ANNEX 7a. ESMS Screening Report, Questionnaire and ESMS Clearance for field projects

Project Data

Project Title:	BUILDING LIVELIHOOD RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE UPPER BASINS OF GUATEMALA'S HIGHLANDS		
Project proponent:	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)		
Executing agency:	International Union for Nature Conservation (IUCN)		
Funding agency:	Green Climate Fund		
Country:	Guatemala	Contract value (add currency):	US$31.500.000
Start date and duration:	2019- 7 years	Amount in CHF:	30.671.800
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	☐ yes ☒ no	Provide details, if yes:	
	Name and function of individual representing project proponent		Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Úrsula Parrilla, IUCN Representative in Guatemala.		June 22 2017
ESMS Screening is *(tick one of the three options)*	**1.** ☒ required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000 **2.** ☐ required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire **3.** ☐ not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire		

ESMS Screening Report

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Julio Montes de Oca, Reviewer of CC standards, and the complete ESMS.	ORMACC, Coordinator, Livelihoods and Climate Change	July 24, 2017
	Linda Klare	IUCN HQ, ESMS Coordinator	July 26, 2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	Project proposal to the Green Climate Fund		24 July, 2017
Risk category:	☐ low risk ☒ moderate risk ☐ high risk		
Rationale: Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization *See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:* ***Section A** for findings about the stakeholder engagement process,* ***Section B** on the 4 Standards,*	Project implementation is evaluated as moderate risk. The activities that have already been designed and planned are expected to have positive environmental impacts as they are aligned with natural based solutions; and tend to the hydrological threats that arise from climate change effects. Also social impacts are expected to be positive as the activities are planned to strengthen local capacities and sustainable practices for improved water infiltration; vulnerable groups will benefit from the action; ensuring gender approach and incorporation of indigenous people´ traditional knowledge and practices. The project design will capitalize on restoration practices and community practices defined by IUCN in the framework of		

***Section C** on other E&S impacts and **Section D** on risk issues related to Climate change*	previous projects (BMU, Knowfor, RCCP, Xaya Pixcaya). Also, the rights approach will be promoted and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Project will be ensured. However, given that the project provides small and medium grants and that the beneficiaries are mainly indigenous communities; the project is conservatively considered overall a moderate risk project. An ESMF should be developed that describes how each grant will be screened on E&S risks as part of the grant appraisal procedure. It will also delineate roles and responsibilities for the screening and potentially required assessments.	
Required assessments and tools	☐ Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) ☐ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) ☒ Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) ☒ Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) ☐ Other: social and organizational assessment at the project start	
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	A gender action plan will be designed, including a thorough analysis of indigenous practices and social rules at the project start. This action plan will have to be formulated with an intercultural vision, which recognizes cultural particularities in the power relations and social distribution of work in indigenous communities	
ESMS Standards	**Trigger**	**Required tools or plans**
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions *(see section B1 for details)*	☐ yes ☒ no ☐ TBD	☐ Resettlement Action Plan ☐ Resettlement Policy Framework ☐ Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction ☐ Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples *(see section B2 for details)*	☒ yes ☐ no ☐ TBD	☒ Social and Organizational Assessment at the project start (see “required assessment”)
Cultural Heritage *(see section B3 for details)*	☐ yes ☒ no ☐ TBD	☐ Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources *(see section B4 for details)*	☐ yes ☒ no ☐ TBD	☐ Pest Management Plan

ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

To be completed by project proponent - Please summarise the project briefly using no more than one page. The summary can be in form of bullet points. Include goal/objectives, expected results/outcomes, outputs (project deliverables) and main activities.

Based on Guatemala's vulnerability to climate change and future scenarios, the project´s overarching objective is to reduce the impacts of climate change on the hydrological cycle in target watersheds through improved land use practices. This will lead to improved water recharge and productivity and contribute to the population´s and ecosystem´s increased resilience to climate change. With a lifespan of seven years, project activities will be implemented in three phases: first year for inception activities, years 2 to 7 for full implementation and years 6-7 implementing an exit strategy to include the development of knowledge products and sustainability arrangements, operation and maintenance plans, and measurement of project impacts at the outcome level.

Total project area is 146,500ha of which 50,732ha will be directly restored. This area includes agroforestry with annual crops, silvopastoral systems, and agroforestry with permanent crops or forest plantations. The selected areas are considered as water recharge areas. The number of direct beneficiaries is 142,500 people.

