

ESMS Screening Report and Clearance - for field projects

This template has been designed for field projects. Another template using a simplified version of the ESMS Questionnaire is available for non-field projects such as projects which support policy making, strategy development or upstream planning processes or provide knowledge through capacity building or knowledge products. Very small projects such as organizing workshops, meeting or conferences, position papers, scientific paper, reports, preparation of scientific materials for subsequent use in conferences or communication are outside the scope of the ESMS and don't require the completion of the ESMS Questionnaire.

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Ensuring resilient ecosystems and representative protected areas in the Solomon Islands (EREPA)		
Project proponent:	Andrew Foran		
Executing agency:	Solomon Islands Government - Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM)		
Funding agency:	GEF Trust Fund - GEF 6		
Country:	Solomon Islands	Contract value (add currency):	USD \$4,918,364
Start date and duration:	TBD / 48 Months	Amount in CHF:	\$4,908,330
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	Provide details, if yes:	

Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

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

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Andrew Foran, Regional Programme Coordinator, IUCN Oceania	1/2/2019
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is \geq CHF 500,000 2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire 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	

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	10.5.2019
	Jennifer Kelleher	ESMS	10.5.2019
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	GEF 6 Project Identification Form - EREPA		5.4.2019
	1. EREPA_ProDoc		6.5.2019

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 will support improved management of land and natural resources in the country through the expansion of terrestrial protected area coverage and participatory land-use planning with local communities. The project - focusing on four provinces with concrete site interventions planned for four sites - will enable to reduce unsustainable logging, mining and agricultural practices and as such create important benefits for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem functioning and carbon sequestration. It further aims to improve community livelihoods through the diversification of income-generating sources, increased direct economic value and benefits from natural resources, and increased resilience to the effects associated with climate change.</p> <p>Despite these environmental and social benefits, some E&S risks have been identified. Most important are social risks related to the creation of new protected areas or the formalization of existing community-conserved areas (CCA), e.g. their designation under the PA law. As these processes might imply changes of management regimes and future regulations or restrictions on access to natural resources, there is a risk that this will affect resource-dependent communities or individuals and as such pose livelihood risks for particular groups. It is acknowledged that Solomon Islands has a robust protected areas law in place which requires inclusive decision making for newly created protected areas and obtaining consent and approval from persons having rights or interests in the area. It is further recognized that a large portion of the sites to be suggested as protected areas are expected to be under community governance with management decisions being made by the communities, which would suggest that potential restrictions will be considered voluntary. However, it cannot be excluded that the project will also work on areas that are not under community governance. For these reasons and described in more detail in section B1, the Standard on Access Restrictions has been triggered and a Process Framework will need to be developed prior to project approval. The Process Framework should also describe what due process will be implemented for voluntary community decisions as this might still carry risks for vulnerable groups (despite not triggering the Standard).</p> <p>Second, the project will set-up a micro-financing system to fund income-generating activities. The activities are not yet defined and while these activities are not expected to be large in scale and as such involve significant environmental risks, minor risks cannot be excluded. Therefore, an abbreviated environmental and management framework (ESMF) is needed that sets out the process how these activities will be assessed for risks (including social risks) and ensure risk avoidance or management.</p> <p>Overall, the project is considered a moderate risk project; despite the identified risks seeming relatively low, the given level of uncertainty (e.g. sites for protected area extension and financed micro-activities are not known) would prevent the project's classification as low risk project. The two safeguard instruments mentioned above (Process Framework and the ESMF) can be combined in one abbreviated ESMF. The ESMF should include a dedicated description of the project-level grievance mechanism.</p>	
Required assessments or tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
ESMS Standards	Trigger	Required tools or plans

¹ For 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.

Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions <i>(see section B1 for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples <i>(see section B2 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Process Framework
Cultural Heritage <i>(see section B3 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input 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

Step 3: ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

The fields below are completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer at Clearance stage

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:			
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:			
Have findings from ESIA triggered any changes (e.g. risk level or Standards triggered)			
CLEARANCE DECISION			
<input type="checkbox"/> Cleared	<i>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.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Conditionally cleared	<i>The conclusions call for improving one or more ESMS activities and/or for important re-formulation of some mitigation measures. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance rejected	<i>Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, critical mitigation measures have not been incorporated or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.</i>		
Rationale – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected)			
Clearance conditions (when conditionally cleared, e.g. tasks to be completed during inception phase):			
Approval ESMS Clearance			
Name	Function	Date	Signature

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's goal is to "establish an effective network of protected areas to achieve healthy, productive and restored landscapes in Guadalcanal, Malaita, Rennell-Bellona and Temotu provinces". The project will be implemented in these four provinces of the Solomon Islands.

The project will support improved management of land and natural resources in the country through the expansion of terrestrial protected area coverage and participatory land-use planning with local communities. The project interventions undertaken at the national, provincial and local levels will enable to reduce the use of unsustainable logging, mining and agricultural practices in the country that leads to the rapid decrease of biodiversity and ecosystem health. These interventions will have important benefits for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem functioning and carbon sequestration. The project will contribute to protect against further loss of biodiversity within a recognized global biodiversity hotspot (East Melanesia Islands) which holds national, regional and global importance.

The project will promote and support conservation activities, sustainable agricultural practices and reforestation interventions. This will include:

- i) addressing current weaknesses in the national, provincial and local frameworks for establishing, extending and maintaining a network of terrestrial Protected Areas; and
- ii) supporting communities to develop and implement appropriate protected area management plans.

The logic of intervention of the project is:

- to support local communities to fulfil the Protected Areas Act's requirements to formally declare terrestrial protected areas in the four provinces;
- to promote the adoption of improved livelihoods, including improved agricultural practices, based on the sustainable use of natural resources to compensate for the loss of income resulting from the PA creation (stopping detrimental logging or agriculture encroachment)
- to establish an efficient network of protected areas (knowledge sharing, M&E, incremental national knowledge database, and long-term funding strategy).

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

1. Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only roles, 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

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

The stakeholder (SH) analysis presented in chapter 3.4. only lists stakeholders but does not analyse them in relation to the project, e.g. their interest in the project, the ways in which these actors may influence the project's outcomes or how they might be impacted (either negatively or positively). For NGOs, no distinction is made between national or international organizations. Please note that while the SH analysis should provide the foundation for planning SH engagement, the analysis itself should not describe the involvement in the design phase of their roles in the project; this is done in the chapter on SH engagement.

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

Information about the project has been shared with a wide a range of stakeholders, namely local communities, provincial and national government agencies and departments, civil society organizations, national and international organizations, regional initiatives, research organisations and the private sector in the Solomon Islands. This collaboration was initiated during the PPG phase through one-on-one consultations and through the organisations of three workshops where all the stakeholders listed below were invited. These consultations were undertaken from 17 July to 07 August 2018. The PPG inception, follow-up and validation workshops were organised to ensure active involvement of all the stakeholders in designing and preparing the project, which is crucial to enable national stakeholders to own the projects. Local stakeholders were also involved in the design of the project through the organisation of on-site focus group discussions to discuss project objectives and activities and assess their interest in the project (see Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 of the Project Document for the methodology of the consultation, the list of meetings undertaken and some information on the content of key meetings).

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

It is not fully evident how the stakeholders with whom consultations were held have been selected – e.g. the selection of villages and their representatives and how the participants of the meetings were chosen.

