

ESMS Screening & Clearance Report

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for large-scale impact in the grazing lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces in South Africa		
Project proponent (e.g. IUCN programme):	Prime Africa Consult		
Project ID	10179	Funding agency:	GEF
Name and function of staff leading project development:	Kyle Harris, Project Lead	Entity executing/managing the project:	IUCN
Expected start date and duration:	Early 2020 (5 years)	Contract value (in CHF):	CHF 3 471 736
Country:	South Africa	Geography/landscape:	Limpopo and Northern Cape, South Africa

Establishing the need for ESMS Screening

The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the purpose is to establish the need for ESMS screening.

Tick one option	Definition	Next steps
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area-based project	An area-based project is a project where resources are provided in form of technical assistance, physical investments (infrastructure, technology or equipment) or financing to bring about changes in skills, knowledge, attitudes, behaviours and/or practices of institutions or individuals within a defined geographical area . An area-based project triggers changes on the ground; in fact, it is designed to have positive impacts on species/biodiversity and/or human wellbeing, but unintended negative effects are possible.	Screening needed -> continue with Step 1a
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-area-based project	A non-area-based project does not implement any activity (e.g. technical assistance, physical investment or financing) in a defined geographical area. The following types of projects are considered non-area based projects: a. Global/regional/national projects that contribute to global, regional or national policy, strategy development or planning, advances global knowledge - provided the project does not involve any actions on the ground; b. Projects analysing biophysical or spatial data, assessing or monitoring status of ecosystems, biodiversity or species including presentation of data in form of a database, maps or through web-based platforms (e.g. Red List of Species, Red List of Ecosystems, IBAT etc.) - provided the project does not involve any actions on the ground or changes in regulatory policies with potential impacts on people or cultural heritage. c. Preparation and dissemination of position papers, scientific paper, reports, documents and communication materials; d. Organization of an event, workshop, stakeholder meeting, conference or training; e. Partnership coordination and management of networks; f. Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences; g. Projects related directly to roles where IUCN provides statutory advisory services to intergovernmental processes with their own oversight policies and procedures in relation to the types of issues covered by ESMS h. Projects that supports the internal development of the IUCN	Screening not needed - complete this box and upload the document on the Project Portal
<input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement	Projects that include law enforcement activities must undergo ESMS Screening due to the potential impacts on people's security, health and safety, irrespective of whether they are area-based or not.	Screening needed -> continue with Step 1a

<input type="checkbox"/> Service Agreement Projects	<p>Service Agreement Projects are projects set up to deliver a service to meet the objectives of a client in exchange for consideration (payment). The client has defined the scope of work and outcomes. IUCN clients might use service agreements for routine services provided in a competitive environment. Service Agreement Projects are outside the scope of the ESMS.</p>	<p>Screening not needed -> complete this box and upload the document on the Project Portal</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Sub-awards or sub-grants	<p>Sub-awards (or sub-grants) are awards where IUCN is not the prime recipient receiving funding from an originating donor but only the sub-recipient. In this position IUCN has responsibility for programmatic decision making over the sub-award, but does not have the primary authority of the award. Examples are consortium partner arrangements where IUCN is only responsible for selected work packages and does not have the role of a consortium coordinator responsible for quality assurance. The Project Manager should verify that the prime recipient has a robust environmental and social management system at least equivalent to IUCN's. The IUCN ESMS Coordinator should be consulted if the Project Manager believes that the prime recipient has overlooked an ESMS risk or if the environmental and social risk management is inadequate.</p>	<p>Screening not needed (unless system of prime recipient is insufficient) -> complete this box and upload the document on the Project Portal</p>
<p><i>The classification of the project is confirmed below by naming the staff member who completed this section. If you have any doubts, contact the ESMS Coordinator or the regional ESMS officer</i></p>		
<p>Comments on the above classification of the project (where relevant):</p>		
<p>Name and function of staff leading project development:</p>	<p>Date</p>	
<p>Joseph Mülders, team member, ESMS</p>	<p>16/11/2020</p>	

Step 1a: Decision on the need of a formal ESMS Screening versus Self-Assessment

The fields below are completed by the project proponent - tick one of the three options

1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project budget is ≥ CHF 1,000,000 - Formal ESMS Screening is required -> continue with Step 1b and then Step 2	
2. <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project budget is < CHF 1,000,000 - Formal ESMS Screening is not required as environmental or social risks are appraised through completion of ESMS Questionnaire (referred to as Self-Assessment!) -> continue with Step 1b</p> <p>If the Self-Assessment does not identify any environmental or social risks or only low risks that are fully addressed by the project activities, no further steps are required and the project is considered cleared on ESMS. The low risk category is confirmed below by providing a brief rationale why the project is considered a low risk project and naming the staff who conducted the Self-Assessment. This document must then be uploaded on the Project Portal and serves as ESMS Screening & Clearance Report².</p> <p>If risks have been identified during the Self-Assessment, tick option 3 below.</p>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rationale why project is considered low risk:
		Name and function of staff who conducted Self-Assessment :
3. <input type="checkbox"/>	Despite being a small project (< CHF 1,000,000), risk issues were identified during the Self-Assessment - Formal ESMS Screening process is required -> continue with Step 2	

Step 1b: Completing the ESMS Questionnaire (enclosed as Annex)

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Joseph Mülders	28/10/2020
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA ³ of the project been done before? Or any form of an environmental and/or social assessment related to the project or to its components?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	
If yes, provide details (content of assessment, what gaps may exist, whether data is still current enough and whether the relevance and quality of data has been assessed by proponent):		

Step 2: Formal ESMS Screening

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

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	15.11.2020

¹ ESMS Self-Assessment means that the Project Proponent completes the ESMS Questionnaire provided in this template as Annex and makes the final judgement about the environmental and social risks. This includes filling out the cells marked with **Project Proponent** as well as the final row in each section row where it says **conclusion of IUCN ESMS Reviewer**.

² Please save the document with the following file name: "esms screening and clearance_ID_NAME PROJECT_self-assessment_low risk".

³ Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) or any other type of impact assessment (a partial ESIA, a targeted assessment of environmental and/or social risks etc.)

	Title	Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	Project document	19.10.2020
	Gender Action Plan Report	19.10.2020

The below Screening Report is completed by the IUCN ESMS reviewer(s) after having gone through the ESMS Questionnaire. It summarizes the main findings of the ESMS Screening and represents a consensus between ESMS reviewers.

ESMS Screening Report		Required tools or other action	Guidance on rating likelihood, magnitude and significance is provided below ⁴		
Environmental and Social Risks (potential negative impacts) <i>(see section B of the questionnaire for details)</i>			Likelihood (1-5)	Magnitude (1-5)	Significance (L, M, M+, H)
Gender equality and risks			3	3	Moderate
Risks of affecting vulnerable groups			3	3-4	Moderate
Risks of infringing on human rights			2	2	Low
Community health, safety and security risks			2	3	Low
Labour and working conditions			2	3	Low
Resource efficiency, pollution, wastes, chemicals and GHG emissions			2	3	Low
Risks from project design failing to take climate change into account			2	2	Low
Other environmental or social risks <i>(add new rows below for each risk):</i>					
ESMS Standards	Trigger ⁵	Required tools or other action	Likelihood (1-5)	Magnitude (1-5)	Significance (L, M, M+, H)
Involuntary Resettlement & Access Restrictions <i>(see section C1 of the questionnaire for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" 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 Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	n/a	n/a	n/a
Indigenous Peoples <i>(see section C2 of the questionnaire 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 Planning Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	n/a	n/a	n/a

⁴ Guidance on rating likelihood, magnitude and significance is provided below (see heading in purple). For more information on these ratings, please see the Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks available at www.iucn.org/esms.

⁵ The decision of triggering a standard does not mean that a safeguard instruments or plans has to be prepared right away. The ESMS Reviewer will specify the consequences of triggering the standard in the respective ESMS reviewer section of the questionnaire in C1-C4. Often plans might be required immediately (prior to project approval), in other cases only at a certain point in time (e.g. plans might need to be complete and accepted before the relevant activity can begin). In cases where the risk issues are less substantive, a plan might not be needed at all and mitigation measures are incorporated into the ESMP.

Cultural Heritage <i>(see section C3 of the questionnaire for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	2	3	Low	
Biodiversity & Sustainable Use Natural Resources <i>(see section C4 of the questionnaire for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: ESMF to refer to the ESMS Pest Management Planning Guidance Note	3	3	Moderate	
Quality of stakeholder consultation during project design so far <i>(see section D4 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> adequate <input type="checkbox"/> not sufficient	Required action:				
Project Risk Category:	<i>The project risk category rates the overall project; it is based on the rating of likelihood and magnitude established for each E&S risk area and for the ESMS Standards. The overall rating is usually that of the highest risk.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> low risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk	<input type="checkbox"/> moderate + risk	<input type="checkbox"/> high risk
Brief summary of the main findings: main risk issues, their significance and risk issues of standards triggered; justification of the overall risk rating	<p>The project aims to mainstream Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the communal grazing lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape province. The project will be implemented at two target landscapes: the Fetakgomo-Thubatse and Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality in the Limpopo Province and the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality in the Northern Cape Province (NC). Within these landscapes the project will support the development of communal-level Participatory Rangeland Management Plan (PRMP), the formalisation of Rangeland/Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements and the implementation of concrete SLM interventions on key rangelands – focusing on two intervention sites: Rietfontein in NC and the Mphanama Village in Limpopo. These interventions should be scaled up through integration of SLM into various levels of developmental planning; this includes capacity building on SLM and the development of landscape level Sustainable Land Management Plans (SLMP). the project will further incentivise SLM by facilitating improved access to markets and finance for scale-up. This includes funding community validated priority value chains, financial capacity training and business case development towards submitting investment proposals to established financial institutions and providing opportunities for microfinance through small grants programmes.</p> <p>The sites and the actual SLM actions will be influenced by the landscape level Sustainable Land Management Plans (SLMP) and will be decided when developing the community level implementation plans (PRMP) and the community level Rangeland/Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements. All three of these mechanisms are inclusive and participatory stakeholder processes facilitated by the project. Hence, the actual SLM actions will only be known during the project. The focus of these SLM interventions will be on supporting softer interventions such as management approaches (improved water, veld erosion management), though it is likely that hard interventions (construction and physical transformation) will be required in areas with significant degradation.</p> <p>The selection of the value chains will be based on the outcomes of the profiling of value chains against the identified SLM and of a capacity assessment. Hence, although likely to include fodder production, meat and hide production but also non-livestock sectors, the final value chains to be supported are not known at this stage. The small grants program (SGP) will focus either on those livelihoods that drive improved SLM (e.g. fodder/ meat/ skins/ bone-meal/ para-veterinary services) or else benefit through the improved SLM (i.e. increased production or tourism related products to promote value chain activities and SLM practices).</p> <p>Because all these interventions (SLM action, value chain activities and activities supported by the SGP) will only be defined and their planning finalized during the project, it is not possible to judge potential environmental or social adverse impacts of these interventions at this stage. These interventions are therefore referred to as sub-projects and an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is needed that will serve as guidance for ensuring that the sub-projects – once defined - will be assessed on potential environmental and social impacts and appropriately managed, in line with the requirements of the IUCN Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) and with the GEF Safeguard policies.</p> <p>Despite activities and sites of the sub-projects not having been defined, a preliminary screening has been carried out and provided the following results:</p>					

