

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA1004

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 23-Oct-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 25-Oct-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Pacific Islands	Project ID:	P131655		
Project Name:	Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Program (P131655)				
Task Team Leader:	John Virdin				
Estimated Appraisal Date:	07-Oct-2014	Estimated Board Date:	22-Dec-2014		
Managing Unit:	GENDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing		
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (100%)				
Theme(s):	Environmental policies and institutions (25%), Other environment and natural resources management (20%), Other public sector governance (20%), Rural policies and institutions (20%), Regional integration (15%)				
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No		
Financing (In USD Million)					
Total Project Cost:	32.97	Total Bank Financing:	32.97		
Financing Gap:	0.00				
Financing Source		Amount			
BORROWER/RECIPIENT		0.00			
International Development Association (IDA)		32.97			
Total		32.97			
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment				
Is this a Repeater project?	No				

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Development Objective of the PROP is to enable the participating Pacific Island Countries to capture greater economic benefits from sustainable management of the region's oceanic and coastal fisheries, and the critical habitats that sustain them. By supporting regional collaboration and the adoption of rights-based approaches to resource access and use, the PROP will directly contribute to

the larger goals of regional integration and sustainable wealth creation among PICs.

In order to achieve the PDO, the program will support continued and strengthened collaboration among PICS, and between PICs and other states, to reduce the open access conditions and management inefficiencies that have led to overexploitation of the oceanic and coastal fishery resources, and to build on the experience and knowledge being generated in the region to strengthen institutional capacity and improve management effectiveness. The project will also assist in the development and implementation of more effective management and monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) tools at national and regional levels, and, in the process, generate significantly increased economic and social benefits for the region that can be sustained over the long term.

3. Project Description

In order to achieve the above objective, the program will include the following components, sub-components and activities available for all participating countries. These will form a menu of activities the Program could support in each country, which would be chosen based on the specific local context. Some activities will be implemented at the national level, while others will be implemented at the regional level to capture economies of scale. All activities in this menu would contribute to the shared regional objective of the PROP, even if implemented nationally. As such, the Program follows the subsidiarity principle, whereby a common approach is coordinated at the regional level, but implemented both regionally and nationally in order to show concrete results on the ground. The legal agreements with each country therefore reflect the specific activities of PROP Phase I described in Annexes 3 through 7.

Component 1: Sustainable Management of Oceanic Fisheries

The objective of this component is to help participating Pacific Island countries strengthen the management of the region's purse seine and long-line tuna fisheries.

Oceanic fisheries hold great economic value and even greater potential for the Pacific, and particularly the three tuna fisheries: tropical purse seine, tropical long-line and southern long-line fisheries. To date these fisheries are relatively healthy compared to other tuna fisheries throughout the world, due largely to their relative isolation. However, they are now reaching their long-term sustainable limits, and future returns will have to come by earning more from current harvests, rather than increasing them. This is eminently possible but, because the fish are moving across borders, it will require continued collective action from countries to sustainably manage the resource. To date only in the purse seine fishery has this begun to happen, and not yet in the two long-line fisheries.

The case of the purse seine fishery largely targeting skipjack tuna is encouraging (this represents over half of the tuna catch in the Pacific). The PNA countries introduced in 2009 a vessel day scheme (VDS) to manage access to the fishery. It works as follows: each year the PNA countries set the total catch limit needed to maintain healthy fish stock, and translate that catch limit into individual vessel fishing days, which are allocated to countries based on an agreed formula, and then the countries sell the days. The vessels days are valuable because they limit catch to sustainable levels of production and this scarcity has value that can be traded. Prior to the introduction of the VDS, PNA countries captured little of the value of the tuna caught in their waters. As a result of introducing the VDS and subsequently a benchmark price, the average price of a vessel day increased from US\$1500 in 2010 to US\$6000 in 2014, and total revenues to PNA countries increased from US \$60 M in 2010 to an estimated US\$265 M in 2014 (still less than 10% value of catch). This is only the value of access – and not potential additional benefits from local value added. Nor is this the end

of the story – a number of experts believe that the price of vessel days can continue to climb, and this fishery could sustainably return over US\$450 million per year to Pacific Island countries.

