



## ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report - for field projects

### Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Expanding Conservation Areas Reach and Effectiveness (ECARE) in Vanuatu		
Project proponent:	Andrew Foran		
Executing agency:	Vanuatu Government - Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC) of the Ministry of Climate Change		
Funding agency:	GEF Trust Fund – GEF 6		
Country:	Vanuatu	Contract value (add currency):	USD \$2,450,459
Start date and duration:	TBD / 48 Months	Amount in CHF:	\$2,445,460
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	Provide details, if yes:	The project was screened before its initial submission to GEF in May 2019. The GEF required major revisions and a focus on community based natural resource management and protected areas. The revised project focuses entirely on conservation areas that will fall under the traditional tenure of ni-Vanuatu.

### 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:	Andrew Foran, Regional Programme Coordinator, IUCN Oceania Kenneth Kassem, Strategic Partnerships Officer	1/2/2019 01/07/2020
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	<p><b>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is <math>\geq</math> CHF 500,000</b></p> <p><b>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (&lt; CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</b></p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is &lt; CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p>	

### Step 2: ESMS Screening

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

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
--	------	------------------------	------

IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS	7.10.2020
	Jennifer Kelleher	ESMS/GPAP	23.2.19
	Anshuman Sakia	ARO ESMS Focal Point	16/07/2020
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	GEF 6 Project Identification Form – ECARE		1/2/2019
	Draft project document		1/2/2019
	Revised project document		01/07/2020

## ESMS Screening Report

### Risk category:

low risk                       moderate risk                       high risk

**Rationale:** Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization

*See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:*

**Section A** for findings about the stakeholder engagement process,

**Section B** on the 4 Standards,

**Section C** on other E&S impacts and

**Section D** on risk issues related to Climate change

The project aims at improving the national systems and capacity for achieving a representative, effective and expanded protected areas network in Vanuatu. The environmental and social context surrounding protected areas in Vanuatu is quite particular: protection has traditionally been and is still a very important aspect of cultural practices, and protected areas are still managed in line with cultural protocols, hinging around traditional land tenure and traditional governance. The strength of the project rests on the fact that it respects and supports tradition in all its aspects (respect of traditional land tenure, respect of Indigenous rights and decision-making processes). The project is therefore expected to generate highly positive social and environmental benefits.

**Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions:** The Standard is not triggered as the project focuses on protection of land that is under community governance systems. However, in order to ensure that any impacts on vulnerable groups are avoided the project will ensure that through the social assessment under output 2.1, undertaken in the priority PAs that are supported by the project, the livelihoods of vulnerable groups and consequences of potential restrictions are well understood by the affected people prior to the communities' approval of designation and management plans. While it is assumed that the kastomary governance regime provides for fair and inclusive decision making, it will be essential to obtain evidence from the communities that decisions about the designation process and the management plan (and respective conservation measures), are supported by all community members, especially those who may have historically been left out of decision-making, such as women, children and vulnerable groups. Evidence should further be provided that appropriate measures have been agreed, included in the PA management plan and will be put in place prior to restrictions to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community. More details see Section B1.

**Standard on Indigenous People:** The Standard is triggered given the presence of Indigenous People. However, taken into consideration that indigenous people form the majority of the population and that the project explicitly aims at strengthening local, traditional governance for conservation and Community Conservation Areas (CCA), risks of indigenous people being affected or marginalized by project activities are not expected. Hence, there is no need for affirmative action and an Indigenous Peoples Plan is not needed. Notwithstanding, the Executing Agency will need to meet the Standard's requirements on FPIC by seeking agreements with the individual communities supported by the project in the target sites about the outcome of the engagement process (designation and registration) and the mutually accepted process how to get there (specifying ecological survey, social assessment, management plan etc.). Also consent of the communities on the actual management plans is needed but this understood as being covered by national legislation.