	<p>The Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions is not triggered as the SLM interventions and potential restrictions will be decided by the resource users and rights holders themselves in their interest of securing sustainable use of the land (see details in section C1). However, the project should ensure and monitor the voluntary nature of such decisions. Second, because it is not unlikely that such restrictions might affect vulnerable groups an assessment of social risks is required in each of the two intervention sites and, if negative impacts are confirmed, mitigation measures are needed. This is addressed in B2 as risks to vulnerable groups.</p> <p>The Standard on Indigenous People is not triggered either. The Limpopo project site does not account for the presence of ethnic groups that considered indigenous. While the Northern Cape province does comprise indigenous groups (Khomani San), their territory does not overlap with the actual SLM intervention site. And while the SLM-based landscape planning process would cover areas where the Khomani San tribes are present, it is acknowledged that the SLMP's will not be relevant for land of the Khomani San tribes as this is registered as a Community Property Association (CPA) and not commonage land. It was therefore decided that the Standard is not triggered at neither the SLM interventions nor the SLM Plans would affect the rights, livelihoods, cultural identity, values or practices of the Khomani San (see section C2 for details).</p> <p>The Standard on Cultural Heritage is triggered (see section C3), however potential impacts are not very likely, precautionary measures should be described in the ESMF.</p> <p>The Standard on Biodiversity and Sustainable Use is triggered as the it cannot be excluded that sub-projects might promote or require the use of herbicides or other biocides to control livestock parasites or invasive species. The ESMF to guide the Screening of sub-projects on the need to adhere with the IUCN ESMS Guidance note on Pest Management and the potential need to trigger the development of a pest management plan. Although water infrastructure provided by the project will be small scale, risk for water dynamics or water flows through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water cannot be excluded and the ESMF will need to provide control and mitigation measures. The ESMF should further guide the selection of species for SLM interventions and ensure that no potentially invasive, non-indigenous species are used or promoted (including the common non-native plant species <i>Prosopis spp</i>) - see section C4 for details.</p> <p>Other social risks have been identified in section B1-5 and gender risks and risks of affecting vulnerable groups are preliminarily assessed as moderate. While a gender action plan provides measures for ensuring gender-responsiveness, risk have been identified due to the prevalence of gender based violence in the project sites posing a threat to active participation in project activities and land management in general. Risks for vulnerable groups are primarily linked to changes in land use and potential livelihood impacts from use restrictions. The sub-project screening and the site-level vulnerability analysis will need to assess the likelihood and magnitude of such risks and negative impacts need to be mitigated. Community health and safety and labour and working conditions present only minor concerns. All social risks should be addressed in the ESMF with clear guidance.</p> <p>Environmental risks are considered as minor (see section B6 for details), but measures for risk prevention, in particular related to value chain activities, should be included in the ESMF.</p>	
Required assessments or tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial ESIA <input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Environmental or Social Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <input type="checkbox"/> Abbreviated ESMF <input type="checkbox"/> Other:

Guidance for rating environmental and social risks

The rating of risks is based on the assumptions that the management measures and plans specified in the respective column are implemented and effective in mitigating the risk. It is good practice that the plans are available before ESMS Clearance. Risk rating is based on the two elements: likelihood and the expected impacts (consequence).

Likelihood represents the possibility that a given risk event is expected to occur. The likelihood should be established using the following five ratings:

- *Very unlikely to occur (1)*
- *Not expected to occur (2)*
- *Likely – could occur (3)*
- *Known to occur - almost certain (4)*
- *Common occurrence (5)*

Impact (or consequence) refers to the extent to which a risk event might negatively affect environmental or social receptors – see below criteria distinguishing five levels of impacts:

Table 1: Rating impact of a risk area

<i>Severe (5)</i>	Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of very high magnitude , including very large scale and/or spatial extent (large geographic area, large number of people, transboundary impacts), cumulative, long-term (permanent and irreversible) ; receptors are considered highly sensitive ; examples are severe adverse impacts on areas with high biodiversity value ⁶ ; severe adverse impacts to lands, resources and territories of indigenous peoples; significant levels of displacement or resettlement with long-term consequences on peoples' livelihood; impacts give rise to severe and cumulative social conflicts with long-term consequences.
<i>Major (4)</i>	Adverse impacts on people and/or environment of high magnitude , including large scale and/or spatial extent (large geographic area, large number of people, transboundary impacts), of certain duration but still reversible if sufficient effort is provided for mitigation; receptors are considered sensitive; examples are adverse impacts on areas with high biodiversity value; adverse impacts to lands, resources and territories of indigenous peoples; significant levels of displacement or resettlement with temporary consequences on peoples' livelihood; impacts give rise to social conflicts which are expected to be of limited duration.
<i>Medium (3)</i>	Adverse impacts of medium magnitude, limited in scale (small area and low number of people affected), limited in duration (temporary), impacts are relatively predictable and can be avoided, managed and/or mitigated with known solutions and straight forward measures.
<i>Minor (2)</i>	Adverse impacts of minor magnitude, very small scale (e.g. very small affected area, very low number of people affected) and only short duration, may be easily avoided, managed, mitigated.
<i>Negligible (1)</i>	Negligible or no adverse impacts on communities, individuals, and/or on the environment.

Significance of a risk area is established by combining likelihood and expected impact (consequence) of a risk event as demonstrated in the table 2. The significance rating signals how much attention the risk area will require during project development and implementation and the extent of control actions to be put in place. See the Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks for further details on the rating (including factors influencing the likelihood and impact).

Table 2: Rating significance of a risk event

		Likelihood of occurrence				
		<i>Very unlikely to occur (1)</i>	<i>Not expected to occur (2)</i>	<i>Likely – could occur (3)</i>	<i>Known to occur - almost certain (4)</i>	<i>Common occurrence (5)</i>
Impact	<i>Severe (5)</i>	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	High
	<i>Major (4)</i>	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High
	<i>Medium (3)</i>	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
	<i>Minor (2)</i>	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
	<i>Negligible (1)</i>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

⁶ For the definition see IUCN ESMS Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources.

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 changes to the risk classification of the project? If yes, explain and indicate the risk areas where modifications were made.			
Have the ESMS actions 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 ESMS actions 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 stakeholder consultation during project design been adequate? Have results of the consultations been documented (disaggregated by gender, where relevant)? Does this demonstrate how the consultations were used to inform project design?			
Has a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) been developed that describes how the identified stakeholder will be further engaged during project implementation?			
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?			
Are provisions made for monitoring the SEP during project implementation?			
Has a project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) 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?			
Have stakeholders been informed about the GRM?			

CLEARANCE DECISION

<input type="checkbox"/> Cleared	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.
---	---

<input type="checkbox"/> Conditionally cleared	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.
---	---

<input type="checkbox"/> Clearance rejected	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.
--	--

Rationale – Explain clearance decision (why cleared, conditionally cleared or rejected):	
---	--

Clearance conditions (when conditionally cleared) - Explain tasks to be completed during the project:	
--	--

Approval ESMS Clearance (M level or above)

Name	IUCN Unit and Function	Date	Signature

Annex: ESMS Questionnaire – to be completed as a preparation for the Formal ESMS Screening or the ESMS Self-Assessment

A. 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. Please also describe the project sites and the project area of influence⁷.

The project has identified two sites, one in the Olifants catchment in Limpopo and one in the Mier region in Northern Cape where activities will be conducted to identify innovative models for use in scale up of SLM. The primary rural livelihood in both of these provinces is livestock keeping, with the leading driver of land degradation being a weakness in the institutional arrangements for effective coordination of communal management. As a measure to safeguard the subsistence agricultural livelihoods of these communities there is therefore a crucial need for mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the communal grazing lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape province. This requires an innovative approach to SLM and requires firstly, the support of on the ground implementation of SLM to achieve LDN and secondly, strengthen decision-making processes around SLM. The project will establish a strengthened SLM landscape at a communal level of which the approaches and requirements will be scaled up through integration into various levels of developmental planning. This will include building SLM capacity, organising and aligning objectives of land users, and implementing improved SLM at target sites. Sustainability of SLM implementation at pilot sites will be incentivised through facilitating improved access to markets and finance for scale-up. The process will then be mainstreamed into governance mechanisms for scale up at a regional level.

