use the rangelands as before. Any temporary impacts should be mitigated by the project in adherence with the requirements of the Standard on Access Restrictions (see section B1).</p>
f. 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	The project in Guizhou will explore the potential for biocultural conservation in collaboration with neighboring communities (there is an incremental benefit to the communities that does not currently exist).	To be examined for each site as part of the ROAM situation analysis.
g. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	No		To be examined for each site as part of the ROAM situation analysis.
h. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No		

i. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	No		
j. 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?	No	Other than the potential collaboration with neighboring communities in Guizhou mentioned above, (if it is found to be of interest to said communities), the change in management regimes implemented within the mandate of the project occurs within state lands only. The project is likely to increase access, not reduce it; in the course of the project, however, there are activities designed to improve interactions between the managers of state lands and adjacent communities and groups who access the reserves for various reasons. These activities will begin with discussions, and at this time, FPIC should be sought.	In the event that the existence of IP in the respective sites has been confirmed, FPIC needs to be obtained for all activities that might impact their livelihoods.
k. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	No		
l. 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	The project intends to establish ecosystem service community monitoring teams, based on an equitable gender-balanced selection process. This will be an incremental benefit that currently does not exist and will soften the boundaries between the State Forest Farms and local communities. Additionally see e. and f. above (which are unlikely to entail gender considerations).	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	TBD	While the proponent has confirmed the existence of IP groups in two of the selected provinces, the applicability of the Standard needs to be decided for each intervention as part of the situation analysis to be undertaken by the ROAM process.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		Where indigenous communities have been identified, an assessment of their livelihood situation and potential impacts from project activities is needed as part of the situation analysis to be conducted at each site.
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		In the event that the above analysis identifies negative impacts, mitigation measures will be required.

B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage³

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site	No	

³Cultural 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.

(e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection?if yes, answer a-d below			
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 cultural landscapes)? if yes, answer a-d below	Yes	There are some burial sites within some of the SFFs.	
3. Does the project area harbour a natural feature or resource with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or communityassociated with that feature (e.g., sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas or sacred species)?if yes, answer a-d below	No	However, project area 2 mentioned above is adjacent to a potentially significant site (a cave) which could be an opportunity to develop a biocultural conservation strategy as one of the opportunities to generate benefit. The project design is not pre-determinative and this activity would start with consultation.	
a. 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		This should be confirmed by the PPG team. It seems unlikely that a project of this scale will not need additional infrastructure of some kind.
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	No		
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items a. and b. might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	No		
d. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	No		
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	Yes	See the answer to 3 above. If the biocultural conservation activity is adopted adjacent to project area 2 mentioned above, there would potentially be economic benefits from tourism. This idea was raised by community members interested in economic development of the area.	If this activity is agreed, the requirements of the Standard need to be applied (FPIC of legitimate rights-holders and equitable sharing of benefits).

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	TBD	If tourism is developed at selected project sites, there is a possibility that the Standard will be triggered in case the project seeks to develop economic benefits from cultural resources. This can only be determined when such an activity and respective details are decided during project implementation.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures?What specific topics are to be assessed?		This will require the identification of the legitimate rights-holders of the site and the use of an FPIC process.
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	No		TBD. The PPG team should pursue further verification with local and national government authorities and cross-checking against the World Database on Protected Areas. It is understood that there are a number of “forest parks”, “wetland parks” and “scenic areas” in or near to the project sites, some of which may qualify as protected areas.
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	No	However, the project intends to recognize the biodiversity that exists within and around project sites.	
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 ⁴ ? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d	Yes	Managers of the State Forest Farms recognize the existence of areas of high biodiversity within their areas.	It is recommended that the project contributes to the identification of such sites / confirmation of their biodiversity value.
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		
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	The area that will be affected will be monocultural tree plantations with a view to increasing endemic biodiversity.	n/a
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourisms facilities, access roads), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity (consider the construction and use phases)?	N/A		
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	No		Under Section B3 above, it is stated that a local cave could be opened up to tourism as part of the project. This carries a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity and on the physical site itself.

⁴ 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.

etc.)?			
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 questions a-d	Yes	The project will identify and translocate species from neighboring climate zones to test assisted ecological adaptation strategies.	
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	Plantation development, largely natural regeneration, enrichment planting, and mixed afforestation.	
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		Not agreed. It is stated above that species from neighbouring climatic zones will be used, hence species that are not native to the project sites.
b. If a.is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?			TBD through the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process. The Prodoc should describe the measures that will be put into place to screen species that are not native to the project sites for their potential invasiveness, prior to their introduction.
c. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of facilitory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	Yes		If the risk is confirmed through the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process, the significance and probability need to be determined and mitigation measures identified. The Prodoc should describe the monitoring and biosecurity measures that will be put into place to prevent the spread of invasive species. It should also describe the management and control steps that will be taken should invasive species be identified.
d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood?	No	The landscape surrounding the State Forests Farms is intensively managed.	To be determined through the technical assessment to be carried out as part of the ROAM process. The fact that the surrounding landscapes are intensively managed does not mean that they are immune to the impacts of invasive species.
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?	Yes	Plantation development can increase water demand. However, the direct effect of the project's planting activities will be very limited, as the direct incremental areas of intervention are small. The project is testing water monitoring methods that will be of use nationally, addressing a shortcoming that has already been identified by hydrologists.	
7. If the project involves civil works or infrastructure development outside areas of high biodiversity value, is there a risk of significant impact on biodiversity?	N/A		
8. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics, river connectivity or the	No	The project is likely to contribute to decreased	