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		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
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	Yes		
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	TBD		
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.		<p>The project will be supporting Government to both collect and use information in planning for a more ecologically representative network of protected areas. This support could lead to government recommendations on access and management to terrestrial and marine natural resources. Noting also that many of the protected areas the project will be supporting are community based ones, whereby communities have decided on their own restriction regimes.</p>	<p>There are two activities in the project that potentially involve involuntary access restrictions: Component 2, output 2.4: Declarations made for at least 50,000 hectares of protected areas across four (4) provinces – including the development of PA management plans – through supporting consenting communities in the PA Act process. Component 3, output 3.3: Degraded forest areas restored through reforestation activities and natural regeneration interventions.</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>Protected area restrictions will remain as per the existing government and community approaches/standards (e.g. both formal national restrictions and community based restrictions such as the use of Tabu), unless during the course of the project government and/or communities decide to change / add to these.</p>	<p>It is understood that the PA Act defines five categories of protected areas and that the project will guide the selection of PA category for the respective sites – but only for four sites selected as intervention sites.</p> <p>For the other areas in the four provinces to be declared as PAs, it is not clear what the project's level of influence is with regards to the decision making on potential access restrictions; and also for example, activity 3.1 "Community-based land-use management plans at the landscape level developed including delineating PAs, sustainable agricultural areas, agroforestry areas, settlement areas, and forest areas, and improved income-generating activities." - clarification is needed on the extent of the project influence.</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?		80% of land is a kastomary ownership system. A Protected Area Act was endorsed in 2010. It officially recognizes this kastomary law ownership system as the one that applies and emphasises that the process of creating protected areas and developing land management plans as to be community owned with specific rules for the involvement of representatives from all the tribes having rights on the area. The project aims to advance necessary review and amendment of outdated policy and laws that still prevail at the time of this project commencing to address contemporary issues and needs (i.e. 1935 Agriculture Act). Compiled reference information about current land uses, land condition and trends will be used to impel the drafting of more contemporary policy and laws.	This particular feature of the PA Act should be described in the prodoc or the Process Framework (PF). It seems that the PA Act already recognizes the communities as the principal owner of any process of declaring land as protected and that specific rules for this process are provided. Under output 2.2 the project aims at developing provincial ordinances to facilitate the application of national legislation on land use and in particular PA Act. There is no mentioning of reviewing outdated policy and laws. Please clarify.
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?		Solomon Islands has strong and robust kastomary land tenure systems, and these are recognised through national laws.	
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.		The Protected Areas categories to be implemented in each site will be selected by the communities themselves. Among the five existing categories which correspond to different restriction regimes, Management Area will probably be the most adequate for inhabited areas. The corresponding restriction regime is to avoid practices that are unsustainable. The project will therefore support communities to adopt improved agricultural practices that are both more productive and sustainable. The communities targeted by the project expressed their interest in creating a formal protected area to assist them in preventing the development of mining or logging activities on their land.	There needs to be careful agreement on the nature of the restrictions. If it is intended that communities are selecting the PA category and whether resource use is permitted themselves, this needs to be stated clearly in the prodoc/PF.
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access? If yes, specify measures. Are they feasible, culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?			
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?		The process for the creation of new protected areas under the Protected Areas Act in Solomon Islands is aligned with the FPIC principles. The consent of representatives from all the tribes having rights on the area is required to be able to undertake the process.	Please reference the relevant FPIC procedure in the prodoc/PF.
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	Solomon Islands has strong and robust customary land tenure systems that EREPA will be designed around.	
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 a Protected Areas Act (developed via national and community consultations) which can include access restrictions to protected areas.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer² on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