**Standard on Cultural Heritage:** The project does not include physical interventions that would affect physical cultural resources. Impacts through use restrictions to sites with cultural or spiritual value are possible but not likely, as this will be decided by the

	<p>communities themselves. Assessing such impacts should nevertheless be included in the social assessment under output 2.1. The plans to preserve the cultural sites within the new National Framework (NSPA), and subsequent scaling up of income generation and economic benefits from national features with cultural significance must be examined to understand potential risks of elite capture. Further details see Section B3.</p> <p><u>Standard Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources</u>: The Standard has not been triggered as no risk issues have been identified (see section B4).</p> <p>Environmental and social impacts are expected to be predominantly very positive. However, a few risks have been identified. While these risks are considered already being adequately addressed by project design, they will still need to be monitored. The risks include: the possibility of aggravating existing conflicts between neighbouring communities or causing new conflicts triggered by a perception of unjustified preferential treatment when selecting sites. The latter has been addressed by the project through a transparent selection process with clear and fair criteria. The potential of aggravating existing conflicts will be carefully assessed as part of the socio-economic assessment under output 2.1; relevant issues will be brought forward to the Area Councils as this is their mandate to mitigate and resolve conflicts. Gender-based violence, while predominately a domestic issue, will be proactively addressed by sensitization and training as well as by the EA adhering to the IUCN policy on SEAH. See section C on further details.</p> <p>Conclusion: While some social risks have been identified, none of them are expected to cause any significant or irreversible impacts as they are considered as being readily addressed by project design. However, because the social analysis will be implemented only during project implementation (and not as part of the preparation phase), the project is classified for reasons of precaution as a moderate risk project. The development of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) is required, to ensure that even low level risks are managed and monitored throughout implementation and that new risks are well perceived. The ESMP will need to be updated once the results of the social assessment are available as this will inform risk levels and mitigation strategies.</p>	
<p><b>Required assessments or tools</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other:</p>	
<p><b>Required actions for gender mainstreaming</b></p>		
<p><b>ESMS Standards</b></p>	<p><b>Trigger</b></p>	<p><b>Required tools or plans</b></p>
<p>Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions <i>(see section B1 for details)</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> TBD</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework</p>

Indigenous Peoples (see section B2 for details)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous People Plan
Cultural Heritage (see section B3 for details)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources (see section B4 for details)	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

### Step 3: ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

The purpose of the ESMS Clearance stage is to confirm the risk classification that has been established by the formal ESMS Screening and to review and approve the risk assessments and safeguard tools developed. It is completed at the **end of project development** prior to approval of the project. The fields below are completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer.

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:			
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:			
Have findings from the risk assessment or other final steps of project development triggered any <b>changes to the risk classification</b> of the project? If yes, explain and indicate the risk areas where modifications were made.			
Have the <b>ESMS actions</b> requested by the ESMS Screening been completed (e.g. tools and other actions)? Has this been done in a satisfactory manner? Has the implementation of the tools been budgeted for?			
Are there <b>ESMS actions</b> requested by the ESMS Screening that still need to be completed during the project? If yes, specify the actions and respective deadlines?			
Has the quality of <b>stakeholder consultation</b> during project design been adequate? Have results of the consultations been documented (disaggregated by gender, where relevant)? Does			

<p>this demonstrate how the consultations were used to inform project design?</p>			
<p>Has a <b>Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)</b> been developed that describes how the identified stakeholder will be further engaged during project implementation?</p>			
<p>Is the SEP inclusive and provides for active participation of a wide range of stakeholders – particularly women, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples, representatives of the local communities and local groups?</p>			
<p>Are provisions made for monitoring the SEP during project implementation?</p>			
<p>Has a <b>project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM)</b> been established that explains the processes for submitting, resolving and escalating grievances? Is the GRM culturally appropriate, readily accessible for local stakeholders and provide appropriate confidentiality protection?</p>			
<p>Have stakeholders been informed about the GRM?</p>			
<p><b>CLEARANCE DECISION</b></p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Cleared</b></p>	<p>The conclusions are positive and the project proposal meets all requirements with regards to avoiding or reducing environmental and social risks: the proposal is accepted.</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Conditionally cleared</b></p>	<p>The conclusions above call for improving one or more ESMS action and/or for important re-formulation of tools and mitigation measures. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Clearance rejected</b></p>	<p>Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, plans or other actions have not been completed and critical mitigation measures have not been incorporated or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.</p>		
<p><b>Rationale</b> – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected):</p>			
<p><b>Clearance conditions</b> (when conditionally cleared) - Explain tasks to be completed during the project:</p>			
<p><b>Approval ESMS Clearance (M level or above)</b></p>			
<p>Name</p>	<p>IUCN Unit and Function</p>	<p>Date</p>	<p>Signature</p>

## Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

### Project summary

ECARE's Objective is for improved national systems and capacity for achieving a representative, effective and expanded protected areas network in Vanuatu.

The project proposes to build on the recent accomplishments of the Government of Vanuatu in the area of conservation: the Vanuatu Ocean Policy and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) approved in 2017 and 2018 respectively. These overarching documents rest and build on an ancestral tradition of nature conservation in Vanuatu: over 600 'Community Conservation Areas' (CCAs) have been recorded in the NBSAP, all managed by custom-owners, using custom rules.