In order for the Pacific Island countries to capture this potential, the VDS will need to evolve and strengthen significantly over its second five years. Specifically, compliance with the system will need to be increased to strengthen its integrity (as for example some countries have exceeded the number of days allotted to them at the expense of the health of the resource), its scope expanded to cover as much of this regional fishery as possible, and its flexibility, transparency and efficiency increased (for example by pooling days among multiple countries, or selling them via auction). Compliance in particular will be a growing challenge, as the increase in the price of access will provide greater incentives for free-riding (i.e. illegal and unreported fishing). A recent two-week surveillance survey carried out by FFA and SPC boarded 206 fishing vessels in Pacific Island waters, and found 27 infractions (13 percent). Given the large size of countries' waters in the Pacific, data to date is uneven, and estimates of the value of fish caught illegally in the region range from in the US dollar millions to over a billion.

For the tropical tuna and southern albacore long-line fisheries, a similar system to the VDS would be introduced to enhance the management of access, significantly enhancing the sustainability and value of this natural capital asset, and subsequently the benefits that it can provide to Pacific Island countries. The PNA member countries already adopted an agreement for such a system for the long-line fisheries in 2011, though it has not yet entered into force (the two remaining member country signatures necessary are expected shortly).

Building on results to date in the PNA, such a process of enhancing the sustainable management of Pacific Island tuna fisheries could be envisaged as follows:

Strengthen the capacity of national and regional institutions to sustainably manage Pacific Island tuna fisheries:

- o Improve compliance with the VDS for the purse seine fishery: Maintain robust limits on fishing (by ensuring compliance with vessel days and associated links to total catch limits) – so total catch stays within recommended limits, allowing the fish stock to stay healthy. Tuna is the region's natural capital asset, and the bigger the fish stocks the more valuable access to them will be – particularly as much of the rest of the world is overexploiting its tuna. Conversely, selling vessel days outside of agreed levels in the VDS, or excessive capital stuffing within vessel day allocations (e.g. using bigger and more efficient vessels to increase catch per vessel day) not only depresses the price of other vessel days on the market but also threatens the long-term sustainability of the natural resource.
- o Expand the coverage of the purse seine fishery VDS and extend a similar system to the long-line fisheries, to include all tuna caught in Pacific Island countries' national waters. As a result, a greater portion of the region's resource would be utilized via this management regime.
- o Increase efficiency and flexibility of the purse seine fishery VDS and similar systems for the long-line fisheries. With a healthy fish stock and valuable asset, many additional opportunities will continue to emerge to increase the returns to countries by increasing the efficiency of access to fleets via systems such as the VDS, including: (a) pooling vessel days among countries to allow operators to enter multiple countries' waters at once, (b) selling days through competitive tenders and auctions, and (c) extending the lifespan of access over multiple years, so operators and investors have more visibility and security. To address any concerns about the stability of revenue flows, adjustments to

the VDS and similar systems can be made with better data sharing and more transparency, for example setting aside a reserve of vessel days for countries that need them, to be purchased at the benchmark price.

Ensure an equitable distribution within Pacific Island countries of the benefits of sustainably managed tuna fisheries:

- o A healthy natural asset and an efficient and robust access regime provide a stable environment for capital investments in value chain improvements and market specialization, increasing the opportunities Pacific Island countries will have to leverage access fees and agreements for local investment in value added and processing, e.g. through preferential sale to joint ventures. With a robust management system for fish supply like the VDS for purse seine tuna fishery, more and more local investments become possible, such as IFC's recent investment to help expand processing capacity of SolTuna in the Solomon Islands. Of course not all Pacific Island countries are the same and some will have different comparative advantages, so investment in value addition may take different forms in different contexts, and may very likely contribute towards regional hubs for different services. In some cases trade-offs will need to be made at national level between collection of economic rents from access to the resource and investment in local value added activities.
- o Additionally, countries could explore options to create community VDS funds to target the benefits of returns from access directly to coastal communities.