In terms of funding, GCF financial support is envisaged to achieve all outputs, with co-financing for this project provided by the Korean Cooperation Agency for Development (KOICA), and the Government of Guatemala (GoG) through its Forest Incentives Program PROBOSQUE. Under each output a short description of proposed activities for achievement is provided

Project will achieve its objective addressing three result areas:

1) Integrated climate-sensitive watershed management adapted to the local context of the Highlands, as a central element leaded by Guatemala's Government (Forest Incentives Programs) and complemented by GCF funds to improve institutions capacities. The main activities in this component are: i) Improved local capacities for climate action and watershed management (GCF) and ii) Government forestry and agroforestry incentives supporting water recharge and productivity (GoG);
2) Community-led implementation of climate actions in priority areas through funding from the grant mechanism will provide community based organizations (CBOs) with direct access to funding for sustainable land use practices which reduce climate impact on the hydrological cycle in the target watersheds (activities and priorities of Outputs 1 and 3). This component will combine GCF and KOICA funds. This component has two main activities; i) Awarding and implementation of medium grants for second level CBOs (GCF) and ii) Awarding and implementation of small grants for grassroots organizations (KOICA)
3) Improved multi-level and multi-stakeholder access to climate information that enhances agricultural and water management practices and programs, focuses on improving collection, interpretation and dissemination of reliable climate information for application to adapted agricultural, agroforestry, forestry practices by local producers as well as water resource management and restoration at landscape level. The main activities under this component are i) Strengthened meteorological and hydrological information systems through investment in equipment for data collection, modeling, forecasting, and archiving (GCF) and ii) Design and implement a participatory early warning system for agricultural practices and water management. (GCF).

Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

1. Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only interests, needs and influence of stakeholders but also whether there are any stakeholders that might be affected by the project? Does the stakeholder analysis disaggregate between women and men, where relevant and feasible? It is recommended to add the stakeholder analysis to the documents submitted at screening stage.

To be completed by project proponent

A preliminary analysis of project stakeholders in the prioritized area (Highlands of Guatemala) has been carried out in the framework of the Feasibility study (Annex to the project proposal). The analysis focused on the type of relation and influence/contribution that the identified actors will have for the project implementation. Based on IUCN experience working in the project areas (San Marcos, Quetzaltenango and Xayá Pixcayá watershed) the conditions and vulnerabilities of indigenous populations are well recognized and taken into consideration in project design (effect of climate change, local institutional organization, governance structures..), and in the feasibility study, while the pertinent national legal framework and bibliographical reviews have been carried out. .

IUCN ESMS Reviewer Julio Montes de Oca

IUCN has been working in areas that are part of the proposed project intervention; and is familiar with indigenous community issues. All the planned strategies and activities are based on previous prioritization of productive and conservation practices and options (functional landscape restoration). The recommended practices are based on sustainable management of soil and water. The social and organizational assessment undertaken at the beginning of project implementation (see ESMS Screening Report chapter) will be needed to go more in depth into stakeholder analysis, focusing on specific needs, traditions and interests in the prioritized micro watersheds. In addition, the conservation rights approach will be promoted in all actions facilitated by the project. Where possible, affirmative action will be supported that favours territorial rights, livelihoods traditions, indigenous knowledge, innovations and traditional practices.

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

To be completed by project proponent

Yes, information about project concept was shared with relevant groups at national level (high decision makers) and at local level (consultation with communities and grass roots organizations), receiving inputs from their local experience and interests. No work on risks identification was directly made (related to identification of groups potentially affected) during the workshops. During the consultations women leaders have been involved and their views and interests were included in the project proposal, while gender considerations in climate change adaptation interventions were discussed with all participants.

IUCN ESMS Reviewer Julio Montes de Oca

Consultations were carried out, and IUCN experience in the areas was used. In addition, at national level, sound consultations with key institutions (environment, agriculture, meteorological institutions and Universities) were carried out. Since the inception design, a formal technical committee was created and their members gave in depth information. In addition, key national decision makers (Green Climate Fund focal point from the Ministry of Environment) at the highest level (Minister) have been consulted and his inputs related to national priorities and policies were included in the project design.

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

g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?			
5. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect current land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to resources, land, or territories through measures other than access restrictions?	No		
6. Has any project partner in the past been involved in activities related to forced eviction, resettlement or access restrictions?	No		
Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer[1] on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions			
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	No		
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?		No assessments required	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		There are no resettlements or any access restrictions, so no measures are required.	
B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples[2]			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer Lorena Cordova**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in an area inhabited by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples or to which these groups have a collective attachment? **If yes, answer questions a-j**	Yes		
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still affect their rights and livelihood? **If yes, answer questions a-j**	No		
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.			
a. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence and influence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.		The project area is inhabited predominantly by indigenous peoples (83%); and population is made up of 48% men and 52% women. In the project area, there are three main indigenous groups: K'iché, K'aqchikel and Mam, the three are Mayan origin and their characteristics and worldview are similar. However, they have different languages (mother tongue) and specific geographical distribution, although they are mixed in some areas of the territory. For Mayan people, agriculture is key for their subsistence, and they maintain a very close relationship with land and natural resources: from forest they get medicine, wood for housing	This project will generate benefits to the communities, since it aims to improve the capacity of the territories to deal with climate change, strengthening restoration management practices and promoting the recovery of ancestral practices. Participatory strategies will be implemented for the design and implementation of agricultural and forestry management practices. Agreements with families, communities and organizations to avoid conflicts related to agricultural and water management practices will be developed taking