The project proposes to expand conservation areas in 3 provinces by engaging with local community customary land owners. This will be partly achieved through revision of national policies and guidelines for conservation area designation, support for decentralised processes of conserved areas through customary owners and Area Councils, and support for community livelihoods that support sustainable financing of conservation areas.

The project also aims at ensuring the sustainability of traditional conservation and management efforts, by partnering with the Vanuatu Cultural Centre and supporting traditional governance on the ground and at decentralised levels, strengthening the link between traditional and scientific knowledge and valuing traditional land management and conservation practices. This includes supporting and utilising the new decentralisation efforts promoted by Government, with a focus on Area Councils, a relay between Central Government and communities, and a vehicle to facilitate joint management between government and traditional governance. As women and youth are heavily involved at this decentralised level, this is also a way to increase the involvement of these under-represented groups in decision making.

The project's outcome and outputs are the following:

Components	Outcomes	Outputs
<b>COMPONENT 1. VANUATU FRAMEWORK AND STRATEGY FOR REGISTERING PAs</b>	Outcome 1. Protected area policies, guidelines developed and improved	Output 1.1. An updated legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu covering terrestrial, coastal and offshore areas.
		Output 1.2. Tools and process guidelines for PA designation, management planning and effectiveness, and for integration in Area Council development plans, are enhanced and developed.
<b>COMPONENT 2 – PA MANAGEMENT PLANNING, CAPACITY BUILDING AND COMMUNICATION</b>	Outcome 2. Expanded protected area network in Vanuatu	Output 2.1. Socioeconomic and Ecological Field surveys of priority existing and proposed PAs conducted.
		Output 2.2. Community owned and endorsed PA Management plans and designation documentation for priority PAs submitted
		Output 2.3. Capacity and support for PA tools built
		Output 2.4. Awareness and understanding of PAs increased at community and national level
<b>COMPONENT 3 – FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF PROTECTED AREAS</b>	Outcome 3: Improved financial sustainability options for protected areas	Output 3.1 Costs of running national PA network assessed
		Output 3.2 PA-related tourism in selected PAs supporting local community and kastomary owners
		Output 3.3. Protected area-oriented sustainable community livelihoods developed.

## 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*

A complete project stakeholder analysis has been carried out. Most of the stakeholders have been participating during the two workshops. Mutual benefits for the government and for CSO stakeholders have been identified. Women have been taken into account at different levels for the design of the project.

*IUCN ESMS Reviewer*

Yes, chapter 6 includes a detailed description of main SHs.

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 of potentially affected groups? Have results from the consultations been taken up and influenced project design?

*To be completed by project proponent*

The project includes consulting with communities and stakeholders in the design of a marine and terrestrial protected areas framework. Two national workshop have been organized. It And the participants have represented specific interests. Women have been contacted through the national women network. Cultural aspects have been addressed through joint meetings with VKS. Note that all the protected areas (excepted future offshore) are traditionally managed by the communities. The project aims to establish protected areas co management framework involving government, decentralised authorities and communities. .

*IUCN ESMS Reviewer*

Consultation could have been more extensive, but overall seem appropriate in light of the proposed consultative process at the site level that will be carried out 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? <b>if yes, answer a-b below</b>	no	Shaded cells do not need to be filled out	
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.); <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	Yes		

3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	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.)? <b>if yes, answer a-g below</b>	TBD		
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.		The project will be supporting Government, decentralised authorities and land owners/communities to both collect and use information in planning and managing for a more ecologically representative and sustainable network of protected areas. This support could lead to recommendations on access and management to terrestrial and near-shore/coastal marine natural resources, but as all coastal or land protected areas in Vanuatu are community owned and community managed, as per the community land tenure principle enshrined in the Vanuatu Constitution, any restrictions will be decided and endorsed by the communities themselves.	
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)?		The project will involve the traditional land owners, along with government and civil society, to develop appropriate management plans which could include recommendations about use or access restrictions. As explained above, any such restriction will be decided and endorsed by the communities. The project will also have an awareness and training components to assist in the implementation of these management plans. Note that these management plans and restrictions will be directly initiated and enforced by local land owners, with support from government	According to section 39 (1) of the EPC Act, "the applicant and/or the CCA management committee/coordinating body is responsible for the development, implementation, and enforcement of the management plan established for a registered Community Conservation Area
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?		The legal framework has been analysed during project preparation. The Vanuatu Constitution (Section 71) establishes that all land belongs to the individual customary owner and their descendants. The Constitution further confirms in Section 72 that custom rules are the basis for the ownership and use of land. Owing to the spatial organisation of the society into villages, land ownership is fragmented into fairly small areas, all managed by a different traditional chiefs - yet linked to a tribal and a language group. The National Parks Act establishes the process of designation.	
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?		Vanuatu has strong and robust customary land tenure systems that ECARE has been designed around. Traditional rights and chief representation are included into the Constitution.	



