

ESMS Clearance of Project

Project Data and ESMS Screening Report

The fields below are copied from the Screening Report

Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Mekong Countries		
Project proponent:	IUCN Asia Regional Office		
Executing agency:			
Funding agency:	GEF		
Country:	Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar	Contract value (add currency):	USD 2,907,064 plus co-finance USD 9,450,000
Estimated start date and duration:	48 months	Amount in CHF:	CHF 2,834,155 plus co-finance CHF 9,212,994
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	yes no	Provide details:	
Risk category:	low risk	moderate risk	high risk
Rationale (complete this section only in case risk category changed; this is expected to be a rather rare event)	<p>The project covers three countries (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar) and promotes sustainable management of peatland ecosystems in order to conserve biodiversity, reduce GHG emissions and strengthen sustainable livelihoods for local communities. Despite the project's positive environmental and social objectives a few social risks were identified; the main risk is that peatland management activities might involve restricting access or use of certain natural resources with negative implications on the livelihood conditions of people who depend on these resources. Another potential impact relates to the presence of indigenous people in the project sites. The project is therefore classified as a moderate risk project.</p> <p>Because of these risks the project proponent is advised to</p> <p>defined in more detail the PPG team should clarify whether any of them involve earthwork and might risk damaging cultural resources and/or might involve restricting access to certain cultural sites. Through gender integrated planning the proponent will ensure that project design will appropriately address gender concerns, avoid negative impacts and that women's role in natural resource management and their rights and access to resources is strengthened.</p>		
Required assessments or 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:		
ESMS Standards and other E&S Impacts	Trigger	Required tools or plans	
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions	yes no		

Cultural Heritage	yes no TBD	Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	yes no TBD	Pest Management Plan

ESMS Clearance of Project : Rating and Conclusion

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

	Name	Organization and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer Clearance Stage:	Linda Klare	IUCN ESMS Coordinator	30 Sep 2017
	Title		Date

Documents submitted at

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.

implementation schedule specified?		
6. Has the guidance on ESMP monitoring ⁴ been followed and a plan to monitor the ESMP presented?	n/a	

as has been verified in 2 villages consulted during the SIA, it is assumed that the use in the PKWS is, however, overall considered sustainable and that it is rather unlikely that restrictions will need to be put in place. Nevertheless, the Process Framework guidance provided in Annex D of the SIA report need to be complied with in case restrictions are needed.

Myanmarie

t1(ed)-12o3(nm)-24e3()]TJ - 0.11 [Tw (t)-1

tc(ns)-8om[(M)-12m4(m)-24uni9(i)3.1(t3)-8.

provided consent to project activities that trigger resettlement or restrictions? Is this evidenced/documentated?		
Standard on Indigenous Peoples		
1. Is the Standard triggered?	Yes	<p>Lao PDR: The three villages selected as demonstration sites are not indigenous; however IUCN's Standard on Indigenous Peoples is triggered if project activities go beyond the pilot sites and influence the wider areas around the Beung Kiat Ngong Ramsar site which include villages inhabited by indigenous Brao communities.</p> <p>Cambodia: The SIA has identified Cham families residing in the two pilot villages. It is debateable whether or not to consider Cham communities as indigenous peoples. They are not recognized as "indigenous" by the Cambodian government; and while they are considered a culturally distinct ethnic group, the SIA concluded that the situation of the Cham families living in the two villages does not differ significantly from other poor Khmer families living at the site, and that their distinctive culture is not under threat from the proposed project.</p> <p>Myanmar: The social scientist consulted during the PPG phase provided the following advice regarding the different ethnic and linguistic groups living in the project area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <u>Intha people</u> are an ethnic group living around the Inle Lake where the project is located. They are culturally special but not indigenous. They are Burmese speaking, but may have come from Dawei area in south-eastern Myanmar once. One of the pilot villages selected by the project, Taung Po Gyi (northwestern shore of Inle Lake), has been confirmed as being an Intha village. • The <u>Shan ethnic group</u> are Thai/Lao groups with the same language roots. They are believed to have come to Myanmar around the 11th century. In the Burmese government terminology the Shan is one of the major "nationalities" or national races in Myanmar. Hence, following IUCN definition and criteria they are not

present. As some level of discrimination of Brao people is being reported, the project should take extra care to protect the rights of these groups when rolling out activities that influence Brao villages.

Cambodia: question not applicable – no presence of indigenous peoples

Myanmar: The project will promote improved management practices around Inle Lake with three demonstration sites – each of them with a slightly different focus

addressio3ith tw3pviy a3(di)3.1((r)-6.3h(e)0.6(a(s)-8()0.7(.)0.6(t)no)-125(he pr)-6.o3(di)3.1(y)211(a)-12..3(oj)-

2. Have appropriate stakeholders been consulted in the assessment of impacts on cultural heritage (incl. users of the resources)?	n/a	
3. Have measures been developed to minimise adverse impacts on cultural heritage and on the users of the resources? Have appropriate stakeholders been included in this process and assigned a role in its implementation and monitoring?	n/a	
4. Are proposed mitigation measures technically and operationally feasible, sustainable and culturally adequate?	n/a	
5. 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	

6.

invasive species?		
4. For projects managing or restoring ecosystems, have precautions been taken to avoid adverse impacts on other components of biodiversity?	n/a	
5. 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	
6. Where the use of living natural resources is being promoted by the project, will it be ensured that the use is sustainable?	n/a	
7. 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)		
1. Is the project in compliance with national legislation and regulations that pertain to environmental and social matters and respective international laws, conventions and standards?	yes	Project design has been developed with national governmental partner agencies who have ensured that that project activities are in full compliance with national legislation and regulations.
2. If impacts have been identified, have measures been developed to minimise the impacts or provide appropriate compensation?	n/a	No other environmental or social risks have been identified by the ESMS Screening and the SIA has not come across any particular social risk in the 7.BT /LBody <<a.n paration and r eectd rapb

addressed in the final project proposal?		provides for special attention on the needs of vulnerable peoples.
2. Does the project include specific plans and measures to reduce vulnerability, build resilience and promote equity?	no	
3. Does the monitor plan include provisions to monitor these impacts?	n/a	
Climate Change		
1. 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?	n/a	
2. 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?	n/a	
3. Are opportunities sought to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	yes	This is already explicit in the project design as protection of peatland and related water resources is a strategy for enhancing adaptive capacities of communities and the respective ecosystem.