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

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

		construction, firewood, non-timber products for food. Forest is also used for religious ceremonies. In general, these populations live in poverty and extreme poverty, in some cases in degraded lands due to intensive cropping in small plots.	into consideration their view and traditional knowledge; and also their needs according to their farming systems
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups?		They speak one of the traditional languages and practice some traditional living forms in their communities; also some of them wear traditional clothes. Their world vision makes them live in a more harmonious relationship with nature, and this directs their practices of natural resources management and agriculture. These three indigenous peoples have their own institutions that are a reference of their cultural identity, including their rules governing the access, use and protection of their lands and natural resources, as well as their decision-making mechanisms.	
c. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		Indigenous peoples or rural communities	
d. How do these groups identify themselves?		Producers, rural /community families;	
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' livelihood through access restrictions? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.	No		
f. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples' material or non-material livelihoods in ways other than access restrictions (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)?	No		
g. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	No		
h. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No		
i. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?	Yes	The project will work closely with indigenous communities to ensure that project actions take into account traditional practices contributing to climate change adaptation. Some of the traditional practices in the area include agroforestry systems, silvopastoral systems and soil conservation practices, all of which improve the stability of the landscape to face climatic events both in the physical sense and in the provision of food and livelihoods. It also will support community forest management, a valuable social organization modality with traditional rules to ensure conservation. All these practices will be taken into account for the project action. As communities are losing their traditional knowledge, the project will highlight and capitalize on traditional practices to improve soil and water conservation.	The Standard requires that FPIC is obtained from the legitimate rights holder in case traditional practices are used / promoted by the project.
j. Has any process been started or implemented to achieve the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples to activities directly affecting their lands/territories/resources?		Consultations were carried out in Huehuetenango, San Marcos, Totonicapán, Quiché and Chimaltenango, to identify their view on social, economic and institutional priorities for their villages and livelihoods. From total participants: 54% were men and 46%	In addition to the preliminary consultations, at the project start a specific analysis must be developed (social and organizational assessment) to define social and cultural

		women; and 71% indigenous people, and 29% “mestizo”. Prior consultations included specific sessions with women to ensure their participation in mixed working sessions.	criteria for the design of the practices, grants priorities as well as strategies for early warning systems.
k. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	No		
l. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a culturally appropriate and gender inclusive way?		The project is proposing to establish a financial mechanism to support communities in the project’s area to implement actions. Since the project area is inhabited mostly by indigenous peoples they are the main beneficiaries. The mechanism will be designed as culturally appropriate and with a gender focus, aiming to be built in a participatory manner. In addition to the financial mechanisms, the Project aims to the adoption of a more sustainable use of soil and water that is resilient to climate change. In addition, where possible, the project will assist indigenous peoples in promoting their collective rights, particularly those related to the conservation and sustainable use of their lands and natural resources.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples Lorena Cordova/Adalberto Padilla.

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD – Explain why	Yes	The Standard is triggered as the project is located in an area inhabited predominately by indigenous communities. No adverse impacts have been identified thus far. On the contrary, impacts for these communities are expected to be by and large positive. The use of traditional practices is considered beneficial both from an environmental and social perspective. However the project will need to ensure that consultations will be undertaken with respective rights holders in order to obtain their agreement (following FPIC) and to ensure that benefits are shared in an equitable way, where applicable.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?		For now, no adverse effects on culture, land, livelihoods and their rights as culturally differentiated peoples are identified that may result from the implementation of the project. However, as a precautionary measure a social and organizational assessment is scheduled for the beginning of project implementation to analyse 3 main issues: i) social organization and rules of communities, and how they relate with water and natural resource conservation /sustainable use); ii) traditional knowledge on soil and water management; and iii) benefit sharing criteria toward equity based on gender and cultural /indigenous characteristics. If any negative impacts come out of the study, these will be addressed through culturally appropriate mitigation measures and agreed by the respective affected groups (to be documented in the ESMP). The project strategy will involve effective participation of indigenous peoples in all phases of the project cycle. However, it is recommended to maintain periodic monitoring of project activities to ensure that no unexpected effects are being generated, in particular related to their livelihoods, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and other relevant collective rights. Monitoring will include community consultations as it is of upmost importance to hear the group’s own views and perceptions. The monitoring activity is documented in the ESMP.
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		If impacts identified as part of the social assessment this should be addressed through community consultations to identify appropriate mitigation measures. This will be done in full adherence to the principle of free, prior and informed consent.