The proposed project has four outcomes which will contribute to the reduction of land degradation through improved SLM and strengthen, through mainstreaming, decision making towards scaling up SLM in target areas in Limpopo and Northern Cape. Outcome 1 will develop a platform by which the scale up of improved information management and knowledge and capacity development, as it pertains to SLM, can be implemented at a larger scale. Outputs will support the development of regionally specific capacity in SLM.. Outcome 2 will improve the transparency of regional approaches and align objectives of government, communal governance structures and land users through the development of a variety of formalised mechanisms. Mechanisms include landscape level implementation plans, formalisation of community level Rangeland/Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements and regional Sustainable Land Management Plans that facilitate regional scale up of activities conducted at target sites and support the implementation of improved SLM on key rangelands in the regions. Outcome 3 will provide markets and finance for scale up through a three-part approach. Part one will be to invest project funding into community validated priority value chains that will enable improved SLM and allow for the development and additional penetration of communities in SLM related value chains. Part one will be to validate a suite of integrated innovative finance solutions towards establishment into the two landscapes. Part two will be to make investments into validated priority value chains through targeted investment and establishment of mechanism that incentivises ongoing SLM through market access and unlocking opportunities towards developing financial capacity and partnerships. Part three will be to provide opportunities for microfinance through small grants programmes and financial capacity training and business case development towards submitting investment proposals to established financial institutions. Output 4 will inform SLM related national policies and processes based on the results and best practices from the implementation of the project actions under the first, second and third components. Component 4 supports dialogue with key stakeholder groups at national and local levels to develop consensus over good practices and policies.

Activities include the following:

- A1.1 Establish and implement user-friendly Knowledge Management Platform to share data, information and lessons learned on Land degradation and SLM among different stakeholders (communal, local, regional and national)
- A1.2 Develop participatory and complementary monitoring mechanism (based on an established framework/system) for input into KMP and train stakeholders
- A1.3 Determine relevant SDGs, indicators and monitor and analyse changes in ecosystem health against the extent of SLM implementation to ensure adaptive management
- A1.4 Conduct skills audit on stakeholders (land users, community groups, extension services, local government)
- A1.5 Based on results of skills audit, develop training module that is community specific that includes relevant SLM tools guidelines and training materials
- A1.6 Training of local champions, land users, extension officers and relevant governance structures in use of regional better practise SLM tools, guidelines and training materials
- A1.7 Identify and train a network of "Mentor Farmers" and community animal health workers in facilitation, participation, mobilisation and community based experiential learning in SLM practises.
- A2.1 Develop spatially relevant SLMP which outlines regional baseline assessments and operational SLM best practises
- A2.2 Mainstream through facilitating buy-in from LM and integrate SLMP into existing management structures
- A2.3 LDN targets and investment priorities should be validated through results of the SLMP and communal level PRMP
- A2.4 Conduct a detailed governance assessment towards evaluating needs and monitor progress towards strengthening natural resource governance
- A2.5 Strengthen land tenure arrangements
- A2.6 Formalise a Rangeland/ Biodiversity Stewardship Agreement within existing legal and governance framework
- A2.7 Build collective understanding and empower participation in Rangeland/ Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements, by supporting project extension services to lobby targeted communities.
- A2.8 Formalise or strengthen existing Land Users into organised formal structures (grazing associations/ Conservation Committee developed)
- A2.9 Conduct SLM needs assessment workshops to identify issues and solutions to SLM, develop sustainability goals and prioritise community driven SLM actions.

⁷ The project area of influence is the area likely to be affected by 1) the project and the project partner's activities and facilities that are directly owned, operated or managed by the partner and that are a component of the project, 2) impacts from unplanned but predictable developments caused by the project that may occur later or at a different location or 3) indirect project impacts on biodiversity and on ecosystem services upon which affected communities livelihoods are dependent.

A2.10	Development Participatory Rangeland Management Plan (PRMP) for improved communal use of 150 000 Ha of communal and commonage land
A2.11	Operationalise / strengthen protocols for inter sectoral and cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms for SLM across government, NGO's, community-based organisations and land users associations.
A2.12	Expand capacity of local and provincial government to utilise SLM LMP
A2.13	Restoration activities identified in the PRMP will be supported and implemented in the two landscapes
A3.1	Determine viability of a suite of integrated innovative finance solutions for the two landscapes
A3.2	Pilot and scale viable finance solutions to facilitate long term financial sustainability of actions
A3.3	Facilitate the strengthening of an updated business model that integrates SLM better practices ensure and participation of interested community land users.
A3.4	Through the support of project extension services implement/operationalize an established incentive mechanism that supports, regulates and accommodates the conditions present in dryland rural livestock enterprises to improve market access and therefore sustainability of SLM.
A3.5	Through the support of project extension services (Government and RP) develop and implement small grants programme that supports the development of alternative livelihoods, to livestock production, that support and incentivise SLM
A3.6	Partnerships will be developed through the course of the project between aggregators or buyers and local communities involved in ongoing SLM
A3.7	Engage relevant red meat commercial market players on SLM livestock production protocol development
A3.8	Facilitate improved access to finance through the development and submission of proposals and business cases to development banks
A4.1	Identify policy gaps that limit, and existing policies and practises that strengthen, LDN attainment approaches at national level
A4.2	Periodically evaluate, at a national level, the policies and practises that strengthen LDN attainment approaches
A4.3	Development of an integrated SLM policy brief that integrates existing relevant SLM policies and project recommended policies
A4.4	Lessons learnt must be periodically captured, evaluated and shared with project forums by the responsible parties
A4.5	Develop SLM multi-stakeholder platforms that report at national level

Guidance on completing the questionnaire

- Answer the questions in the 'Project proponent' column by selecting 'Yes, no, n/a (not applicable) or TBD (to be determined)'; in the second column provide additional information - describing the risk, whether it will need to be further assessed, and/or how the risks will be **avoided or managed** (minimized or mitigated).
- If you don't have the required information, describe how you would gather the data during the project preparation phase or during project implementation. Please note that additional activities identified and specified in this exercise will either need to be integrated into the ToR for the risk assessment or into the project design as project activity. E.g. if you describe that land rights of local communities will be assessed, this either needs to be included in the ToR of a social assessment or specified as project activity.
- If the information requested can be found in the project proposal, please also reference the specific section of the proposal where this stated.

B. Assessment of social or environmental impacts

Please consider not only direct environmental and social impacts but also potential indirect, cumulative⁸ and transboundary impacts as well as impacts of associated facilities⁹			
	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question and describe how the risks are being assessed, avoided or managed</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
Gender equality and risks (including gender-based violence)			
1. Is there a risk that the project may discriminate against women or other groups based on gender with regards to participation in the design and implementation of project activities or to access to resources, services, or benefits provided by the project?	Yes	There is a risk of gender discrimination in terms of participation of the project design and implementation, exclusion from access to benefits, resources, and services. As a result, mitigation measures as outlined in	

⁸ Cumulative Impact means the collective impact of a project's incremental impact added to the impacts of other relevant past, present and reasonably foreseeable future developments, as well as the unplanned but predictable activities enabled by the project that may occur later or at a different location. Example: Substantial increase in number of tourists that frequent a site turns a project-funded PA access road into a major cause for disturbance for wildlife.

⁹ Associated Facility or Activities means a facility or activity not funded as part of the project that is necessary for the financial and/or operational viability of the project, and would not have been constructed or expanded if the project did not exist. Example: a visitor centre built by the project might require an access road as associated facility – the construction of which might trigger environmental impacts.

		the Gender Action Plan (GAP) will reduce the risk through a variety of approaches.	
2. Is there a risk that project activities inadvertently create, aggravate, or perpetuate inequalities between women and men?	Yes	There are risks for instance with regards to labour and working condition infringements; however mitigation measures outlined in the GAP will reduce the risk through a variety of measures.	
3. Is there a risk that the project potentially limits women's ability to use, develop or protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services?	Yes	There is again a risk, however mitigation measures outlined in the GAP will reduce the risk through a variety of measures. The Gender Action Plan which aims to ensure, at the very least, equal opportunity for males and females to benefit equally from the project and of course use of the natural resources being developed. Additionally, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (with integrated Grievance Redress Mechanism) will, as a responsive mechanism, aim to mitigate the risks of limited participation through facilitating continuous feedback and communication with women and womens groups	
4. 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 in gender based violence (including sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, or sexual harassment)? Have any such incidents been reported in the past?	Yes	Gender based violence is generally prevalent in the targeted communities, posing a threat to active participation in project activities and land management in general. As a result, the risk is to be taken very seriously and various preventative and responsive measures to mitigate these types of risks are included in the GAP.	No later than at inception stage the EA should put in place procedures to identify risks and prevent incidents related to sexual exploitations, abuse or harassment caused by persons employed or engaged by the project. This should include procedures that describe how to act in case of incidents (e.g. report, investigate, and remedy such actions). A link to the GRM is possible for capturing incidents occurred to project stakeholders, but in line with IUCN policy on Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual Harassment the EA also needs to ensure reporting, protection and redress modalities for victims among project staff. Both procedures need to ensure safe reporting conditions including anonymity and confidentiality, and protection from retaliation.
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on¹⁰		Likelihood of risks (1-5): 3	Magnitude (1-5): 3
Risk of affecting vulnerable groups			
5. Has the project site been assessed on the presence of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups or individuals ¹¹ . Please name the groups.	Yes	The project design component has included a high level analysis of communities in terms of potential vulnerabilities. The analysis identified general high-risk	

¹⁰ Please see guidance for rating the magnitude of social and environmental impacts above. It is understood that there might still be a considerable degree of uncertainty.

¹¹ Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless or elderly people, persons with disabilities, children, ethnic minorities, displaced people, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups, among others.