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.		sedimentation by recommending better terracing techniques, increase filtration by planting trees, and reduce flood danger by planting trees. These effects are not measurable within the project period.	
9. 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	The project will attempt to improve on existing terracing techniques to either eliminate them or find methods that result in less disturbance of the top soil; existing practices can cause siltation.	
10. 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	Although the project specifically targets ecosystem services, the effects are expected to increase benefits.	To be answered through the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process.
11. 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?	No	There is potential selective harvest of mature trees in monocultural plantations but only for the purpose of enrichment. Harvesting is strictly controlled in all project areas.	
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b	No		This should be verified as part of the technical assessment to be carried out as part of the ROAM process.
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
13. In case the project intends to use biological pest management techniques, is there a risk of adversely affecting biodiversity?	N/A		
14. 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		To be included in the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process.
15. 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		To be answered through the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process.
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	Yes	The Standard is triggered. While the expected impacts on biodiversity are by and large positive, there are risks related to the potential introduction of invasive species, uncertainties regarding the presence of protected areas and potential minor impacts from tourism development (see comments above). These need to be clarified partly by the PPG team, partly by the technical assessment as part of the ROAM process.	
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	See above		
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	In the event that risks are identified, measures will be needed.		

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 applicable.	No		
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		This will need to be clarified at each site by the socio-economic situation analysis as part of ROAM.
3. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		The project will adopt gender-balanced selection protocols for engaging community members and students involved in the project. In China, sex-based discrimination is illegal, however, so the protocols will have to be based on ensuring an equal number of women are given the opportunity to join; selection remains merit- and availability-based.	
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?		This is not applicable.	
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? ⁵	Yes	There is such a risk in China as there is in Europe, North America, and elsewhere. There is a possibility that the project will benefit people of one gender more than another gender, in such a way that cannot be justified as affirmative action. The project will address this concern through the strategy described in no. 3, above. Additionally, the project will continue to consult with the local level Women's Union on the best ways to ensure gender equity.	
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups ⁶ 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		This will need to be clarified at each site by the socio-economic situation analysis as part of ROAM.
7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or	Yes	We are unable to quantify this risk as it involves future unknowns. We expect this risk is low and is	

⁵Affirmative 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 a previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

⁶Depending 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.

expected migration including displaced people.		exceedingly unlikely to entail violent conflict. Suggest this point as something to check during mid-project assessment and correct accordingly.	
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human-wildlife conflicts)?	No		
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. 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
	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	This point is addressed above.	
3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	No		
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions?	No		
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	No		

(consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?			
6. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?	No		
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?	No		

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts

Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?	TBD	No other environmental risks have been identified but the social issues mentioned above should be further explored at each site as part of the ROAM process.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	See above	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		

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,TB	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Have the historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including climate sensitivity ⁷ been analysed in the project area?	TBD	The project design team identified likely scenarios based on recent literature covering the regions in which the project areas are located, but there were insufficient resources to analyse "historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including climate sensitivity in the project area." The data needed to conduct such an analysis at the project area scale are not available.	
2. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	Yes	Floods, droughts, sandstorms.	
3. 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	Poor people are likely to be impacted more than others. However, poverty rates have been declining and the project areas have specific targeted anti-poverty measures in effect.	
4. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes?	No		This risk cannot be dismissed at this stage (e.g. selected species might not adapt well to climate change). Such analysis should be part of the technical assessment in the ROAM process.
5. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future	No		Same as (4) above

⁷ Sensitivity is the degree to which a system can be affected, negatively or positively, by climate-related stimuli. IPCC, 2001

climate variability and changes?			
6. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of the local ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes?	No	The opposite – the project will reduce the vulnerability to climate change by diversifying existing monocultures.	
7. Is there a risk that the project might lead to climate maladaptation ⁸ through yielding short-term benefits while increasing longer-term climate risks?	No		Same as (4) above
8. Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	The project will improve water retention and regulation and will test assisted species migration.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Climate Change Risks

<i>Are negative impacts expected from the project?</i>	No	While overall the impacts are expected to be largely positive (contributing to CC adaptation and mitigation), there are issues that should be investigated once the concrete restoration activities have been determined in the ROAM process at each site (see above comments).
<i>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed</i>	See above	
<i>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</i>		

⁸ Maladaptation is a business-as-usual development, which by overlooking climate change impacts, inadvertently increases exposure and/or vulnerability to climate change. OECD, 2008