B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage[3]			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer Adalberto Padilla**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection? **If yes, answer a-d below**	No		
2. Does the project area harbour cultural resources such as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resources with archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community (e.g., burial sites, buildings, monuments or cultural landscapes)? **If yes, answer a-d below**	TBD	There are some sacred sites related to traditional worldview of indigenous communities. A specific study/evaluation (see ESMS Screening Report chapter) will be developed to identify criteria and rules for the implementation of functional restoration practices to address water-related effects of climate change.	A social and organizational assessment (already budgeted) will be made at the project start to identify sacred sites and key communal indigenous sites (communal forests for example) that should be taken into consideration when designing agricultural practices, conservation areas and other relevant options for restoration.
3. Does the project area harbour a natural feature or resource with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature (e.g., sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas or sacred species)? **if yes, answer a-d below**	TBD	No information was found on sacred and archaeological sites of importance within the area of influence of the project. Interventions will focus in the upland part of the watersheds, and in areas predominantly occupied by indigenous communities. A specific study/evaluation will be developed to identify areas, criteria and rules for the implementation of functional restoration practices to address water related effects of climate change.	
a. Will the project involve infrastructure development or small civil works such as roads, levees, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation or buildings such as visitor centre, watch tower?	Yes	Restoration options will be based on nature based solutions (agroforestry systems, silvopastoral systems, and water conservation). Infrastructure contemplated area those related to the establishment of meteorological stations, and small water storage which are considered as low impact infrastructure.	
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	No		
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items a. and b. might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	No		
d. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	No		
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	No		

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

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage. Adalberto Padilla.		
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	No	The project is not expected to have any negative impacts on cultural resources nor will it restrict access to cultural sites. The project intends to promote the use of indigenous natural resource and water management practices; this could be considered as triggering the Standard in line with criteria III (a project that "intends to promote the development and use of greater social or economic benefits from cultural resources"). However, the use of traditional knowledge is already sufficiently covered by the Standard on Indigenous Peoples. We therefore consider the Standard on Cultural Heritage as not being triggered.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?		
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		

B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer Lorena Cordova**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? **If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-d**	Yes	Within the project area, there are 18 protected areas classified in different categories according to the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP), including part of the Multiple Use Area of the Lake Atitlan Basin, a National Park, Volcanic Cones considered permanent closure zones, and several Municipal Regional Parks and private natural Reserves.	If in the area there are many protected areas (legally and not legally recognized), the project will need to refine criteria for the delimitation of the intervention and the way protected/conservation areas will contribute to hydrological cycle improvement while at the same time ensuring biodiversity conservation, and respecting cultural values and traditional uses from those areas.
2. Is the project located in or near to areas recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	Yes	Within the project area there are many territories recognized as communal lands that are natural forests with high biodiversity, managed jointly and in an organized way by communities and in some cases with the participation of municipalities.	Same as above.
3. Is the project located in/near to areas which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value[4]? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	Yes	Within the project area there are many territories recognized as communal lands that are natural forests with high biodiversity, managed jointly and in an organized way by communities and in	Same as above.

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

		some cases with the participation of municipalities, but not within the National Protected Areas System.	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.			
a. If the project aims to establish or expand the protected area (PA), is there a risk of adverse impacts caused by the project on natural resources on areas beyond the PA?	No		
b. If the project aims at changing management of a PA, is there a risk of adverse direct and indirect impacts on other components of biodiversity?	No		
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourisms facilities, access roads), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity (consider the construction and use phases)?	No		
d. If the project promotes ecotourism, is there a risk of adverse impacts to biodiversity, e.g., due to water/waste disposal, disturbance of flora/fauna, overuse of sites, slope erosion etc.)?	No		
4. Will the project introduce or translocate species as a strategy for species conservation or ecosystem restoration (e.g. erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	No		
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-d**	No	All the planned productive activities will be based on existing agricultural lands, not in high biodiversity protected /conservation areas	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 4 or 5 above.			
a. Does this project involve non-native species or is there a risk of introducing non-native species inadvertently?	No		
b. If a.is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?	N/A		
c. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of faciliatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	No		
d. Is there a risk that species introduction causes adverse impacts on local people's livelihood?	No		
6. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water flows on-site or downstream (including increases or decreases in peak and flood flows and low flows) through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or through other activities?	No	On the contrary, the project focus is to improve water catchments, water infiltration and efficient use of water based on nature based solutions to minimize the effects of climate change.	
7. If the project involves civil works or infrastructure development outside areas of high biodiversity value, is there a risk of significant impact on biodiversity?	No		

8. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g., water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.	No	On the contrary, the project focus is to improve water catchments, water infiltration and efficient use of water based on nature based solutions to minimize the effects of climate change.	
9. Is there a risk that the project affects water quality of waterways (e.g., through diffuse water pollution from agricultural run-off or other activities)?	No	It is expected that one of the long-term impacts of project is the improvement of water quality, so is considered a positive risk.	
10. Is there a risk that the project affects ecosystem functions and services not covered above, in particular those on which local communities depend for their livelihoods?	No	It is expected that one of the long-term impacts of project is the improved provision of ecosystems functions and services.	
11. In case the project promotes the use of living natural resources (e.g., by proposing production systems or harvest plans), is there a risk that this might lead to unsustainable use of resources?	No		
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? **If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b**	No		
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
13. In case the project intends to use biological pest management techniques, is there a risk of adversely affecting biodiversity?	No		
14. Is there a risk that the project will cause adverse environmental impacts in a wider area of influence (landscape/ watershed, regional or global levels) including transboundary impacts?	No		
15. Is there a risk that consequential developments triggered by the project will have adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services? Is there a risk of adverse cumulative impacts generated together with other known or planned projects in the sites?	No		

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources Lorena Cordova		
Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD - Explain why	No	The project has been designed to promote sustainable practices for restoration, including the evaluation of environmental co-benefits. Hence, impacts are expected to be by and large positive.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?		No, there are not assessments required, but a specific study at the project start will be needed to clarify specific strategies and criteria on how project will be related to protected areas, their biodiversity and local knowledge.
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		

Other social or environmental impacts			
C1: Other social impacts			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer Lorena Cordova**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Is there a risk that the project affects human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? Differentiate between women and men, where applicable.	No		
2. Is there a risk that the project creates or aggravates inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the situation or livelihood conditions of women or girls?	No		
3. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		The project aims to generate equal opportunities for women and men, designing interventions with improved women´s participation in mind, and to include their interests and aiming to reduce gaps in access to its benefits.	
4. Explain whether the project provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?		The project will be developed in coordination with the Offices in charge of gender issues of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the Municipalities. The IUCN Global Gender Office will support the design and implementation of the project to ensure the involvement and sharing of benefits for women.	
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action?[5]	No		
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups[6] in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?	No		
7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.	No		
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human–wildlife conflicts)?	No		
9. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	No		

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

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

10. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	No		
11. Is the project likely to induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?	No		
12. Is there a risk that the project could negatively affect the livelihoods of local communities indirectly or through cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts?	No		
13. Is there a risk that the project affects the operation of dams or other built water infrastructure (reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals) e.g., by changing flows into those structures? If yes, has an inventory of existing water resources infrastructures in the project area been compiled and potential impacts analysed?	No		
14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?	No		
15. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	No		
C2: Other environmental impacts			
	Project proponent		**IUCN ESMS Reviewer Lorena Cordova**
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Will the project lead to increased waste production, in particular hazardous waste?	No		
2. Is the project likely to cause pollution or degradation of soil, soil erosion or siltation?	No		
3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	No		
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions?	No		
5. Is there a risk that the project triggers consequential development activities which could lead to adverse environmental impacts, cumulative impacts due to interaction with other projects (current or planned) or to transboundary impacts (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	No		
6. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country the project needs to adhere to?	TBD	There is a national regulatory framework for environmental impact assessments and the project is not considering actions that require that type of assessment, but in the grant facility criteria related to environmental safeguards and risk will be included for the selection of the proposals.	
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?	No		

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts		
Are any significant negative environmental or social risks expected?	No	Environmental and social impacts are expected to be largely positive. As a precautionary measure a social and organizational assessment will be undertaken at the start of the project to assess the social context in each site in more depth and identify areas, criteria and rules for the implementation of functional restoration practices to address water related climate change effects and social/organizational and cultural respect. While also the activities funded by the small and medium grants are expected to generate only positive social and environmental outcomes, it will be important to develop a mechanism for E&S screening to be applied for each proposal as part the grant appraisal process. The mechanism and roles and responsibilities should be described in the ESMF.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed?	No, there are not. For the small and medium grants see above.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	No negative impact was identified that justify specific additional measures.	