<p>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why</p> <p>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures?</p> <p>What specific topics are to be assessed?</p> <p>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</p>	Yes	<p>The planned creation of new protected areas or the formalization of existing community-conserved areas (CCA), e.g. designation under the PA law, might imply changes of management regimes and future regulations or restrictions on the access to natural resources; there is a risk that such restrictions might affect the livelihood of resource-dependent communities or individuals. It is acknowledged that Solomon Islands has a robust protected areas law in place which requires inclusive decision making for newly created protected areas and obtaining consent and approval from persons having rights or interests in the area. It is further recognized that a large portion of the sites are expected to be under community governance with management decisions being made by the communities, which would suggest considering potential restrictions as voluntary.</p> <p>However, first, it cannot be excluded that the project will also work in areas that are not under community governance. And even if they are, it needs to be recognized that it is ultimately the government, which induces (with this project) the creation of new protected areas or the formalization of existing CCAs – hence the degree of voluntariness is somehow debateable.</p> <p>Second, with regards to the PA Act, there are no explicit provisions in the Act about the need for an explicit assessment of livelihood impacts and for an procedure to ensure that livelihood impacts are avoided or mitigated; it is also not fully clear that the decision-making process gives sufficient attention to vulnerable or disadvantaged groups within the communities.</p> <p>Therefore, and following the precautionary principle, the Standard has been triggered and an abbreviated Process Framework (PF) will need to be developed prior to project approval. The PF will ensure that procedures are in place that specifically address those who may lose out – by designing a process whereby they participate in the design of the restrictions, determine the appropriate measures that are needed to restore or improve their livelihoods and will be engaged in monitoring the effectiveness of such measures.</p> <p>For CCAs that are assumed to decide themselves about and where restrictions are imposed on, the Standard is not triggered in a strict sense. However, the PF should still describe what due process will be implemented for those sites, e.g. establishing that decision-making needs to be considered adequate and reflecting voluntary, informed consensus and that appropriate measures will be agreed and put in place to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community.</p>
B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples³		
		Project proponent
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>
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	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		Approximately 97% of the population is indigenous, they originate from the East Melanesian Islands. The remaining 3% are mainly Polynesians and Micronesians. Non-indigenous

² 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).

³The 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

(including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.		group generally live on government owned land such as Micronesians from Phoenix islands living in Choiseul. All proposed project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous Solomon Islanders. The only exception is if the project site in Guadalcanal does extend to the Queen Elizabeth Park in Guadalcanal. This area is government owned.	
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups?		An indigenous group is defined in the country as a tribe or clan that owns a space by birth or inherited access rights to this land through genealogy, and live on this land.	
c. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		The term indigenous tribes is not used in the Solomon Islands because it represents the large majority of the population. Officials have adopted the terms Indigenous People and Local Communities (IPLC).	
d. How do these groups identify themselves?		People in the intervention areas identify themselves as members of villages first – which often includes members from several tribes – and tribes only when directly asked.	
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' material or non-material livelihoods in ways other than access restrictions (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)?	No	Solomon Islands has strong and robust customary land tenure systems that EREPA will be designed around. In addition, specific activities will aim at reviving or conserving traditional practices (such as basket weaving) and cultural values (such as connection with nature) as this need was raised by community members during consultations at PPG stage.	
f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	TBD	The project includes measures for consultation and participation by all community members, including any marginalised/vulnerable groups. For example, discussions regarding the integration of disabled people in the project have been initiated during the PPG phase.	
g. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	Yes	The project will support existing community-led and managed protected areas – which are underpinned by traditional knowledge and management approaches – and build on communities' traditional knowledge of their environment.	
h. 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	Communities have been selected based on their interest in the conservation of their land and in creating a formal protected area. Their motivation was double checked during consultations at PPG stage. This consultation process will continue in the first phase of the full project. In addition, as previously mentioned, the law for the creation of new protected areas under the Protected Areas Act in Solomon Islands is aligned with the FPIC principles.	
i. 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 Solomon Islanders, and where the communities themselves have initiated and developed conservation/protected/managed areas.	
j. 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	Sustainable financing for protected areas and community managed areas is a proposed 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. This project will seek gender transformative approaches. The advice of UN Women colleagues at the UNW office in Honiara will be sought during the PPG phase of the project and ensure the Gender score-card criteria are met in the project design.	
--	--	---	--

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	No	It is noted that approx. 97% of the population is indigenous and all proposed / potential project sites are on land customarily owned by indigenous Solomon Islanders. However, the criteria of having social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national population and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulation, that are separate from those of the dominant society, does not apply . In addition, there seems no risk of marginalizing IP when implementing project activities or that they are more vulnerable to, or unable to fully participate in, and benefit from, the project. Hence the Standard is not considered triggered and the questions do not need to be assessed.
---	----	--