		<p>groups and assessed them against project activities. Final vulnerable groups represented groups with high likelihood of 1) being affected negatively by project activities/outcomes and 2) not having access to benefits of the project.</p> <p>The results are split between elements in the GAP, ProDoc and Stakeholder Analysis.</p> <p>Preliminary vulnerable groups identified include: women, elderly, disabled, unemployed, households living in poverty, uneducated, geographically isolated individuals and groups. The basis for this identification is included in the ProDoc.</p> <p>The project site will further be assessed during project implementation. The development of the SLMP under output 2.2.1 include conducting a Participatory Assessment of Land Degradation and Sustainable Land management in Grassland and Pastoral Systems (PRAGA) at each site (Limpopo and Northern Cape). As such it is assured that vulnerable and marginalised groups are identified at the community level. The PRAGA methodology will further classify the linkages between identified groups and the resources in question outlining rights, responsibilities, relationships and returns.</p>	
<p>6. 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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No specific risks have been confirmed at the time of writing; as it is not clear what specific vulnerable groups may be impacted , this will only be known through PRAGA However, a high-level vulnerability assessment has been developed (see prodoc chapter 3.1.4)</p> <p>Once the PRAGA methodology has classified the linkages between identified groups and the resources in question, the impacts on material and non-material livelihood conditions will be assessed. At that point the project will develop mitigation measures for potential impacts of disproportionate risks on vulnerable groups. Additionally, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (with integrated Grievance Redress Mechanism) will, as a responsive mechanism, aims to mitigate this risk .</p>	<p>The PRAGA methodology will ensure the identification of vulnerable groups, but only at the municipality level. In order to assess risks for VG of SLM interventions (PRMP and R/BSA) a vulnerability assessment at the site-level is required. This should be established in the ESMF. It is considered likely that access restrictions decided by the land users / right holders might affect people who are currently using the sites due to their vulnerability status.</p> <p>The development of the Fair-Use Land Tenure Checklist under output 2.2. can also be considered as one measure to identify and potentially also mitigate negative impacts of land use and/or land tenure arrangements on VG.</p>
<p>7. Is there a risk that the project might discriminate against vulnerable groups with regards to participation in the design and implementation of project activities or to access to resources, services, or benefits provided by the project?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No specific risk is clear at the time of writing however this general risk should not be discounted.</p>	<p>Same as above – the vulnerability assessment to include assessing risk of discrimination</p>

		<p>Similarly to the previous answer, once the site specific vulnerable groups have been identified through implementation of project activities, the project will develop measures to ensure indiscriminatory participation of vulnerable groups in project implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (with integrated Grievance Redress Mechanism) will, as a responsive mechanism, aim to mitigate the risks of non-participation.</p>	
8. Is there a risk that the project might affect persons with disabilities?	No	No specific risk is clear at the time of writing however disabled peoples will be included as potential vulnerable groups and therefore risks to participation and rights of resources will be mitigated through measured described above.	
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Likelihood of risks (1-5): 3	Magnitude (1-5): 3-4
Risks of infringing in human rights, including substantive and procedural rights			
9. Could the project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of individuals or groups? In terms of economic rights, consider in particular their ability to access services or resources essential to basic needs (e.g. health or education, drinking water, productive resources, sources of income, subsistence food production).	No	<p>No specific risk to human rights has been identified. The Constitution of South Africa clearly outlines the suite of rights and basic needs afforded by every citizen. The infringement on these rights would result in a civil case and therefore there are legislative mechanisms that aim to ensure mitigation of these risks. Every effort, during project design, has been made to ensure these principles are adhered to and maintained during project implementation. Through SLM the project aims at improving productivity of resources (land) with positive impacts on people's livelihood / income.</p> <p>Although not preventative, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (with integrated Grievance Redress Mechanism) will, as a responsive mechanism, aim to identify and mitigate the risks of adverse impacts on human rights.</p>	
10. Could the project negatively influence land use and/or land tenure arrangements with a risk of adversely affecting peoples' livelihoods or rights? Consider also disproportionate adverse impacts on vulnerable groups, on women or on people coming from outside the project area as well as situations where communal ownership might be affected. <i>If the project might restrict access to land use or related resources where affected persons do not have the right to refuse (e.g. creation of a PA), this is a specific topic that is covered in section C1.</i>	Yes	<p>The project will influence land tenure arrangements and therefore may have an effect on the land use and land tenure. The project however aims to strengthen land tenure arrangements and rights to land of individuals and community groups through improved governance and regulation. Therefore risks of negatively influencing land use and/or land tenure are seen as negligible. Nonetheless, the target landscapes are predominantly state owned and therefore decision of land tenure is not entirely in the hands of the project. To mitigate risks the project will develop a fair use land tenure checklist to ensure eligibility criteria are adhered to and land use</p>	

		and/or land tenure arrangements, specifically with regard to vulnerable groups are not impacted negatively. See further explanation in B2.	
11. Is there a likelihood that the project might lead to unjustified preferential treatment of individuals or groups (e.g. in terms of access to resources or services provided by the project) or to the formal or de facto restriction or exclusion ¹² of groups from access to such resources or services?	Yes	Similarly, to the answer above, decisions on land use and land tenure are made by municipal and traditional authorities. This introduces an element of subjectivity and uncertainty in terms of inclusion and participation of community members and groups and therefore a risk of preferential treatment. With regards to the processes facilitated by the project, this will be mitigated through making these process transparent and inclusive; among others through the governance assessment (NRGF). Of particular significance is the case of the small grant program and which individuals or groups would be eligible for allocations. To mitigate the risk clear criteria will be developed in a Benefit Eligibility Checklist that enshrine the principles of inclusivity and equality to ensure fair and transparent allocations of the grant funding.	Guidance on the eligibility criteria of the SGP to be included in the ESMF.
12. Is there a likelihood that the project would exclude individuals or groups from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No	The sites identified are all state-owned land and the mechanisms included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will make every effort to ensure all relevant stakeholders have the opportunity to participate in discussions affecting them.	It is understood that one output of PRAGA is a site-specific stakeholder analysis – identifying who are the relevant stakeholder in each site. These data will need to be used to inform and update the SEP.
13. Is there a likelihood that the project might contribute to the discrimination or marginalization of specific groups? (only mention situations not specified in any of the questions above)	No		
14. Within the project area, are there any indications of legacy issues, current conflicts or human rights infractions? Have any of the project's potential partner organizations and stakeholders been involved in human rights conflicts in the past? Consider in particular situations such as failing to respect the rights or livelihood needs of indigenous or local communities during the process of protected area establishment, forced eviction of people, resettlement process where agreed arrangements and compensations were not complied with or other actions that resulted in historical injustice.	No	No pending legacy issues have been identified. One positive example: in 2002 Northern Cape Government successfully settled a land claim between the San and Mier communities, of approximately 100 000Ha.	
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Likelihood of risks (1-5): 2	Magnitude (1-5): 2
Community health, safety and security			
15. Is there a risk that the project could exacerbate existing conflicts among communities, groups or individuals (e.g. by increasing resource competition when promoting economic opportunities,	No	It has been observed that there is existing conflict in community groups (in Northern Cape specifically) of which are at risk of flaring up due to increased	Slightly disagreed with “No”. Because of the described conditions (population density and water stress), it seems that there is a risk

¹² Examples for *de facto* restriction or exclusion are: information is not made available in appropriate languages, individuals with no/low income or without tenure rights (or registered titles) can't access services (e.g. agricultural extension services, persons with disabilities are confronted with physical barriers that block their access; certain groups are stigmatised by society and thus have no access services.

<p>aggravating conflicts about land or natural resources or by causing an influx of in-migrants). Consider in particular situations where the project sites are affected by fragility, violence and conflicts (war, inter-ethnic conflict, insurgency or high levels of drug trafficking or other organised crime) and dynamics of recent or expected migration (e.g. return of displaced people).</p>		<p>opportunities and perhaps competition between groups. Conflicts have been observed over allocation of water sources specifically.</p> <p>The project aims to improve the organisational and governance capacity of community groups. This is envisioned to improve issues of conflict through ensuring transparency and goal orientated approaches.</p> <p>Limpopo target site has extremely high population densities and although specific conflicts between communities have not been identified, it is likely resource competition may drive conflict.</p> <p>Although there is currently conflict, it is envisioned that these conflicts may be mitigated or managed by the project implemented improved governance of resources and land management. Improved management, communication and transparency will aim to ensure reduced conflict and relationship management.</p>	<p>that project activities inadvertently lead to exacerbating such conflicts. Hence the ESMF should include measures of monitoring and mitigation.</p>
<p>16. Is there a risk that project activities might weaken community institutions or disrupt social interactions within the communities or the cohesion of communities?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The project activities have been specifically designed to improve social cohesion.</p>	
<p>17. Does the project potentially increase risk of human–wildlife conflicts including the risk of injury or loss of life of humans?</p>	<p>No</p>		
<p>18. Does the project or project partners engage or work with law enforcement personnel (including collaboration with government forest guards, protected area or community rangers, police, military or paramilitary forces) that may pose a potential security risk for communities and/or individuals? Consider causes such as inadequate training or lack of accountability mechanism and practices such as violent interrogation practices, harassment of members of particular ethnic groups, detention of arrested people without legal proceedings etc.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Although regulation and governance will be strengthened, the project does not include any activities related to law enforcement.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the unlikely event that unlawful treatment of communities may occur The Constitution of South Africa clearly outlines the suite of rights and basic needs afforded by every citizen. The infringement on these rights would result in a civil case and therefore there are legislative mechanisms that aim to ensure mitigation of these risks.</p> <p>Although not preventative, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (with integrated Grievance Redress Mechanism) will, as a responsive mechanism, aim to mitigate the risks of adverse impacts on of unlawful treatment through facilitating continuous feedback and communication with all individuals and groups.</p>	
<p>19. Do any of the law enforcement personnel carry firearms in the course of their duty?</p>	<p>No</p>		