D. Climate change risks (Risks caused by a failure to adequately take climate change effects on people and ecosystem into consideration)

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer Julio Montes de Oca
	Yes,no, n/a,TBD	*Answer question, provide further detail where relevant*	*Comments, additional considerations*
1. Have the historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and change including climate sensitivity[7] been analysed in the project area?	yes	Since the project aims to address climate change impacts from the adaptation perspective, this analysis has been the cornerstone of the proposal´s priorities and proposed interventions	Sound analysis has been carried out based on strong climatic information and data processing from Universities, past projects and mainly from research center IARNA of the-URL (Rafael Landívar University)
2. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	yes	The area is prone to diverse climate hazards but the project will focus on mitigating water-related ones: flood, drought and landslides.	Hydrological stress and projections of climate change on water quality and quantity were carried out to prioritize specific areas as well as pertinent restoration practices.
3. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more susceptible than others (e.g., women or vulnerable groups)?	No		The project is expected to influence positively the situation of local population and the functionality of the landscape (delivery of ecosystem services that contribute to adaptive capacity) and conservation.
4. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes?	Yes	As the project is located in a vulnerable area, this is a risk There is scientific evidence showing that the frequency of the ENSO (El Niño Southern Oscillation) has increased from two events in the period 1950-1970 to seven in the period 1990-2010. In terms of vulnerability to climate phenomena, Guatemala occupies the ninth place among countries at greatest risk of suffering from hydro-meteorological phenomena. However, the project has been	The project addresses both short and medium term impacts of climate change on the hydrological cycle and in turn on water availability, a key resource for local livelihoods and economic activities of surrounding areas (as the project is located in water recharge areas)

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

		designed to minimize the effects of CC in particular those related to water regulation and provision.	
5. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future climate variability and changes?	No		
6. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of the local ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes?	No		
7. Is there a risk that the project might lead to climate maladaptation[8] through yielding short-term benefits while increasing longer-term climate risks?	No		
8. Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	The project aims to improve the adaptive capacity of communities through integrated watershed management, improving community response capacity, but also reducing vulnerability through strengthening land management practices (forest and watershed restoration, agroforestry systems, etc.) by providing technical assistance and funding for the implementation of these practices through grants and orientation of state incentive mechanisms; and also the design/strengthening of an agricultural early warning system to reduce potential losses for communities in response to short-term events	Through capacity building, technical assistance and provision of sound funding (for investment and working capital), the project aims to increasing the adaptive capacity of communities. In addition, public investment in restoration will be strengthened through the state incentive program PROBOSQUE.

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Climate Change Risks Julio Montes de Oca.		
Are negative impacts expected from the project?	No	No adverse impacts are expected. On the contrary, the project will address key drivers of climate change in relation to the hydrological cycle and water resources in general.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assesed	The present conditions and future climate change scenarios have been taken in to consideration to prioritize key intervention areas within the overall project area in the Guatemalan Highlands. The menu of practices to be applied has been identified based on the EbA approach promoted by IUCN as well as specific pilot experiences in the region/country and practices considered in the national restoration strategies and included in the modalities of government incentive mechanisms. As the implementation of the climate change adaptation approach must be further customized at local level, additional analysis (which is also participative) will be carried out as part of project implementation upon start-up.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	As part of the project, one of its added values is that climatic and hydrological cycle information will be generated and fed into the design and implementation of adaptation measures. This information will be linked to the criteria for selecting measures under the project´s grant mechanism.	

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

ESMS Clearance of Project Proposal

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:	Tania Ammour	IUCN ORMACC- Regional Programme Coordinator	July 27, 2017
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Clearance Stage:	Project proposal short version		July 26, 2017
	Feasibility Study; Form for Complaint; Project proposal;		

☒**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.*
☐**Conditionally cleared**	*The conclusions call for improving one or more ESMS activities and/or for important re-formulation of some mitigation measures. This will lead to the proposal being conditionally cleared; the reviewer will provide guidance on the way forward.*
☐**Clearance rejected**	*Essential ESMS provisions have not been complied with, critical mitigation measures have not been incorporated or don't seem feasible or sufficient for avoiding or minimizing impacts; or significant data gaps still prevail and additional field assessments are required.*
Rationale - Summarize key findings from the checklist (Annex A) and provide guidance for next steps (where relevant):	Project implementation is evaluated as moderate risk. The activities that have already been designed and planned are expected to have positive environmental impacts as they are aligned with natural based solutions; and tend to the hydrological threats that arise from climate change effects. Also social impacts are expected to be positive as the activities are planned to strengthen local capacities and sustainable practices for improved water infiltration; vulnerable groups will benefit from the action; ensuring gender approach and incorporation of indigenous people´ traditional knowledge and practices. The rights approach will be promoted and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Project will be ensured. However, given that the project provides small and medium grants for activities that are not known at this stage and the fact that the beneficiaries are mainly indigenous communities which requires adherence to provisions formulated in the respective Standard, the project is conservatively considered overall a moderate risk project. An ESMF has have been prepared that describe how indigenous communities culture and worldview will be taken into consideration in activities related to Output 1 (restoration practices and FPIC), Output 2 (for grant appraisal procedure) and Output 3 (climate information dissemination and early warning system for agricultural practices) It will also delineate roles and responsibilities for the screening and potentially required assessments as part of the grant making scheme.