To help Pacific Island countries realize these opportunities, the following activities could be supported by the PROP:

1.1 Strengthen the capacity of national and regional institutions to sustainably manage Pacific Island tuna fisheries

These activities would support strengthening the vessel day scheme (VDS) for the purse seine fishery and extending a similar management system to the long-line fisheries, in order to sustainably increase the benefits to participating countries from access to these fisheries. More specifically, this sub-component would finance the following activities:

- Nationally-Implemented Activities in Participating Countries
 - o Disbursements linked to indicators for implementation of effective management measures. This activity would disburse funds directly to implementing agencies of national governments to reimburse against pre-identified eligible expenditures for operating costs linked to regionally-agreed indicators for strengthened and effective management of the tuna fisheries. Such eligible expenditures will be tracked, and PROP safeguard instruments would also apply to these expenditures. Disbursements would be made annually to national government implementing agencies in each participating country to reimburse these eligible expenditures, based on independent third-party verification that the following indicators have been met (expenditures for each indicator are priced equally):
 - Improving compliance with the VDS for the purse seine tuna fishery:
 - o The number of days fished in a country's waters does not exceed its agreed annual allocation of fishing vessel days (PAE), while the TAE remains within sustainable levels
 - o 100% of fishing vessel days are recorded annually according to agreed criteria
 - o 100% of fishing vessel days used and sold are disclosed annually to the PNAO Fisheries Information Management System (FIMS) and other parties as part of a comprehensive verification system for the VDS

- Expanding the coverage of the purse seine fishery VDS or similar zone-based limit systems for the long line fisheries, to include all tuna caught in the country's national waters:
 - 100% of tuna catch within a country's national waters is encompassed within the VDS or a compatible system (specific target set for each country, gradually)

Additionally, though not linked to disbursements, these expenditures would also support participating countries to increase efficiency and flexibility as appropriate:

- Increasing efficiency and flexibility of the purse-seine fishery VDS and similar systems for the long-line fisheries:
 - (Yes/no) more flexible measures are applied, (such as creating multi-zone and multi-year days, development of competitive VDS marketing arrangements, long-term contracts, creation of secondary markets, etc) that increase the value of a vessel day above the baseline (gradually phased in)
 - o Goods, works and services needed for achievement of the disbursement-linked indicators. This activity would provide support to participating countries for procurement of specific goods, works and services needed to meet the disbursement-linked indicators (DLIs) for strengthened management of the tuna fisheries, such as establishing fisheries monitoring centers and strengthening observer programs for example.
- Regionally-Implemented Activities:
 - o Technical assistance to PNAO to support implementation of the recommendations of a regional review of the VDS & PNAO. This activity would provide targeted technical assistance to support PNAO in the implementation of the recommendations agreed by its members to take actions that will strengthen the VDS in the purse seine fishery and / or across related long-line fisheries during the 2014 regional review of the policy framework of the VDS and the accompanying governance and organizational structure to of the PNAO to administer it.
 - o Technical assistance to SPC to support the information base for the VDS and similar systems for the long-line fisheries. This activity would provide targeted support to SPC to strengthen the analytical and information base needed for the VDS and similar systems for the long-line fisheries, including setting reference points and control rules for fishing activities that link to resource sustainability.
 - o Coordinated technical assistance to countries to strengthen the VDS for the purse seine fishery and expanding this system to the long-line fisheries. This activity would support technical assistance provided by FFA in coordination with the PNAO, to participating countries for implementation of the PROP. This activity would support a technical team to lead and coordinate a number of assessments, studies, trainings, mentoring etc. as requested by participating countries, in order to achieve the PROP's objectives. Such assistance is expected to include, among others, conducting economic analyses and preparing briefing materials to increase the understanding among stakeholders of the benefits of a robust VDS, assisting in the development of any modifications to legal frameworks that may be needed (e.g. to enforce the VDS), and a conducting a rolling regional review of the functions and services required to manage tuna fisheries and identify opportunities for regional, sub-regional and national level location and provision of fisheries management services (e.g. management, science, monitoring and surveillance and enforcement hubs, etc.).