<p>20. Is there a possible risk that the project exposes communities to accidental hazards or increases their vulnerability to natural hazards? This would cover exposure to hazardous substances (explosives, fuel and other chemicals), the use of vehicles and equipment and risks related to new constructions or failure of structural elements built by the project (e.g. through failure to secure construction sites or water infrastructure, collapse of buildings, exposure to risks from earthquake or subsidence etc.).</p>	No	This is not a project risk.	The answer is TBD (to be determined). While not very likely, as the value chain activities are not known, this risk cannot be excluded. Guidance to be provided in the ESMF.
<p>21. Is there a likelihood that the project causes health and safety risks through construction or management changes of water infrastructure (e.g. by changing flows into water infrastructure, triggering water-borne or -based diseases) or through increasing risks of other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections? Examples include the creation of stagnant water bodies, livestock activities affecting quality of portable water etc.</p>	No	Specific water infrastructure to be developed is not yet identified in the design phase. It is, however envisioned that likely water infrastructure development will focused around the development of boreholes that will allow for access of groundwater for livestock watering. Water will likely be accumulated in reservoirs or troughs. Through improper management and use it is possible that these resources could develop health and safety risks. If water infrastructure is developed in the project, it will be the responsibility of the PMU to ensure a best-use water resources management protocol is included and implemented at project sites.	The answer is TBD. This guidance should be included in the ESMF
<p>22. Is there a probability that the project could have adverse impacts on community health and safety through reduction in local air quality (e.g. through generation of dusts, burning of wastes, or burning fossil fuels and other materials in improperly ventilated areas)?</p>	No	Not likely. The project is not a development project and therefore the scale of activities will not trigger air quality risks.	
<p>Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on</p>		<p>Likelihood of risks (1-5): 2</p>	<p>Magnitude (1-5): 2</p>
<p>Labor and working conditions affecting project workers¹³</p>			
<p>23. Would the project potentially lead to working conditions that fail to comply with national labor laws and international commitments? Consider the following minimum requirements¹⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear documentation of employment terms and conditions (including their rights under national law related to hours of work, wages, overtime, compensation and benefits); • regular and timely payment of wages; adequate periods of rest (incl. holiday, sick, maternity, paternity, and family leave); • principles of non-discrimination, equal opportunity and fair treatment relating to any aspect of employment relationships in the context of the project (e.g. hiring and treatment of workers); • prevention of harassment, intimidation, and exploitation in the workplace, in particular of vulnerable workers, including but not limited to women, children of working age, migrants and persons with disabilities; • freedom of association and collective bargaining. 	No	<p>These are always risks in any project, however in South Africa these risks are mitigated through the Basic Conditions of Employment Act, No 11 of 2002. The Employment Act outlines the fair and equitable minimum requirements to be met by an employer with relation to the employee. Non-compliance thereof represents a legal mechanism that mitigates this risk.</p> <p>Furthermore, through the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the Grievance Redress Mechanism will facilitate the identification and investigation of any violations and drive appropriate responses.</p>	<p>To ensure the management of these risks, a project level Employment Management Checklist will be required at project inception phase. The Checklist will ensure due diligence and clauses on labour conditions are included in contracts and implementation agreements. Guidance to be provided in the ESMF.</p>

¹³ 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) community workers employed or voluntarily engaged in a project.

¹⁴ The minimum requirements are established in the ESMS Guidance Note on Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks available at: www.iucn.org/esms

<p>24. Is there a risk that project workers might be exposed to occupational health and safety (OHS) risks including specific hazards in the work areas (e.g. dangerous machinery, chemical or biological hazards, hazardous transport activities, increased exposure to infectious diseases and specific threats to women)? Also consider risks for people engaged in community work programs or volunteers engaged by the project or project partners.</p>	No	<p>These are always risks in any project, however in South Africa these risks are mitigated through Occupational Health and Safety Act, No 85 of 1993. The OHS Act outlines the minimum requirements to be met by an employer with relation to the employee exposed to potential occupational hazards. Non-compliance thereof represents a legal mechanism that mitigates this risk.</p> <p>Furthermore, through the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the Grievance Redress Mechanism will facilitate the identification and investigation of any violations and drive appropriate responses.</p>	<p>To ensure the management of these risks, a project level Occupational, Health and Safety Management Checklist will be required at project inception phase The Checklist will ensure due diligence and clauses on OHS requirements are included in contracts and implementation agreements. Guidance to be provided in the ESMF.</p>
<p>25. Are any project staff or people engaged for the project (e.g. rangers, community rangers) exposed to the risk of violence in the course of their duties (e.g. exposure to armed poachers or criminal groups involved in drug trafficking)? If yes, explain how risks are managed (e.g., access to adequate healthcare, systems of evacuation in case of emergencies)?</p>	No	This is unlikely.	
<p>26. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in either forced labor (e.g., any work or service which someone has not volunteered for and is forced to do) or harmful child labor¹⁵? Child labor would be considered harmful if it interferes with the child's education or be detrimental to the child's health or mental, spiritual, moral, or social development.</p>	No	This is not a typical risk in South Africa and is not clearly evident, at the time of writing.	
<p>Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on</p>		<p>Likelihood of risks (1-5): 2</p>	<p>Magnitude (1-5):3</p>
<p>Resource efficiency, pollution, wastes, chemicals and GHG emissions</p>			
<p>27. Is there a risk that the project might lead to releasing pollutants to the environment or increased generation of waste or waste water due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts? Consider in particular hazardous waste.</p>	Yes	<p>Risks of pollution and waste are not identified for any project activities. The project through the development of the PRMP and SLMP will ensure best practises in waste management are promoted through land use.</p> <p>The risk however may arise through the development of SLM related value chains such as dairies or abattoirs. Waste risks associated with these enterprises will be mitigated through ensuring eligibility of activities as per standards for waste management. The eligibility of an enterprise will be assessed against a waste management protocol and checklist which is in line with best use waste management methodologies. The process will act as a screening tool to prioritise enterprises who have the least adverse risk.</p>	<p>This guidance to be included in the ESMF</p>

¹⁵ Child labor for these purposes refers to children under the age of 14, unless national law specifies a higher age. Children between 14-18 employed or engaged in the project would not be considered as child labor (unless national law specifies a different age), but would require special conditions related to their engagement.

<p>28. Does the project activities involve a significant use of energy, water or other resources? If yes, explain how it will be ensured that resources are used efficiently.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is likely the use of water will increase. The appropriate and effective use of water resources are regulated through the National Water Act. The risk of unsustainable water use remains a project risk. At a project level, communal water users will be sensitised as to effective water use and management through the development of the Best Use Water Resources Management Protocol.</p> <p>Risks may similarly arise through the development of SLM related value chains. Water management risks associated with these enterprises will be mitigated through ensuring eligibility of activities as per standards for water management. The eligibility of an enterprise will be assessed against the Best Use Water Resources Management Protocol and Checklist which is in line with best use waste management methodologies. The process will act as a screening tool to prioritise enterprises who have the least adverse risk.</p>	<p>This guidance to be included in the ESMF</p>
<p>29. Might the project use or promote the use of chemicals or other hazardous materials subject to international bans, restrictions or phase-outs?)¹⁶ Please note that the use of pesticides are covered in the Biodiversity Standard (Section C4).</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Unlikely.</p>	
<p>30. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions or to a substantial reduction of carbon pools (e.g. through loss in vegetation cover or below and above ground carbon stocks)?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Although the project focusses on livestock agriculture as a land use, the goal is to ensure sustainability of land use in these production systems and does not envision a net gain in GHG emissions. The improved management of land will likely lead to increased SOC and therefore increase carbon stocks.</p>	
<p>Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on</p>		<p>Likelihood of risks (1-5): 2</p>	<p>Magnitude (1-5): 3</p>
<p>Climate Change (risks from project design failing to take climate change into account)</p>			
<p>31. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes? If yes, explain how the project intends to lower such risk.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The sensitivities to climate change impacts have been assessed and these are seen as negligible due to the nature of proposed project activities.</p> <p>The predominant historic climatic impacts in the target regions have been extensive droughts and, more specifically in the Limpopo region, increased prevalence of high velocity rain events. These patterns are expected to continue and likely become more prevalent in the future (over the next 30 years).</p> <p>The increased prevalence of these climatic patterns has historically increased the vulnerability of communities in both regions and is expected to continue this trend if no interventions are applied.</p>	

¹⁶ For instance, substances listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, or other chemicals or hazardous materials subject to international bans, restrictions or phase-outs due to high toxicity to living organisms, environmental persistence, potential for bioaccumulation, or potential depletion of the ozone layer, consistent with relevant international treaties and agreements.