Annex A: Checklist for Clearance of Project Proposal

This checklist is completed by the ESMS Coordinator in consultation with the IUCN ESMS Expert team. The purpose of the appraisal is to check whether the project and its ESMP have incorporated adequate measures to avoid, minimize or compensate for potential social and environmental impacts and that a suitable mechanism is conceptualized that assures implementation of mitigation measures and monitoring of their effectiveness. Some questions may not be applicable for the appraised project and hence should be marked with n/a.

	Yes, no, n/a	**Comment**
General appraisal of project proposal and process of stakeholder engagement		
1. Have the ESMS procedures on stakeholder consultation been properly applied during project design and ESIA and resulted in effective engagement of relevant stakeholders, including affected groups?[9]	Yes	The consultation process with relevant stakeholders and local communities has been carried out. The summary of the consultation is included as an Annex of the Project Proposal. During the consultation, concerns, priorities and opportunities for the implementation of climate change related activities were identified. An ESMF and a ESMP have been developed. The first to define principles and procedures for screening individual grant proposals on E&S risks and, where relevant, develop mitigation measures; the latter to ensure monitoring of risks. In addition, since the beginning of the project design, high level authorities from the key public sectors (Environment, Agriculture, Meteorological Institute) have been driving the definition of both geographic and thematic priorities and options.
2. Have required disclosure of information been made in a culturally appropriate way?[10]	Yes	There was no need to undertake an ESIA during project development stage - hence no disclosure requirement.
3. Have the EISA recommendations been incorporated in the project proposal and mitigation measures presented in form of an ESMP (or other ESMS action plans[11])? Have required resources been accounted for in the project budget? Are responsibilities and implementation schedule specified?	Yes	The recommendations from the Screening have been taken into consideration. An ESMF has been designed and describes the rationale, the relevant policies and regulatory frameworks, the identified risks and mitigation measures, the ESMS principles and standards guiding ESMF implementation; and the ESMF implementation responsibilities. In addition, the feasibility study is part of the Project proposal (Annex). The studies and mitigation actions are included in the project budget.
4. Has the guidance on ESMP monitoring[12] been followed and a plan to monitor the ESMP presented?	Yes	The ESMP has been designed; ESMP monitoring is integrated in the project monitoring process.

[9] The minimum requirements for consultation are summarized in table 6 in the ESMS Manual available at www.iucn.org/esms. The final ESIA report must contain a description of the public consultation process, including a summary of the concerns raised by various stakeholders and how these concerns have been addressed in the ESIA and ESMP.

[10] The minimum requirements for disclosure of information are summarized in table 5 in the ESMS Manual available at www.iucn.org/esms.

[11] For instance Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) or Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restrictions.

[12] See ESMS Guidance Note on Developing and Monitoring an ESMP, available at www.iucn.org/esms.

5. Have potential data gaps been filled through baseline studies, where relevant?	Yes	A social and organizational assessment at the project start is planned.
6. Has the IUCN grievance mechanism been adapted to reflect local conditions, where relevant?	Yes	An adjusted ESMS complaint form template has been designed and will be translated to Spanish and to the different relevant Mayan languages: Mam, Quiché and Cakchiquel
7. Have relevant stakeholders been informed about the grievance mechanism or is it stated how this will be done upon launch of the project?[13]	No	This will be done once the project is launched.
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions - *answer only if standard has been triggered*		
8. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid the need for resettlement or access restrictions?	N/a	
9. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimize the impact on people's livelihood and/or a mechanism for compensation, assistance and benefits to enhance or at least restore the livelihoods of affected people relative to pre-project levels ("no net loss")?	N/a	
10. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Do they seem fair and are they accessible by all affected groups? Are they sufficient and reach all affected groups?	N/a	
11. Has a FPIC process been adhered to and have affected people participated in designing an action plan or a process framework and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring? Have the consultation been done with legitimate representatives of the affected groups? Is this properly evidenced?	N/a	
Indigenous peoples - *answer only if standard has been triggered*		
12. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid impacts on indigenous peoples?	n/a	So far no negative impacts have been identified
13. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts, secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits to these communities and/or provide adequate and fair compensation for impacts?	n/a	So far no negative impacts have been identified

[13] See chapter 3.3.2 of the ESMS Manual about the need to inform stakeholders about the grievance system, available at www.iucn.org/esms