- o Technical assistance and operating costs to identify surveillance and enforcement tasks and needs for countries to collaborate to ensure compliance with the VDS, and a network of compliance experts to support countries' in this effort. This activity would build upon the current regional fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) strategy and effort at FFA in order to support: (i) a regional identification of the key surveillance and enforcement tasks for ensuring compliance with the VDS, and the comparative advantage of various countries to conduct these tasks in collaboration, as part of sub-regional and regional efforts; and (ii) a regional unit and network of compliance experts that could provide on-demand support to participating countries for surveillance and enforcement of the VDS.

1.2 Ensure an equitable distribution within Pacific Island countries of the benefits of sustainably managed tuna fisheries

These activities would support Pacific Island countries to make informed decisions and investments to ensure an inclusive distribution of the benefits from sustainably managed tuna fisheries. This would include collaboration with IFC to leverage access values to a healthy resource, into local investments up the value chain where feasible, that can increase employment. Similarly, this would include piloting local VDS funds to channel access revenues directly to fishing communities, which could have the additional benefit of reducing pressure on and reinforcing better management of, coastal fisheries.

- Regional Activities
 - o Regional technical advisory services for the establishment of hubs throughout the Western Pacific for services and value addition. This activity would support technical advisory services to identify the competitive advantage of participating countries to establish regional hubs for various services and value addition along the chain (e.g. fish quality assurance, processing, distribution and providing services), linked to reforms for strengthening the VDS. Additionally, this activity would include ongoing support to participating countries to develop the various opportunities identified, and to secure the necessary finance and private partners in order to implement them.
 - o Pilot Community VDS funds. This activity would support FFA to provide technical assistance to conduct participatory scenario analyses to design pilot community VDS funds whose objectives would be to secure a share of tuna access revenues for fishing communities in participating countries, by purchasing vessel days. This would include formal establishment of pilot community VDS funds based on the results of the scenario analyses, though capitalization with Bank financing is not envisaged.

Component 2: Sustainable Management of Coastal Fisheries

The objective of this component is to support participating countries to sustainably manage defined coastal fisheries, focusing on those with the greatest potential for increased benefits, i.e. coastal fisheries such as bêche-de-mer (BDM) that (i) can generate export earnings for the country, and/or (ii) support livelihoods, food security and dietary health. Towards this objective, this component includes activities to: (i) empower stakeholders to sustainably manage targeted coastal fisheries in participating countries, working at the smallest scale feasible in order to generate a response from the fish stocks (e.g. in some cases this might work at the single or multi-community scale around defined reef fisheries); and (ii) link sustainable coastal fish products to regional markets.

Coastal and lagoon fisheries throughout the region are critically important to many Pacific island States with few other sources of protein. It is estimated that fish provide 50 – 90 percent of animal protein intake in rural areas and 40 – 80 percent in urban areas. Most of the fish eaten by rural communities (particularly on the coral atolls and smaller islands) come from subsistence fisheries, with little or no cash cost to the consumer. Subsistence fisheries generally employ 10 to 20 times as many people as commercial fisheries.

A diverse range of coastal fishery opportunities exist in the region: in some cases exploitation pressure is low and the management goal is to encourage development of the fishery while protecting resource sustainability for the future. In others, especially where there is easy access to markets, over-fishing has already occurred and the fishery is performing sub-optimally. In these cases there is a need to rebuild resources and effectively control the fisheries based on them to achieve optimal biological or economic yields. This is perhaps most true for the high-value BDM fishery. BDM is a product that is harvested in all Pacific Island countries, almost exclusively for export to Asian markets and Asian communities elsewhere. The BDM fishery is analogous in some ways to the purse seine tuna fishery, in that a handful of Pacific Island countries now control a large share of a global commodity for which demand exceeds supply. A 2013 study estimated the value of BDM exports from 5 Pacific Island countries (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji and Tonga) to average US\$17.4 million over the past 10 years, and that this value could have been at least doubled through improved management (Hambrey et al, 2013). An earlier study estimated average annual BDM exports from Australia and the Central Western Pacific islands during 2004–2008 at about US\$52 million (Purcell et al., 2009). That study notes that ‘many of these fisheries are suffering unsustainable levels of exploitation, to the point of local extinctions of some species and consequently impacting the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of fishers’.