		<p>Climate change, however, is a driver of the targeted problem and therefore interventions put in place will reduce vulnerability to ongoing impacts from climate change. The impacts of climate change on biodiversity and therefore resilience of these natural systems to degradation is compounded by unsustainable land management. By addressing unsustainable land management at a large scale- mainstreaming of SLM in these drylands- the project will increase the resilience of these systems and their communities to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The risks to the project through impacts of climate change are furthermore negligible due to the nature of activities and implementation modalities.</p> <p>The project aims to mainstream SLM approaches of which include training, awareness, strengthened management and governance which incorporates climate change adaptation. As a result, firstly the efficacy of project interventions on SLM adaptation is magnified (due to the risks introduced through climate change) and secondly the adoption of project strategies by communities, local and regional stakeholders is magnified due to the risks of climate change faced on a global scale.</p>	
<p>32. Is there a risk that project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities or the local ecosystem to climate variability, temperature increases or climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc)?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There is no risk that project activities will increase vulnerability of communities and ecosystems to climate change but in fact actively reduce these existing vulnerabilities.</p> <p>As described above droughts and unpredictable high intensity rainfall events have been more prevalent in target landscapes in recent years. These climatic events are expected to increase in the future within project target areas.</p> <p>Project activities aim at developing sustainable land management approaches as driven by the community needs (highly consultative) and best use practices in sustainable management. This approach allows for the consideration of the status-quo needs of land users (and those currently impacted by conditions described above) and integrate them with latest research and approaches that ensure sustainable management of land (including climate change adaptation). The current and future climatic conditions in target landscapes are therefore key considerations when developing approaches and interventions at the community level during project implementation.</p>	

	<p>Furthermore, through SLM activities and targeted interventions, target land will be restored and ecosystem resilience to impacts from climate change will be improved.</p> <p>The project objectives, through developing capacity and strengthened governance in implementing SLM, is routed in adapting sustainably to land degradation, as driven by a variety of impacts including climate change. As a result, the vulnerabilities introduced by risks of climate change in the target regions are mitigated through project interventions focussing on adaptation to a range of local conditions. Project interventions (or by extension climate risk measures) include improved land management through participatory training development, SLM training and SLM implementation support (PRMP), supporting adaptive and holistic management of resources through improved management mechanisms (SLMP, KMP), support and build capacity in governance institutions to implement upgraded mechanisms (SLMP, KMP), promotion of pathways to alternative livelihoods such as market access and access to financial support (R/BSA, SGP business plan development), upgrading of value chains to represent production conditions (innovative financial mechanism).</p> <p>It must be noted that these interventions do not work in isolation but rather align and correspond with existing mechanisms and processes to ensure existing SLM efforts are strengthened and not replaced. This ensures all adaptive mechanisms remain cost effective and feasible. The financial risks of the project managing climate change vulnerabilities are therefore negligible.</p> <p>Through the improved regional land management mechanism (SLMP) and Knowledge Management Platform (KMP), baseline conditions and trends will be monitored, evaluated and validated against national strategies and goals (i.e. LDN targets). The lessons learnt through project implementation will additionally be captured through the development of policy briefs and shared through national forums and multi-stakeholder meetings.</p>	
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on	Likelihood of risks (1-5): 2	Magnitude (1-5): 2
Other environmental or social risks		

33. Please list in the row(s) below any other direct, indirect (induced or cumulative), and transboundary environmental and social risks, and the risks and impacts of associated facilities: ¹⁷	None		
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on		Likelihood of risks (1-5):	Magnitude (1-5):

C. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards

C1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions¹⁸

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question and describe how the risks are being assessed, avoided or managed	Comments, additional considerations
1. Will the project involve physically involuntarily resettling people or communities and/or acquiring their land (e.g. for the creation of a strict nature reserve or reducing the threat of wildlife related incidents for communities living in reserves)? if yes, answer a-b below	No	Shaded cells do not need to be filled out	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. Is there a risk that the project will involve forced eviction ¹⁹ ?	No		
3. Does the project include activities that might cause economic displacement by restricting peoples' access to or use of land or natural resources where they have traditional or customary tenure, or recognizable usage rights? Please consider the following activities: establishing new protected areas (PA) or extending the area of an existing PA, improving enforcement of PA regulations (e.g. training guards, providing monitoring and/or enforcement equipment, providing training/tools for improving management effectiveness), constructing physical barriers that prevent people accessing certain places; changing how specific natural resources are managed to a management system that is more restrictive ²⁰ ; if yes, answer a-h below	Yes		
Answer only if you answered yes to item 3			

¹⁷ Example for cumulative impact: A project builds an access road for PA staff, but another project builds a visitor center in the PA which increases traffic on the road and causes disturbance for nesting sites etc.

¹⁸ The term "**involuntary resettlement**" refers to project-related land acquisition and restrictions on land use which have adverse impacts on communities and persons. Project-related land acquisition or restrictions on land use may cause physical displacement (relocation, loss of residential land or loss of shelter), economic displacement (loss of land, assets or access to assets, leading to loss of income sources or other means of livelihood), or both. Resettlement is considered involuntary when affected persons or communities do not have the right to refuse land acquisition or restrictions on land use that result in displacement (World Bank ESS5)

¹⁹ It is important to understand that Involuntary resettlement is different from "**forced eviction**"; the latter being defined as the permanent or temporary removal **against the will** of individuals, families, and/or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal and other protection (WB ESS5). Forced evictions is an extreme form of involuntary resettlement and "constitutes a gross violation of human rights, in particular the right to adequate housing" (Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 1993/77).

²⁰ Note that the Standard "does not apply to restrictions of access to natural resources under community-based natural resource management projects, i.e., where the community using the resources collectively decides to restrict access to these resources" (e.g. introduction of restrictions to ensure continued access to these resources) "provided that an assessment establishes that the community decision-making process is adequate and reflects voluntary, informed consensus, and that appropriate measures have been agreed and put in place to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on the vulnerable members of the community" (WB ESS5).

<p>a. Indicate the project activities that (might) involve restrictions <u>and</u> the respective land or resources to be restricted including communal property and natural resources such as marine and aquatic resources, timber and non-timber forest products, fresh water, medicinal plants, hunting and gathering grounds and grazing and cropping areas</p>	<p>The project aims to improve land management in rangelands on commonage land of NC and communal grazing lands of Limpopo. This will be done by developing sustainable land management plans (SLMP), community scale Rangeland Management Plans (PRMP) and through Rangeland/ Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements (R/BSA). The first tool is not expected to involve concrete decision such as use restrictions as it is conceived as a landscape level mechanism for prioritising rangeland action as well as aligning the landscape SLM objectives with municipal, provincial and national governance structures. The PRMPs operate as a community scale land management action plan that are developed through the direct participation of the land user. Through the PRMP process, land users will be able - through a process of spatially mapping – to define their future vision and determine specific use of land. This might involve restrictions, identified by land users who require specific restrictions on use or movement by non-compliant land users.</p> <p>The R/BSA is an incentive based mechanisms which operates to formalise the intentions of land users to implement SLM on rangelands. The R/BSA will operate as a framework, including code of conduct, conditions and incentives, from where regulation of land use on commonage or communal land may be implemented.</p> <p>In both cases (PRMP and R/BSA) decisions about restrictions will be decided by the resource users and rights holders themselves.</p>	
<p>b. Has the legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource been analysed, broken down by different groups including women and ethnic/indigenous groups? Are customary rights for land and natural resources recognized? Are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not legally recognized?</p>	<p>Yes, the overall framework has been analysed and the PRAGA process will further detail the analysis by breaking it down into various groups (see discussion on identifying vulnerable groups). In NC the project focuses non-private land owned by municipalities and managed as municipal commonages. This means that land is provided to members of the community through a lease process that includes competitive bidding whereby the municipality receives numerous applications from which they assess, together with the local council, which applicants to grant use of commonage land. In Limpopo land allocation of communal land to prospective users is conducted by the Traditional Authority. The process involves a land user requesting land allocation from the Traditional Authority. If the request is accepted, the applicant will be issued a Permission to Occupy (PTO).</p>	<p>PRAGA and the site-level analysis to clarify whether customary rights for land and natural resources recognized and implemented? And whether there are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not legally recognized.</p>

<p>c. Have the implications of access restrictions on people's livelihoods been analysed? Consider adverse potential impacts on livelihoods, food security, businesses and employment due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of access to natural resources in a particular area, • Loss of access to social services such as schools, health care etc, • Change of quality/quantity of resources a household can access, • Change in seasonal access to a resource, • Change in nature of access (i.e. from unregulated to regulated), • Change in types of assets needed to access resources; <p>If yes, please elaborate on the different livelihood elements that are affected, explain who might be affected and describe impacts. Distinguish between social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples), men and women; also consider impacts of restrictions on people coming from outside of the project area.</p>		<p>The implications of access restrictions have been broadly analysed and the major risk is to non-compliant groups. There is currently misuse of communal land due to weak governance and lack of regulations and the social groups who may be negatively affected by the restrictions are those acting outside of formal processes. This may be due to their vulnerability status who may not have the means to adapt or even access resources in a compliant manner.</p> <p>The PRAGA process will identify vulnerable and marginalised groups at the municipality level and classify the linkages between identified groups and the resources in question outlining rights, responsibilities and relationships.</p>	<p>In addition to PRAGA there is a need for vulnerability assessment at the level of the two intervention sites for the SLM /PRMP.</p>
<p>d. Have strategies been considered to avoid restrictions by making changes to project design? If yes, explain.</p>		<p>Restriction will only be decided by the respective land users during project implementation.</p>	
<p>e. If it is not possible to avoid restrictions, will the project include measures to minimize or compensate for impacts from loss/restrictions of access? Please describe the measures.</p>		<p>The R/BSA's is an incentive based mechanism where land users will be able to access specific benefits in exchange for declaring their intentions to manage the land in line with SLM principles. Hence, the benefits can be considered as mitigation.</p> <p>Restrictions will be decided by the land users themselves with guidance from SLM principles and are put in place to establish long-term sustainable utilisation of land. It must be noted that benefits accrued from improved land management may take time to positively impact communities.</p> <p>In order mitigate impacts in vulnerable groups that project will develop a Fair-Use Land Tenure Checklist aiming to ensure transparency and consistency of eligibility against criteria for land use and/or land tenure arrangements. The checklist will provide a first step screening tool to ensure changes in land use and/or land tenure arrangements do not to affect vulnerable groups disproportionately.</p>	
<p>f. Are eligibility criteria established that define who is entitled to benefits or compensation? Are they transparent and fair (e.g. in proportion to their losses and to their needs if they are poor and vulnerable)?</p>		<p>The project will provide benefits such as access to small grants; but these benefits are not intended to compensate impacts from access restrictions.</p>	
<p>g. Are these measures culturally appropriate and gender inclusive? Does the geographical scale of the measures match the scale of the restrictions (e.g. will measures be accessible to all groups affected by the restrictions)?</p>		<p>n/a</p>	
<p>h. Has a process been implemented or started to obtain consent from groups that are likely to be negatively affected by restrictions? Please describe the process (who has been consulted and how).</p>		<p>n/a</p>	