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	n/a
---	-----

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

B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage⁴

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<small>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</small> <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 (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	Yes	The province of East Rennell is included in the project, and is the location of the only World Heritage site in Solomon islands, inscribed by UNESCO in 1998.
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	Some project areas will, as all proposed / potential project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous Solomon Islanders.
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)? if yes, answer a-d below	Yes	Some project areas will, as all proposed / potential project sites are on land/coast customarily owned by indigenous Solomon Islanders.

⁴ 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.

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?	No		It is not expected that any project activity will lead to decisions on physical access restriction to sites, which might inhibit the exercise of cultural practices. On the contrary, the project should take advantage of "tabu" or sacred sites when defining different zones as such sites may have already been established by the communities as no-use areas.
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	TBD	Sustainable financing for protected areas and community managed areas is a proposed 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.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	No	Given the participatory process of the project and as established by the Solomon PA Act, it is unlikely that future land use plans and the designation of areas for conservation might conflict with cultural practices or that restrictions on physical access to cultural sites will be imposed. On the contrary, taking sacred sites or tabu areas into consideration when deciding about the zoning is highly recommended as explained above.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		Identification of sacred sites or tabu areas within each site
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
	<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? If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d	Yes	The province of East Rennel is included in the project, and is the location of the only World Heritage site in Solomon islands, inscribed by UNESCO in 1998.

<p>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</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>One of the main objectives of the project is to conserve biodiversity through the creation of protected areas and the development of sustainable income generating activities. To maximise the benefits regarding biodiversity protection, the project intervention sites have been purposely chosen within, overlapping or at close proximity with Key Biodiversity Areas of the archipelago.</p>	
<p>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 value⁵? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The presence of a Key Biodiversity Area was a key criterion for the selection of the intervention sites. The targeted sites are all community-based conservation areas. The objective of the project is to support communities in formally declare these sites as protected areas to be able to protect these resources by law.</p>	
<p>Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.</p>			
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The project will support existing community led and managed protected areas, plus support the establishment of further PA's.</p> <p>Component 3 of the project aims to limit adverse impacts through the improvement of environmental quality and livelihood benefits of production landscapes for communities within and adjoining PAs.</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The project directly aims to protect biodiversity. The only expected changes is to formally declare existing conservation areas, implement regulations regarding the use of natural resources in a more systematic manner, and promote improved income generating activities based on the sustainable use of natural resources.</p>	
<p>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)?</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>It is possible that communities will select interventions to promote the development of ecotourism – such as ecotourism camps or environment-friendly infrastructure for bird watching – to enable the long-term financing of the protected area.</p>	
<p>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.)?</p>	<p>No</p>		

⁵ 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.

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	No		
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	No		This cannot be excluded at this stage, e.g. as part of the activities funded by the micro-financing system
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		As the project might include a deliberate introduction of non-native species, it will be critical that an in-depth risk assessment is undertaken beforehand including the identification of measures to mitigate risks. The risk assessment should be rigorous as islands are particularly vulnerable to invasive species. As part of the assessment it should further be proven that the intended introduction is in accordance with the regulatory framework for such species introductions in the country. It is also important that measures are put in place to avoid accidental introduction of invasive species. The IUCN Guidelines for reintroduction and other conservation translocations should be adhered to. ⁶
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 facilitatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	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	Soil conservation interventions around water bodies that may be implemented in the project will focus on soil stabilisation and improving water infiltration, with the purpose of restoring/strengthening natural water ways.	