To strengthen the management of targeted coastal fisheries such as BDM, this component would largely be implemented nationally, with regional coordination activities to link products to markets.

2.1 Sustainable Management of Targeted Coastal Fisheries

16. These activities would be implemented nationally in each participating country by the relevant Government agency. The agency would provide dedicated technical assistance and small goods and operating costs to communities to strengthen management and value addition around targeted coastal fisheries, in many cases recruiting a partner such as a local non-government organization (NGO). This technical assistance, small goods and operating costs would be carried out via the following activities:

- o Identify the coastal fisheries targeted for support, including collection of baseline information, i.e. initial biological and socio-economic assessments as needed to determine resource potential and likely costs and benefits of different scenarios for rebuilding or improved management. This program of extension support to improve management and returns from targeted coastal fisheries will identify those fisheries and sites for support following a period of awareness-raising and wide advertising to give interested communities a chance to come forward. Those sites with valuable coastal fisheries and strong local commitment will be selected based on the following criteria:
 - The fishery or fisheries to be managed are well-defined (i.e. within a distinct geographic boundary, for a particular species or group of species, or for a stock);
 - Each site must have the potential to accrue positive economic benefits to stakeholders through improved fisheries management;
 - Each site must not encompass more than 3 to 4 small to moderate-sized communities, which

- must be neighboring communities;
- Each site must have strong local leadership, be socially cohesive, and ideally have a stakeholder group or association formed that could be recognized with authority to formulate management measures on behalf of stakeholders; and
 - Each site must provide formal confirmation that fishers in the targeted fishery are fully committed to participate in the management and project.
- o Support the development or strengthening of stakeholder groups and associations to participate in the sustainable management, and in some cases rebuilding, of these fisheries, including: ensuring legal recognition and empowerment of the groups and their management options, providing extension and training to support organization and operation of the groups.
 - o Assist these stakeholder groups to develop and implement improved management approaches appropriate to the circumstances and needs of the fishery, relying mainly on the development or strengthening of Community-Based Management (CBM) systems, or on co-management arrangements involving communities, government and other stakeholders. In others, particularly for high-value export products, CBM may not provide all the tools needed for effective management and there may need to be additional fishery monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) carried out at provincial or national level. The stakeholder groups would be supported assess the current situation and options for strengthening management of the resource and subsequently returns, in some cases developing rebuilding plans for the fish stocks, drawing upon good experiences throughout the region, such as the locally-managed marine area (LMMA) network. Ongoing training and support would be provided to stakeholder groups for development and implementation of management measures (such as identification and development of ecosystem-based management measures, monitoring of fish catch and effort, etc.), supporting restocking or artificial resource enhancement where feasible and justified, and providing any enforcement support needed to ensure compliance (especially at the point of export).
 - o Link products from the fisheries managed by stakeholder groups to regional markets, including providing technical assistance and training for skills development, as well as small goods and works for local value addition. This support would likely focus on development and coordination of processing and packaging technologies, development of value-added products, market diversification including certification and eco-labeling, compliance with food safety and other technical requirements of target markets, sharing of trade and market information, capacity-building in small business and enterprise management, and cooperation in marketing arrangements and information-sharing across communities and countries.
 - o Monitoring to assess changes in the status of the resource and the economic status of activities based on it, evaluate the performance of the management strategies adopted, and allow the adaptation and improvement of these strategies.

2.2 Linking Sustainable Coastal Fish Products to Regional Markets

These activities would be implemented regionally, in collaboration with SPC:

- o In parallel with national efforts to restore BDM fisheries, mediate the formation of a regional or sub-regional BDM fishery grouping to advance the economic interests of participating PI countries. Regional technical assistance and convening would be provided to harmonize economic and other management arrangements, developing minimum terms and conditions of resource access, establishing a regional register of responsible/ compliant BDM industry participants, maximizing the

leverage available through collective bargaining and action, and promoting exchange of technical information in support of national-level management initiatives. The proposed arrangement would mainly be of interest to the main BDM-producing Pacific Island countries (those of Melanesia) but, as with PNA, countries with lower levels of production would also benefit from the bargaining power generated by the larger producers. The proposed BDM arrangement will almost certainly be built on an existing regional or sub-regional grouping of countries, and may ultimately be extended to cover other coastal fishery resources, particularly trochus, another high-value export product.