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.		These implications will be formally researched during the 'ground truthing' phase of the project and the social assessment scheduled under activity 2.1.1, noting that all of the terrestrial and near-shore/coastal protected areas the project will be supporting are community based, whereby communities have decided on their own restriction regimes. Also noting that the project focuses on land that is mainly under community governance systems known as Vanuatu kastom which is a holistic approach to life and management of natural resources. Kastom also deals with disputes, issues relating to marriage and children, disputes over the payment of debts, failure to honour agreements, and some offences committed by one person against another. In kastom, the overriding aim is to restore peace and harmony in the community. Hence, risks for specific groups, including vulnerable members of the society, are expected to be handled through the customary conflict management system. Nevertheless, the project will ensure that the social assessment would screen for potential risks or impacts falling disproportionately vulnerable groups.	
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?		A key outcome of the project is the design of management tools, including tools to minimise impact and compensate for loss of access. Good practices in these regards will also be collated, analysed and disseminated. However, it will be the communities' responsibility to provide for mitigation or compensation if impacts have been identified.	The responsibility for mitigating risks for vulnerable members of the communities should be included in the agreements established with each community supported by the project
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?		This is a key goal of the consultations with communities at the ground truthing phase of the project, noting also that all of the protected areas the project will be supporting are community based ones, whereby communities have already decided on their own restriction regimes.	Vanuatu Environmental Management and Conservation Act, chapter 37. Registration of Community Conservation Areas, 2, c) "consent and approval are obtained from all persons having rights and interests in any land that is to be included in the proposed Community Conservation Area"
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	Vanuatu has strong social and cultural identity, customs and institutions (including land tenure) that will be fully respected to ensure that the project does not negatively impact rights and livelihoods of ni-Vanuatu	
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	Yes	The government has in place protected/conservation areas (developed via national and community consultations) which can include access restrictions.	

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

<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	No	All coastal or land protected areas in Vanuatu are community owned and community managed, as per the community land tenure principle enshrined in the Vanuatu Constitution and as per Environmental Management and Conservation CAP 283 custom landowners can register and protect any site as a Community Conservation Area. As the project focuses on protection
---	----	--

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

		<p>of land that is under community governance the Standard is not triggered because it will be the communities themselves who would make a decision on access restrictions (if such are needed) - hence decisions would be considered voluntary.</p> <p>However, in order to comply with the ESMS principle on protection of vulnerable groups, the project includes a social assessment for all PAs supported by the project (activity 2.1.1) to ensure that livelihoods of vulnerable groups and consequences of potential restrictions are well understood prior to decisions about restrictions. While it is assumed that the kastomary regime provides for fair and inclusive decision making, it will be essential to obtain evidence from the communities that decisions about the designation process and the management plan (and respective conservation measures), are representative of all community members, especially those who may have historically been left out of decision-making, such as women, children and vulnerable groups. Evidence should be provided that appropriate measures have been agreed and included in the PA management plan to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community.</p>
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>		See above
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>		See above
<b>B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples<sup>2</sup></b>		
	<b>Project proponent</b>	<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
	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? <b>If yes, answer questions a-j</b>	yes	
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still affect their rights and livelihood? <b>If yes, answer questions a-j</b>	N/A	
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.		Approximately 98% of the population is indigenous. All proposed / potential project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous ni-Vanuatu.
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups?		<p>Considering the diversity of indigenous peoples, an official definition of "indigenous" has not been adopted by any UN-system body. Instead the system has developed a modern understanding of this term based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self- identification as indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member.</li> <li>• Historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies</li> <li>• Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources •</li> <li>• Distinct social, economic or political systems</li> </ul>