4. Will/might the project require the acquisition of land for purposes other than the conservation objectives described above? E.g. for building (communal) infrastructure (development of water tanks, irrigation canals, access roads etc.). If yes, describe the legal status/ownership of the land that might be subject to land acquisition. If voluntary donations are considered, explain how it will be ensured that no pressure or coercion is involved.	No	No, the project will not need land for the purposes of community investment. The land at both sites is owned by the state and therefore will not need to be purchased.	
5. Has any form of resettlement, land acquisition or land use restrictions occurred prior to the project (e.g. the start of the design phase)? Was any of this undertaken or initiated in anticipation of or in preparation for the project?	No		

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

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)	no	Likelihood of risk (1-5):	n/a	Magnitude (1-5):	n/a
<p><i>What are the main risks and who are the main groups potentially affected? 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? What safeguard tools are to be prepared (e.g. Process Framework)? When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?</i></p>	<p>The Participatory Rangeland Management Plans (PRMP) and the Rangeland/ Biodiversity Stewardship Agreements (R/BSA) might involve access restrictions. Both decisions about restrictions, however, will be decided by the resource users and rights holders themselves – in NC these are the lessees who have been granted the right to use of commonage land; in Limpopo land allocation of communal land to prospective users is conducted by the Traditional Authority, the applicant will be issued a Permission to Occupy (PTO). As restrictions might be decided by the users themselves in their interest of securing sustainable use of the land, the Standard is not triggered. However, the project should ensure and monitor the voluntary nature of such decisions. Second, because it is not unlikely that such restrictions might affect social groups who, due to their vulnerability status, are using the land and its resources without having any formal use rights. These social risks need to be understood in terms of likelihood and magnitude in each of the two intervention sites. If negative impacts are confirmed, mitigation measures are needed. This is addressed in B2 as risks to vulnerable groups. It is understood that the project already foresees minimizing such risks through the development of a Fair-Use Land Tenure Checklist which aims to ensure transparency and consistency of eligibility against criteria for land use and/or land tenure arrangements and provides a first step to ensure that changes in land use arrangements do not affect vulnerable groups disproportionately.</p>				

C2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples ²¹

	Project proponent	IUCN Reviewer
	<p><i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i></p> <p>Answer question and describe how the risks are <i>being assessed, avoided or managed</i></p>	<p><i>Comments, additional considerations</i></p>

²¹The 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

1. Does the project site ²² overlap with lands or territories claimed indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples? If yes, answer questions a-k	Yes		
2. Even if indigenous groups are not found at the project sites, is there still a risk that the project could affect the rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples?. If yes, answer questions a-i	Yes		
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.			
a. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project's area of influence.		<p>The International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), the Development Bank South Africa (DBSA) and the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the African Commission's Working Group of Experts on Indigenous Populations/Communities recognize the San and more precisely the Khoi (Khoekhoe or Khoisan) ethnic groups in South Africa as Indigenous Peoples. The Khoisan are decedents of the San found in South Africa of which there are various traditional authorities and tribal councils (i.e. Khomani san, Kouga Khoisan etc.).</p> <p>The Limpopo project site does not account for the presence of Khomani San. The ethnic groups present in the Fetakgomo-Thubatse and Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality predominantly are the Northern Sotho/Pedi people. The Sotho communities are currently residing under their Traditional Authorities (of which there are many >40).</p> <p>The situation in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality in the Northern Cape Province is different. The Khomani San are situated within the Northern Cape province about 70Km west from the implementation site. The community is approx. 1500 people large. However, the project's SLM interventions will focus only Rietfontain which is populated by the Mier people. The Mier are not decedents of the San and are not considered as indigenous peoples. The Mier communities are managed through the local municipality and have no Tribal Authority. However, the project also intervenes at a regional scale through SLM-based landscape planning (SLMP) and these would cover areas where the Khomani San tribes are present. But, SLMP's will only be relevant for land that is under commonage (public land). The land of the Khomani San tribes, however, is registered as a Community Property Association (CPA) and therefore is considered private land.</p>	
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups? Do these groups identify themselves as indigenous? And how does the host country's Government refer to these groups?		n/a	
c. Explain whether communities have traditionally lived in the project site or whether there are groups or some households who have moved from their traditional area to the project site to be in or near a protected area for economic reasons. ²³		n/a	
d. Is there a risk that the project affects their 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. Distinguish between communities whose traditional resource use areas overlap with the PA, even before it was created, from those who have a recent history and presence there.	n/a	n/a	

²² The project site is defined as the project's area of influence. This is often larger than the site where actual project activities are located as it considers the area impacted by the activities. For example, a project that intervenes in a PA through strengthening law enforcement will also impact groups that live just outside a PA but have historically hunted inside the PA, even before it was created.

²³ It is important to bear in mind that the Standard is seen to generally apply to the community and not to an individual that may have left the community.

e. Is there a risk that the project affects their livelihood in ways other than through access restrictions? E.g. by affecting their self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices, social cohesion, or by providing inequitable benefits?	n/a	n/a	
f. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional (ecological) knowledge?	n/a	n/a	
g. Are any indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how does the project respect their rights (paying attention to national laws on the matter) and avoid any negative impacts?	n/a	n/a	
h. Explain whether and how legitimate representatives of indigenous groups have been consulted to discuss the project and better understand potential impacts upon them? Has a process been started or implemented to achieve their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) to activities that might affect them (positively or negatively)?	n/a	n/a	
i. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a way agreed with them and is culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?		n/a	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)	No	Likelihood of risk (1-5):	n/a	Magnitude (1-5):	n/a
<i>What are the main risks and who are the main groups potentially affected? 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? What are the safeguard tools to be prepared (e.g. IPP)? When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?</i>		As explained under question a the Limpopo project site does not account for the presence of Khomani San and does therefore not trigger the standard . The situation in the Northern Cape site is more complex as indigenous groups (Khomani San) are situated within this province. Their territory does not overlap with the SLM intervention site as it is about 70Km away. However, the project also intervenes at a regional scale through SLM-based landscape planning (SLMP) and these would cover areas where the Khomani San tribes are present. But, SLMP's will only be relevant for land that is under commonage (public land). The land of the Khomani San tribes, however, is registered as a Community Property Association (CPA) and therefore is considered private land. The CPA acts as a collective trust that manages the land on behalf and for the benefit of the Khomani San community by the Khomani San Traditional Authority. It is considered as private as it was transferred from the state to the CPA through the land restitution process in 1999 and the CPA in owns the land. It was therefore decided that the Standard is not triggered at neither the SLM interventions nor the SLM Plans would affect their rights, livelihoods, cultural identity, values and practices, etc.. The decision to not trigger the Standard, however, should be reassessed at a later date and monitored throughout the project implementation in case a situation of indigenous people's self-identification.			

C3: Standard on Cultural Heritage²⁴

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question and describe how the risks are being assessed, avoided or managed
		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? if yes, answer a-c below	No	

²⁴ Cultural heritage is defined as tangible or intangible, 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.

2. Does the project site include important cultural resources such as burial sites, buildings or monuments of archaeological, historical, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value? if yes, answer a-c below	n/a	It is almost certain that the project pilot sites include important cultural resources, however the nature of interventions means cultural resources will not be disturbed during project activities. Project activities are not intrusive to landscapes and impacts are highly unlikely.	
3. Does the project area site include any natural features or resources that are of cultural, spiritual, or symbolic significance (such as sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas, or sacred species)? if yes, answer a-c below	n/a	No natural features or resources that are of cultural, spiritual, or symbolic significance have been identified. Project activities however, are not intrusive to landscapes and impacts are highly unlikely. Regardless of this, potential cultural and spiritual sites will be identified through community consultations (As per SEP) and vulnerability assessments during the PRAGA process.	
a. Will the project involve development of infrastructure (e.g. roads, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation) or construction of buildings (e.g. visitor centre, watch tower)?	No	Unlikely	
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	No	Unlikely	
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items a. and b. might affect known or unknown (buried) cultural resources?	No	Unlikely	As the restoration activities and sites are not identified nor are the value chains activities potential impacts cannot be fully excluded. Guidance to be provided in the ESMF
4. Will the project restrict local users' access to cultural resources or natural features/sites with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	No	Key restrictions are to cattle grazing and use of rangelands. The restrictions will not prevent access to natural features/sites with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance.	While such risk seems unlikely, guidance should still be provided in the ESMF as the activities and sites are not known
5. Is there a risk that project activities might affect in-tangible cultural resources such as values, norms or practices of local communities?	No		While such risk seems unlikely, guidance should still be provided in the ESMF as the restoration activities and sites are not known
6. Will the project promote the use of or the development of economic benefits from cultural heritage resources or natural features/sites with cultural significance to which local communities have legal (including customary) rights?	No		

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage

Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)	Yes	Likelihood of risk (1-5):	2	Magnitude (1-5):	3
---	------------	----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------	----------

What are the main risks and who are the main groups potentially affected? 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? What are the safeguard tools to be prepared (e.g. Chance Find procedures)? When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?

While impacts on tangible or intangible cultural resources are not very likely, adverse impacts cannot be fully excluded at this stage as the restoration activities and sites are not identified nor are the value chains activities. Guidance to be provided in the ESMF to screen the sub-projects on potential risks of damaging hidden cultural resources through earthwork, affecting in-tangible cultural resources as well as impacts from restricting access to cultural or natural resources with cultural significance.