⁶ Available here: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2013-009.pdf>

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	Agricultural and other management 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	
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	Agricultural management 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	Activity 3.3.2 (Implement low-cost and effective techniques for the management of invasive species where appropriate) may include interventions to protect the crops from these species. This requires adherence to the pest management planning guidance note ⁷ .
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b	No		
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
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		
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		

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

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	Yes	Overall, the impacts are considered highly beneficial for biodiversity and ecosystem health, with two exceptions: risks related to the introduction of non-native species and risks related to the use of pesticides. These risks are considered to be readily addressed by ensuring adherence to the respective IUCN guidance notes quoted above.
---	-----	--

⁷ Available here: https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_esms_pest_management_guidance_note.pdf

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	For income-generating, activities funded by the project, which are not known at this stage, an abbreviated Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is needed that describes the process how such activities will be assessed on environmental risks.
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	n/a

C. Other social or environmental impacts

C1: Other social impacts			
	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is there a risk that the project affects human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? Differentiate between women and men, where 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 project will seek gender transformative approaches. The Ministry of Women, Youth, Children & Family's Affairs was consulted at PPG stage to discuss gender inequality and identify opportunities to maximise the benefits of the project for women. During the PPG phase, particular emphasis was given to designing local income diversification activities that cater for gender needs. The team of the Ministry of Women, Youth, Children & Family's Affairs will continue to be engaged in the project during the implementation phase, starting with their involvement in the development of PA management plans to ensure that women are adequately consulted and integrated.	
3. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		See C1 (2) above	
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?		See C1 (2) above	
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? ⁸	No	See C1 (2) above	
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups ⁹ in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination	No		

⁸ 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 Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?			
7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.	No	The involvement in all processes of communities, CBOs and provincial government through participatory and consenting processes is an unequivocal mandate. The project will build on existing community agreement and ambition for protected area declaration and management.	There is a small risk of funding decisions (e.g. micro-finance) might stir social conflicts in case such decisions are perceived by individuals from the communities as unjustified preferential treatment. Hence, it will be critical that the funding decisions are based on fair and transparent criteria.
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human-wildlife conflicts)?	N/A		
9. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	N/A		
10. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	N/A		
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)?	N/A		
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	The project aims to support the development of improved, climate-resilient and sustainable livelihoods for local communities.	It should be stated clearly in the Prodoc that micro-projects will be identified by the local communities themselves to allow maximum self-determination
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?	N/A		
14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?	No	Any statutory requirements for social impact assessments were identified during the PPG phase for this project	
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

	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. 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	Solomon Islands government has in place EIA legislation, regulation, and guidelines	
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?	No	The Department of Environment is the Executing Agency, and will identify and act on any potential conflicts between the projects activities and existing environmental regulations.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts

Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?	TBD	No significant risks are identified at this stage. However, there is a small risk from income-generating activities which are not known. Hence the ESMF mentioned in B4 should also contain relevant components to address any other identified social risks.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		
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
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Have the historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including climate sensitivity ¹⁰ been analysed in the project area?	Yes	Through a broad number of reports, both national and sector focused.	
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, landslides, ocean acidification, ocean warming	
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 main direct source of income, protein and livelihoods for the majority of the Solomon Islands population, with rural communities most vulnerable, and within communities and women and children are the most vulnerable groups.	

¹⁰ Sensitivity is the degree to which a system can be affected, negatively or positively, by climate-related stimuli. IPCC, 2001

4. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes?	Yes	The project aims to increase the resilience of communities and landscapes to climate change impacts through effective ecosystem based management and protection of local ecosystems and their services.	This may be the intention but short- and long-term risks posed by climate change need to be considered systematically in the detailed planning of activities (e.g. when selecting species for restoration).
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 ¹¹ 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

Are negative impacts expected from the project?	No	While it is the intention to increase resilience to climate change, it is nevertheless critical to ensure that short- and long-term risks posed by climate change are systematically considered during implementation of relevant activities (e.g. when selecting species for restoration). This should be included in the ESMF.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed		
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		

¹¹ Maladaptation is a business-as-usual development, which by overlooking climate change impacts, inadvertently increases exposure and/or vulnerability to climate change. OECD, 2008