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinct language, culture and beliefs</li> <li>• Form non-dominant groups of society</li> <li>• Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.</li> </ul> <p>According to these characteristics, approximately 98% of the population is indigenous.</p>	
c. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		Referred to as ni-Vanuatu.	
d. How do these groups identify themselves?		As members of tribes, communities, languages and provinces/country	
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	Vanuatu has strong social and cultural identity, customs and institutions (including land tenure) that will be fully respected to ensure that the project does not negatively impact rights and livelihoods of ni-Vanuatu. All PA management plans will be developed by the indigenous land owners themselves.	
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	Vanuatu has strong and robust customary land tenure systems that ECARE will be designed around. Community consultation, ownership and implementation of project activities and outcomes is key underpinning for the project. In addition, one of the key project aims is to strengthen cultural identity, values and practices. The possible limitation of material livelihoods are decided by the communities themselves.	
g. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	No	The project includes measures for consultation and participation by all community members, including any marginalised/vulnerable groups. These groups will be engaged through the traditional governance networks at Provincial, Area Council and community levels.	The socio-economic al assessment carried out in each site will examine the risk of potentially affecting vulnerable groups.
h. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	TBD	Sustainable financing for protected areas is an element of the project. Any related economic activities will be decided upon and developed by the communities, incorporating customary land tenure systems and related decision making processes.	The intention that any potential use or commercial development of natural resources will be decided upon by the communities should be included in the agreement between the project and the respective communities.
i. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	Yes	ECARE will take a strong focus on appropriate, context specific knowledge generation and management. As per Vanuatu's NEPIP 2016-2030, traditional knowledge and practices related to biodiversity conservation will be used and promoted as high priority. As natural resources in Vanuatu are owned and used by communities, the project will ensure consultations engage effectively with community in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The project will also support the identification and dissemination of endogenous good practices related to the use and promotion of traditional knowledge.	
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?		Yes, and it has been included into the project design. All the community conservation areas that the project will support have been initiated and designed by communities, sometimes with support from the Environment department	In order to fully comply with the Standard, the Executing Agency will need to develop for each site, that is supported by the project, an agreement with the communities

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• about the outcome of the engagement process (site designation and registration) and</li> <li>• the <u>mutually accepted process</u> how to get there (specifying ecological survey, social assessment, management plan etc.).</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of the agreements between the parties as the outcome of the negotiations needs to be provided.</p>
k. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?		All proposed / potential project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous ni-Vanuatu, and where the communities themselves have initiated and developed conservation/protected areas.	
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?		Sustainable financing for protected areas and community managed areas is an element of the project: through identification and dissemination of good practices. Any related economic activities will be decided upon and developed by the communities incorporating customary land tenure systems and related decision making processes. As above Culturally appropriate and gender inclusive principles and strategies will be implemented in all ECARE components. ECARE will also ensure all activities emphasize knowledge of the local context and use local knowledge to inform ways of working.	

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

<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	Yes	Approximately 98% of the population is indigenous and all proposed / potential project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous ni-Vanuatu. The Standard on Indigenous People is triggered given the presence of Indigenous People. However, taken into consideration that indigenous people form the majority of the population and that the project aims at strengthening local, traditional governance for conservation and CCAs, risks of indigenous peoples being marginalizing when implementing project activities are not expected. Hence, there is no need for affirmative action and an Indigenous Peoples Plan is not needed. The Standard's requirements on FPIC should be met following the description in 2.j above. It is acknowledged that livelihood conditions, interests as well development priorities and trade-offs may differ between community members. Risks related to access restrictions that may affect specific groups within the communities are covered by the measures specified in B1; risk of negative impacts falling disproportionately on disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups groups is covered in section C.
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>	This is covered by the social assessment under output 2.1 (activity 2.1.1)	
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>	Not yet. The development of culturally suitable mitigation measures and/or compensation mechanisms for any loss of access to resources, if any, is scheduled under activity 2.2.1.	

### B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage<sup>3</sup>

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

	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? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	No		
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)? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	TBD	A number of conservation areas identified by the traditional owners and presented in the NBSAP harbour cultural significance for the traditional owners (which justifies their conservation).	
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)? <b>if yes, answer a-d below</b>	TBD	This will be ascertained during the course of the project (ground truthing phase).	
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		
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?	TBD	This cannot be excluded, but as any restrictions will be decided by the community themselves, it is not expected that any restrictions would be decided that would affect the community's ability to use such spiritual resources or sites.	This should be included in the social assessment.
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	yes	ECARE will be generating advice or information that should lead to scaling up successful forms of income generation for protected areas that could lead to the development of economic benefits from national features with cultural significance. This could include advising on tourism development.	Adverse impacts from tourism development on cultural resources should be addressed in the tourism study (activity 3.2.1). . It is understood that the project will not directly develop economic benefits from cultural resources. However, activities such as the development of PA management plans, providing training for tourism operators and the development of sustainable financing schemes might influence decisions about the use of cultural resources. Hence, in such situations the project should advise on the need to obtain consent from rights holders in relation to the development of economic benefits from cultural resources..