14. Have consultations been held with affected indigenous groups regarding rights or use of natural resources and have they adhered to FPIC? Is this properly evidenced? Have affected groups participated in the design of mitigation measures (ESMP) or indigenous peoples plan (IPP) and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?	No	The project intends to promote the use of traditional knowledge (e.g. natural resource and water management practices). During project implementation and as a first step social and organizational assessment will be undertaken to analyse social organization and rules of communities and identify relevant NRM practices. Where practices are considered appropriate for inclusion into the set of practices promoted by the project, consultations will be undertaken with respective rights holders in order to obtain FPIC from respective rights holders.
15. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate? Are they sufficient and reach all affected groups?	n/a	
Cultural Heritage - *answer only if standard has been triggered*		
16. Have appropriate stakeholders been consulted in the assessment of impacts on cultural heritage and on the users of the resources? Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid impacts or restricting access to resources?	N/a	
17. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise adverse impacts on cultural heritage and on the users of the resources? Have appropriate stakeholders been included in developing these measures and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?	N/a	
18. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	N/a	
19. If the project involves earth works with a potential risk of accidental discovery of buried resources, does the project proposal contain provisions for “chance find”?	N/a	
20. If the project intends to promote the development or use of resources to which communities have legal (including customary) rights, has a FPIC process been implemented? Have arrangements been made to ensure fair and equitable sharing of the benefits?	N/a	
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Living Natural Resources - *answer only if standard has been triggered*		
21. Will the project be able to avoid even minor, localized environmental impacts in protected areas and other areas of high biodiversity value?	N/a	
22. If the project requires the introduction of non-native species, will it be able to avoid adverse impacts including the potential of species developing invasive characteristics?	N/a	

23. Will the project be able to also control other pathways for invasive species?	N/a	
24. For projects managing or restoring ecosystems, have precautions been taken to avoid adverse impacts on other components of biodiversity?	N/a	
25. Will the project be able to avoid adverse impacts on water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle that might inhibit freshwater and other water-related ecosystems from fulfilling functions in relation to up- and downstream water resources?	N/a	
26. Where the use of living natural resources is being promoted by the project, will it be ensured that the use is sustainable?	N/a	
27. If the project requires the use of biocides (pesticide or herbicides), have alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid using biocides? If the use cannot be avoided, will the project be able to prevent negative impacts on human health or biodiversity?	N/a	
Other environmental or social risks - *answer only if other environmental or social risks had been identified during screening (or scoping)*		
28. Is the project in compliance with national legislation and regulations that pertain to environmental and social matters and respective international laws, conventions and standards?	N/a	
29. Have project alternatives been sufficiently considered to avoid social and environmental risks identified during screening (or scoping)?	N/a	
30. If avoidance is not possible, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts or provide appropriate compensation?	N/a	
31. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	N/a	
Gender		
32. Were men and women involved in project design and ESIA process in a culturally appropriate way?	Yes	
33. If gender issues were identified during screening and ESIA, does the project proposal include measures to address these issues? Have these measures been developed in consultation with women in affected communities and gender experts with knowledge of local needs?	no	No ESIA was required
34. Does the project include specific plans and measures to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	Yes	The project is conceptualized with a focus on providing equal opportunities for both women and men; where affirmative action is required, specific benefits are foreseen

		for women (e.g. through the grant mechanism). In addition a gender action plan is being designed for project implementation..
35. Does the project include specific measures to strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources, when appropriate and consistent with national policy?	Yes	Affirmative actions and criteria to empower women for the management of natural resources are planned and included in the gender assessment and plan; as well as in the project proposal.
36. Does the monitoring plan provide for measuring gender equality progress and/or gender disaggregated indicators? If there is a risk that women may be affected by project activities, are specific provisions included to monitor these impacts and are services of qualified experts secured to guide this monitoring work?	Yes	
Vulnerable groups		
37. If risks for vulnerable groups were identified during screening and ESIA, were those addressed in the final project proposal?	No	No risks have been identified so far. However, the social assessment, to be undertaken at the beginning of the project, will shed more light on this matter.
38. Does the project include specific plans and measures to reduce vulnerability, build resilience and promote equity?	Yes	The project has already been designed to benefit vulnerable groups and communities as the focus area is characterized by high poverty and marginalization conditions.
Climate Change		
39. If it has been identified that climate change might affect the implementation of project activities or their effectiveness and sustainability, has this been addressed by mitigation measures?	Yes	All the project design and focus are oriented toward climate change resilience.
40. If there is a risk that the project might increase the vulnerability of local communities and the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes, have these issues been addressed by mitigation measures?	No	
41. Are opportunities sought to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	All the project design and focus are oriented toward climate change resilience