C4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question and describe how the risks are being assessed, avoided or managed	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is the project located in or near areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value²⁵ 	No		
2. If there are any project activities proposed within or adjacent to areas high biodiversity value or critical habitats described above , is there a risk of causing adverse impacts to biodiversity and the integrity of the ecosystems? Consider activities such as infrastructure works (e.g. watch tower, facilities, access roads, small scale water infrastructure) or ecotourism activities and impacts from inadequate waste disposal, disturbance of nesting sites, slope erosion through hiking trails etc. Consider both construction and use phases?	No	The project aims to improve SLM and therefore improve condition of rangelands which directly improves biodiversity.	
2. Is there a risk of significant adverse impacts on biodiversity outside above described areas (PA etc.), through infrastructure development, plantation development (even small scale) or other activities e.g. through the removal of vegetation cover, creation of soil erosion and/or debris deposition downslope, or other disturbances? Consider both construction and use phases.	No		
3. Is there a risk that the project affects areas of high biodiversity value outside above described areas (PA etc.), e.g. by procuring natural resource commodities (e.g. timber used for watch towers etc.)? If yes,	No		

²⁵ 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.

explain whether appropriate industry-specific sustainability verification practices be used.			
4. Will the project introduce or use non-native species (flora and fauna), whether accidental or intentional? Consider activities such as reforestation, erosion control or dune stabilisation or livelihood activities (e.g. aquaculture, farming, horticulture etc.). If yes, explain how the risk of the species developing invasive characteristics is managed?	Yes	The project will not promote the propagation or spread of non-native species. The region in Northern Cape, however, represents a region of extensive non-native plant species (<i>Prosopis spp</i>) of which are used by local land users as an alternative fodder for livestock during the dry season. As a result, the project might be encouraged by stakeholders to promote the use of these species as an adaptive measure in the dry season.	As the detailed activities and sites are not known, the risk cannot be decided conclusively. The IUCN Biodiversity Standard and the GEF requirements for Minimum Standard 3 do not allow the introduction or use of potentially invasive, non-indigenous species. Hence, the ESMF needs to include clear guidance on this: that the screening need to review sub-projects very diligently on this matter and that no sub-project will be approved that might involve the introduction or use of potentially invasive, non-indigenous species (including <i>Prosopis spp</i>).
5. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	No	Not likely although through increased economic activity (increased population density) this risk may arise indirectly.	
6. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics or water 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 and as such affects the hydrological cycle, alters existing stream flow and/or reduces seasonal availability of water resources?	Yes	Output 2.1.6: Priority community-based rangeland restoration actions supported. The project will conduct a needs assessment for infrastructure required by the community to effectively implement SLM. As the project focusses on drylands in Limpopo and Northern Cape, it is likely that water related infrastructure is developed. It must be noted that no large dams or reservoirs will be developed and development will likely be restricted to groundwater resources (boreholes and associated small reservoirs). South African legislation under the National Water Act ensures a mandatory impact assessment to be conducted prior to implementation of any activities that may pose significant risk to water resources. This mitigates risks to water resources through national legislation. If water infrastructure is developed in the project, it will be the responsibility of the PMU to ensure a best-use water resources management protocol is included and implemented at project sites.	As the restoration activities are not known at this stage, guidance must be provided in the ESMF about the need to comply with National Water Act. Given the small scale nature of the likely infrastructure, the need for an EIA is not very probably. However, it might still be sensible to carry out a targeted risk assessment which need to be determined by the screening of the sub-projects.
7. Is there a risk that the project affects water quality of surface or groundwater (e.g., contamination, increase of salinity) through irrigation/ agricultural run-off, water extraction practices, influence of livestock or other activities?	No	Although the project focusses on various aspects of improved land management (including water, veld, livestock), the project aims to directly improve practises to impact on improved condition of the natural environment.	

8. Will the project involve or promote the application of pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? Also consider the use of integrated pest management.	No	The project may promote the use of livestock related pesticides for control of parasites which will be determined in project implementation. Two specific pest management techniques are envisioned: (i) physical methods (alien plant removal) and (ii) application of small amounts of synthetic biocides or natural biocides (livestock related parasite and pest management). The ESMS GN for Pest Management Planning does not require a Pest Management Plan for such activities.	If only these 2 techniques are promoted, no further action is required. However, as the activities will only be determined during the project, it cannot be excluded that other technique might be chosen. Invasive species management in South Africa often involves the use of herbicides. The ESMF must provide guidance for screening the sub-projects to identify whether they include the use of herbicides or other biocides. The screening must be guided by the IUCN ESMS Guidance Note on Pest Management Planning to determine whether the development of a pest management plan will be needed for any of the sub-projects (https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_esms_pest_management_guidance_note.pdf).
9. Will the project involve handling or utilization of genetically modified organisms /living modified organisms?	No		
10. Does the project promote the use of genetic resources (e.g. harvesting, market development), and if so, what are the measures for access and benefit-sharing relating to these?	No		
11. Is there a risk that the project could give rise to an increase of incoming migration and population increase, which could put a strain on the existing natural resource base?	No	The project aims to improve land management and support the development of secondary economies and value chains. This would create a growth in the local economy, however, aims to mainstream this throughout the region. The impacts of migration are therefore seen as negligible.	
12. Could the project result in noise and vibration from construction and maintenance equipment, traffic and activities, which may disturb sensitive fauna receptors, including underwater noise impacts on fish and marine mammals?	No		
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
Standard triggered? (Yes / No / TBD)	Yes	Likelihood of risk (1-5): 3	Magnitude (1-5): 3
<i>What are the main risks? If possible, indicate probability and magnitude of impacts. 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? What are the safeguard tools to be prepared (e.g. Pest Management Plan, Protocol for Species Selection)? When would the tools need to be available (complete and accepted)?</i>	While not very likely it cannot be excluded that sub-projects might promote or require the use of herbicides or other biocides to control livestock parasites or eradicate invasive species. The ESMF to guide the Screening of sub-projects on the need to adhere with the IUCN ESMS Guidance note on Pest Management and the potential need to trigger the development of a pest management plan. It is likely that the SLM activities might require water related infrastructure. Despite these being small scale structures, guidance should notwithstanding provided in the ESMF about the need to comply with National Water Act, and even if an EIA is not needed, to carry out a targeted risk assessment in case risk have been identified that extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water might negatively affects water dynamics or water flows. The ESMF should further guide the selection of species for SLM interventions and ensure that no potentially invasive, non-indigenous species are used or promoted (including the common non-native plant species <i>Prosopis spp</i>).		

D. Integrating ESMS Principles in Project Design

The below table reviews the project and its design process on adherence to the ESMS Principles. The principles are described in the ESMS Manual. Please note that the Guidance Note on Stakeholder Engagement²⁶ represents a new policy provision and delineates further requirements for consultation and involvement of stakeholder during project design and implementation.

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Has a Stakeholder Analysis been done and documented identifying a project's key SH, assessing their interest in the project, ways in which they may influence the project's outcomes and how they might be impacted by project activities (positively or negatively)?	Yes	Yes, a stakeholder analysis has been conducted. Please see section 3.4 of the Draft ProDoc	
2. Does the analysis differentiate between women and men, and along key axes of social differentiation, where relevant?	Yes	The stakeholder analysis differentiates between women and men, where relevant	
3. In case stakeholders have been identified that might be negatively affected by the project, please name the groups.	Yes	Preliminary vulnerable groups identified include: women, elderly, disabled, unemployed, households living in poverty, uneducated, geographically isolated individuals and groups. The basis for this identification is included in the ProDoc. The site specific vulnerable groups will be finalised during project implementation.	The PRAGA assessment is designed to identify vulnerable groups in the intervention sites.
4. Has information about the project and potential risks (ESIA, ESMP) been disclosed ? If yes, indicate the sites. If not, explain how and when this will happen.	No		The ESMF will be disclosed prior to project approval
5. Have consultations been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept and risks? Were consultations conducted in a meaningful and culturally appropriate way? Provide details about the form of consultations and the groups involved.		Consultations with a variety of stakeholders, governance structures and community members have been held. The general approach and objectives of the project have been shared and these were well received.	
6. Were women involved in the consultations or consulted separately? Please provide details.		Women were involved in consultations.	
7. Have vulnerable groups such as disadvantaged or marginalized people been consulted or stakeholders that might be negatively affected? Please provide details about the groups, the consultations and results of the consultations.		Vulnerable groups were not specifically sought out, however the groups identified in the ProDoc were present in various community meetings.	
8. While gender risks have been covered in section B, briefly describe how the project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment.		The project will improve gender equality through the implementation of the Gender Action Plan which aims to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain and improve participation, involvement, and representation in project activities, governance structures and beyond; - Improve gender indicative data collection for improved management and decision making wrt gender equality; 	

²⁶ Available at www.iucn.org/esms

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainstream gender issues aligned with SLM in policies and guidelines informed by the project outputs and lessons learnt. <p>The project Log Frame includes gender specific indicators and target to ensure the full consideration of gender equality throughout the project implementation phase.</p>	
9. Has a project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) been established that explains the processes for submitting, resolving and escalating grievances? If not, explain how and when this will happen. If indigenous peoples are present, explain how it will be ensured that a GRM is available that is culturally appropriate, available in local languages, accessible to affected indigenous peoples, and take into account the availability of customary dispute settlement mechanisms among indigenous peoples.	No	No, the GRM has not yet been established.	To be developed during the inception phase of implementation of the project.
10. Is the project in full compliance with laws and regulations of the host country incl. those implementing obligations under international laws (incl. provisions for disclosure and consultation)? Are relevant licenses or permits available?	Yes	The project is in full compliance with laws and regulations present within South Africa. These cover economic, social and environmental risk sectors which in fact mitigate many of the risks identified within this document. Because the SLM interventions will only be identified during the project, any relevant permits and licenses will be applied for once these interventions are known.	
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer			
Are ESMS requirements on stakeholder engagement, disclosure and grievance fulfilled to satisfactory level? What additional actions need to be carried out and by when? What actions to be implemented during the project should be included in the ESMP or the Stakeholder Engagement Plan?		All requirements are that are not fulfilled yet have been delineated in the ESMF	