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

<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	Yes	The project does not include physical interventions that would affect physical cultural resources. Impacts through use restrictions to sites with spiritual value are possible but not likely, as such restrictions will be decided by the communities
---	-----	--

	<p>themselves. For precautionary reasons, the social assessment should elaborate on known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance and the results should be taken into account in the development of the management plans. .</p> <p>The need to obtain consent from rights holders in case the development of economic benefits from cultural resources should be promoted wherever relevant (PA management plans, tourism operators training and sustainable financing schemes).</p> <p>In collaboration with the Vanuatu Cultural Centre, the project should further ensure that Cultural Heritage pertaining to protected areas is preserved and enhanced. If cultural sites fall within the new protected areas, they should be included in the same processes of consultation as the protected areas itself.</p>
--	--

<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>	See above
---	-----------

<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>	n/a
---	-----

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

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
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? <b>If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d</b>	No	
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? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	Yes	The project objective is to expanding conservation areas reach and effectiveness in Vanuatu, and KBAs will be a criteria for site prioritisation. All the PA in Vanuatu are protected by indigenous people who are also local users.
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 <sup>4</sup> ? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	yes	The project aims at formally designating and supporting areas which are already under protection.
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	No information or advice generated by ECARE will do this. the information and advice provided should positively affect the sustainable use of Vanuatu's natural resources. The project will also support capacity building of Area Council

<sup>4</sup> 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.



		decentralised authorities to integrate community conservation areas into their local development plans in order to prevent any adverse impacts to CCAs resulting from development activities.	
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	Any management changes would be designed with protecting biodiversity as a criteria/goal.	
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)?	No	No specific infrastructure development is planned for the project.	
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	Any ecotourism project supported by the project, through the projects support of development of sustainable finance and livelihoods opportunities for communities and landowners, would be implemented using an ecosystem-based approach to land use planning and activity.	
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)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	No		
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</b>	No		
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?	N/A		
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)?	N/A		
d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood?	N/A		
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	None of these activities are planned or expected for the project.	
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?	No	None of these activities are planned or expected for the project.	

8. 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	No activities likely to cause this are planned or expected for the project.	
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	No activities likely to cause this are planned or expected for the project.	
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	Any changes and activities that may be implemented in the project will be designed and implemented using an ecosystem-based approach to land use planning and activity, and all the community conservation areas that the project will support have/will be initiated and designed by communities.	
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	Changes and activities that may be promoted or implemented in the project will be designed and implemented using an ecosystem-based approach to land use planning and activity	
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? <b>If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b</b>	No	The project has no focus on activities or information that could lead to this.	
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	The project has no focus on activities or information that could lead to this.	
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	The project has no focus on activities or information that could lead to this.	

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

<b>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</b>	No	The Standard is not triggered as it exclusively focusses on the designation of PAs which is expected to be highly positive for biodiversity and sustainable use practices. No significant risk issues have been identified in the above analysis.
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>	N/A	



<p><b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>		
<p><b>C. Other social or environmental impacts</b></p>			
<p><b>C1: Other social impacts</b></p>			
	<p><b>Project proponent</b></p>		<p><b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b></p>
	<p><i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i></p>	<p><i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i></p>	<p><i>Comments, additional considerations</i></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Approximately 98% of the population is indigenous. Youth, women and chiefs will be involved through the existing traditional mechanisms of consultation at the local level.</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>no</p>	<p>Gender inequality remains a major development challenge in Vanuatu and must be factored into all aspects of program design and implementation. There has been very strong representation from women in DEPC in the formulation of the PIF and project design with close senior engagement. Gender Equity principles will be implemented in all ECARE components, in particular those designing capacity development and stakeholder consultations. As explained under Output 2.1 the field work to be conducted at the local level will follow a careful process of gender responsive engagement. This project will focus on promoting initiatives where women, men, boys and girls have equal opportunities to access resources, information, rights and decision-making processes through equal participation and benefits from the development of protected areas.</p> <p>It is to be noted that the traditional governance structure related to women (who have representatives at Area Council, Provincial and National levels) will be fully engaged in the process, both in terms of decision making, and information and training.</p>	
<p>3. Is there a risk that the project might aggravate risks of gender-based violence (including sexual harassment, sexual exploitation or sexual abuse)? Is there a risk that persons employed or engaged by the project executing agency or through third parties to perform work related to core functions of the project might engage gender-based violence? Have any such incidents been reported in the past?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Vanuatu has a high rate of gender-based violence. Women's traditional roles and the implications with natural resource management is discussed in Chapter 19. The inclusion of women's groups in the Area Councils will be leveraged to include women in decision making apparatus established in the project. Gender specific responses to socio-economic surveys and engagement are outlined in Output 2.1, Output 2.2, Output 2.4 and Output 3.3.</p>	<p>Given the high occurrence of GbV, despite being predominately perceived as a risk occurring in a domestic context, it is recommended as precautionary measure that the project includes measures for sensitization and training on this topic, for project staff as well as for project stakeholder. In line with IUCN policy on Sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH) it is further recommended that the Executing Agency puts in place procedures to prevent and detect SEAH including modalities for confidential reporting, investigation, protection and remedial action and redress to any survivors</p>

4. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		Good practices around conservation of natural resources used by women (for weaving purposes primarily) will be identified and women groups trained to improve their conservation knowledge and practices. Note that women and women networks are part of traditional decision making mechanisms at the level of communities and decentralised area councils.	
5. 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?		The project provides for strong measures to increase the representation rights of women, especially at local levels. The project, through its training component in areas traditionally reserved to women (food preservation, waste management, management of certain natural resources used by women), will further empower women, which is recognised as a major tool to address gender inequality as well as domestic violence.	
6. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? <sup>5</sup>	No	See C2 above	
7. Is there a likelihood that project risks and negative impacts fall disproportionately on disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups? Consider impacts on material and on non-material livelihood conditions. Also consider changes in land use and/or tenure arrangements with a risk of disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups, including people coming from outside the project area such as internally displaced people.	No	The project consultations and activities (Output 2.1, 2.2, 3.3) are designed to include vulnerable, youth, and women's groups.	The social assessment implemented under activity 2.1.2 include potential risks or impacts falling disproportionately on vulnerable groups.
8. 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 or the risk of unjustified preferential treatment.	TBD	<p>If information on ecological representativeness is in conflict with community priorities, this could lead to conflict. Information generated to develop Vanuatu's NSPA will also necessarily be dealing with conflicting interests between tourism, conservation, fisheries, shipping etc.</p> <p>Conflict between neighbouring communities may occasionally occur in Vanuatu, especially when there is a perception of unequal development. This issue will be dealt with at Area Council levels: Area Councils will deal with broad land use planning issues and paramount Chiefs at that level have the mandate to mediate and diffuse conflicts. At the local level, the project, through the ground truthing operations, will identify existing or potential inter communities conflicts and will provide for their resolution through mediation and intervention with area council authorities and paramount chiefs</p>	<p>There seems to be a risk that the process of selecting target sites may be interpreted as unjustified preferential treatment by those communities that were not selected. The risk needs to be addressed through a transparent selection process with clear and fair criteria.</p> <p>The project includes a review and update of the legal framework and policy for PAs in Vanuatu. It will be crucial that suggestion will not (even inadvertently) implicate any conflict with existing local social or traditional frameworks.</p>

<sup>5</sup> 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 a previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

9. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human-wildlife conflicts)?	No		
10. Is there a risk that the project exposes local communities to <b>accidents</b> or increases their vulnerability to <b>natural hazards or disasters</b> ? This would include exposure to hazardous substances, accidents involving vehicles and equipment, and risks related to infrastructure built by the project, in particular in areas subject to floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, etc.	No	The project will not increase any risks of accidents. Vanuatu communities live with high levels of risk from earthquakes, volcanos and cyclones on a regular basis. The Department of Environment, as executing agency will not conduct activities when these risks are elevated in any particular area.	
11. Will the project support PA management and/or provide support for law enforcement activities? If yes, please briefly describe relevant project activities and answer questions a-d. Otherwise, skip to the next question.	No		
a. Which agencies are responsible for law enforcement in the project area? Do they include any community organizations or private companies?		Communities are responsible for traditional and customary rule enforcement in Vanuatu. This is done through chiefly roles. National police have limited presence in many rural communities.	
b. Do park rangers or other law enforcement personnel carry firearms in the course of their duty?	No		
c. Has there been any conflict between the management of the protected area/s and local people in the last 5 years? If so, what were the causes of the conflict (e.g. poaching, logging, disputes over access rights, artisanal mining)?	Yes	Vanuatu has 9 registered protected areas of which 4 were registered in the past 5 years. Those 4 (Mt Tabumasana, Wairua, Apuma and Dolav) have had minimal conflict. Vanuatu's first CCA, established in 1998, has been struggling with land disputes and disputes over tourism income and logging rights that were not adequately addressed when the CCA was formalised. A case has been submitted to the courts and is currently under review.	
d. Have there been any formal complaints, investigations or press reports relating to law enforcement activities in the project area?	Yes	The project will have activities in 3 of Vanuatu's six provinces. Several cases of police abuse have been raised in the media recently from Sanma. None of the abuse complaints have related to protected area management.	
12. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	No		
13. Is there a risk that the project might involve or lead to working conditions that do <b>not meet national labour laws</b> and international commitments (e.g. through discriminatory working conditions, lack of equal opportunity, lack of clear documentation of employment terms, failure to prevent harassment or exploitation etc.)? Consider also work executed by contractors	No	The project does not involve any activities that could lead to this risk. IUCN will work with the EA to ensure that all staff associated with the project have proper contracts that conform with national labour law.	
14. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	No		
15. Is there a risk that project workers <sup>6</sup> , including volunteers or people engaged in public/community work programs,	No	There will be no additional risks related to the project. Some biodiversity and resource surveys may be conducted using	

<sup>6</sup> Project workers refer to (i) people employed or engaged **directly by the project executing entity** to work specifically in relation to the project, (ii) people employed or engaged through **third parties** to perform work related to core functions of the project, (iii) individuals engaged by the project in public or **community work programs or as volunteers**.

might be exposed to <b>occupational health and safety</b> (OHS) risks including risks related to vehicles and equipment, chemical or biological hazards, exposure to infectious and vector borne diseases and specific threats to women?		SCUBA or snorkelling equipment. All SCUBA activities will be done with certified SCUBA divers and a SCUBA safety plan.	
16. 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		
17. 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	The project aims to support the development of livelihoods of local communities.	
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	The project includes a legislative and regulatory review process.	

## C2: Other environmental impacts

	<b>Project proponent</b>	<b>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</b>
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
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	
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 (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	No	

6. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?	yes	Environmental Management and Conservation Act 2010 require projects and proposals to have an EIA which includes environmental, social and custom impact.	
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?	No	The Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC) is the Executing Agency, and will identify and act on any potential conflicts between the projects activities and existing environmental regulations, in both the project design and implementation phases.	

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

<b>Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?</b>	No	Environmental and social impacts are expected to be predominantly very positive. However, a few risks have been identified; while they are already adequately addressed by project design, they will still need to be monitored. These include: the potential of causing livelihood impacts from access restrictions (but this is already covered under B1); the possibility of aggravating existing conflicts between neighbouring communities or causing new conflicts triggered by a perception of unjustified preferential treatment. The latter has been addressed by the project through a transparent selection process with clear and fair criteria. The potential of aggravating existing conflicts will be carefully assessed as part of the socio-economic assessment; relevant issues will be brought forward to the Area Councils as this is their mandate to mitigate and resolve conflicts. Gender-based violence, while predominately a domestic issue, will be proactively addressed by sensitization and training as well as by the EA adhering to the IUCN policy on SEAH.
<b>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?</b>	Social assessment will be carried out in activity 2.1.2	
<b>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</b>	See above	

### 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. Have the historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including climate sensitivity <sup>7</sup> been analysed in the project area?	Yes	Through a broad number of reports, at regional, national and sector levels that have been taken into account for the project preparation.	
2. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	Yes	Cyclones, storm surges, droughts, ocean acidification, ocean warming are current in Vanuatu. The last major event was the category 5 Cyclone PAM in 2015.	

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

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	Natural resources are the main direct source of income and livelihoods for majority of ni-Vanuatu, and naturally sensitive to climate change.	
4. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes?	TBD	The project aims in part to increase the resilience of communities and to climate change impacts through effective ecosystem management. Obviously, the occurrence of a new major event such as Cyclone PAM would affect directly the implantation of the project.	
5. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future climate variability and changes?	No	See D4 above	
6. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of the local ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes?	No	See D4 above	
7. Is there a risk that the project might lead to climate maladaptation <sup>8</sup> through yielding short-term benefits while increasing longer-term climate risks?	No	See D4 above	
8. Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?		See D4 above	

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

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

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