- o Ongoing technical support to countries with BDM and coastal fisheries management (e.g. a ‘BDM task force’), including support to assess potential biological, economic and fiscal management tools for BDM and other export-oriented coastal fishery products, which could be applied at the national level as part of an integrated suite of management arrangements that involve both CBM and MCS. This would also include periodically updated assessments of BDM production, price and market trends and other industry monitoring and intelligence; and development of fishery monitoring tools that can be deployed at national level to enable performance assessment of fishery management and development activities, and training of national staff from participating countries in their use. These tools may possibly be based in part on the fishery monitoring ‘dashboards’ already developed by the Bank for other countries/ regions.

Component 3: Sustainable Financing of the Conservation of Critical Fishery Habitats

The objective of this component is to help identify revenue streams to sustainably finance the conservation of critical habitats that underpin oceanic and coastal fisheries in the region. While a number of initiatives have been launched by communities and countries throughout the region to protect and conserve critical fishery habitats, the key obstacle has consistently been a lack of mechanisms to capture the benefits these habitats provide, and sustainably finance the costs of this effort. This obstacle is also a key area identified in the Pacific Oceanscape Framework. For this reason, the PROP will provide targeted technical assistance and support at the regional level to help identify the benefits of conservation and establish mechanisms that can capture these benefits. The aim would not be to provide sustainable financing for all regionally-significant fisheries habitat conservation efforts, but rather to provide the catalytic upstream finance needed to identify, develop and achieve consensus on mechanisms to capture the benefits of conservation and help unlock significant financing, for example from the GEF, international foundations, etc. For this reason, the component would include activities that establish: (i) Pacific Marine Conservation Development Financing Mechanisms to support the growing number of large marine protected areas (MPAs) in the region; and (ii) a pilot Pacific Blue Carbon regional program for small to medium scale fishery habitats. This component would be coordinated by the Oceanscape Unit within the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (both staff and consultants as needed), with technical guidance from the Marine Sector Working Group and CROP agencies.

3.1 Establish Pacific Marine Conservation Development Financing Mechanisms to support large marine protected areas

This sub-component will help enhance the productivity of Pacific oceanic and coastal fisheries by providing the upstream technical assistance needed to establish sustainable financing mechanisms for conservation of the natural habitats upon which they depend. Increasingly one of the most common and significant fishery habitat conservation measures in the region is the introduction of large-scale MPAs. In many cases, the key obstacle to the success of these measures is the identification of the costs and benefits of their introduction and operation, and establishment of mechanisms to capture these benefits (which are global in nature in many cases) and sustainably finance operating costs. As

such, the PROP will include assistance to help targeted countries determine the costs and benefits of existing and proposed MPAs, and to identify options to capture the benefits, for example through the development of ecosystem service markets and trading of costs and benefits with adjacent coastal States and distant water fishing States. Where large-scale MPAs are designed to deliver both ecological and sustainable net benefits to the countries, the PROP would support the development of mechanisms to capture the benefits and provide a sustainable stream of finance for operating costs, for example through conservation trust funds, and/or markets for the ecosystem services (e.g. through the VDS, or tourism green fees). This would build upon precedents outside the region, such as the conservation trust fund established in Brazil, the Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (Funbio). Activities to develop and establish such mechanisms would include:

- o Assessment of existing and potential new regional sites for large scale marine protected areas, to be supported by the PROP. An analysis of both the scope and distribution of the ecological and economic costs and benefits to the Pacific islands region from its large oceanic ecosystems, and identification of existing and potential new marine protected areas that could further build the Pacific Islands Oceanscape Framework. The analysis would consider short and long term impacts and focus on the shared interests of the Pacific Islands region (i.e development, food security, sustainability). The assessment would establish clear standards for measuring costs and benefits of large scale marine protected areas (MPAs) and clear criteria for financing assistance with their establishment and/or operation, and engage with regional leaders, regional fisheries management organizations, and global institutions to support and recognize these criteria. These criteria will then provide important reference points for the financing activities of Pacific marine conservation development financing mechanisms. PIFSec's Oceanscape Unit would carry out this review with the Marine Sector Working Group, including database analysis with SPC and the Government of Australia.
- o Technical assistance for the establishment of Pacific Marine Conservation Development Financing Mechanisms for those sites to be supported by the PROP. This will include the technical assistance necessary to establish Pacific marine conservation development financing mechanisms, including design, establishment and administration, governance, etc. This would include development of the principles, rationale and criteria, and the identification of funding opportunities. Technical assistance will identify opportunities to engage commercial and non-profit NGO partners in the development of the financing mechanisms. A consultation workshop with MSWG participants and potential commercial and non-profit partners would be held to review and develop an agreed draft for review and subsequent endorsement by Forum leaders.
- o Technical assistance, training and exchange of lessons learned to individual Pacific Island countries hosting large MPAs. This activity will provide technical assistance, legal and regulatory support, and fund institutional strengthening activities that enable host States to establish and manage large scale marine protected areas and participate in the Pacific marine conservation development financing mechanisms. This activity would also provide national governments with communication materials, technical assistance and iconic speakers to broaden government and stakeholder understanding of sustainability limitations, ecosystem services, and conservation benefits.

3.2 Establish a pilot Pacific Blue Carbon Regional Program for the conservation of small to medium scale fishery habitats

In complement to support for rebuilding or strengthening coastal fisheries (see component two), this sub-component will provide technical assistance to help design a Pacific Blue Carbon Regional Program to secure climate finance to create conservation incentives for coastal communities to conserve mangrove habitats, seagrass beds and coastal wetlands that support fisheries. This sub-

component will work at the regional level to assess opportunities to pair up with established, standards-based climate finance mechanisms like the terrestrial framework to pay for carbon stored in natural coastal habitats that would otherwise be lost to habitat degradation or deforestation (e.g. REDD+), identify opportunities in the voluntary carbon market, and build a long term Pacific Blue Carbon Regional Program to support the technical surveys and background work needed to capture these opportunities. Following the design of the Pacific Blue Carbon Regional Program, the activity will help identify at least 3 pilot communities in participating countries where climate finance might realistically be secured for conservation of natural coastal habitats (i.e. ‘blue carbon’), where clear tenure and stakeholder benefits are ensured in order to avoid implementation and enforcement issues that are associated with top-down regulation, uncertainty over tenure, and lack of engagement by stakeholders. Technical assistance will then be available to these communities to support these blue carbon projects to become viable. Analysis would build on lessons learnt from existing blue carbon projects. More specifically, these activities would include:

- o Assessment of opportunities to pair up with established, standards-based climate finance mechanisms to pay for carbon stored (REDD+), identification of opportunities in the voluntary carbon market and development of a Pacific Blue Carbon Regional Program (\$.05m). The assessment and strategy will support Pacific engagement in blue carbon trading and biodiversity offsets and ultimately develop local-regional markets for Blue Carbon. PIFSec’s Oceanscape Unit would coordinate this review with the Marine Sector Working Group, engaging CROP agencies and retaining consultants as necessary.
- o Development of criteria and identification of 3 to 5 potential pilot trial communities and projects for Blue Carbon funding. This activity will develop and confirm criteria for Pacific communities and marine conservation projects and identify potential pilot trial communities in participating countries for blue carbon, where clear tenure and stakeholder benefits are ensured in order to avoid implementation and enforcement issues that are associated with top-down regulation, uncertainty over tenure, and lack of engagement by stakeholders. PIFSec’s Oceanscape Unit will coordinate this activity, consulting with the Marine Sector Working Group to confirm criteria and initially identify potential pilot communities and projects, engaging CROP agencies and retaining consultants as necessary.
- o Baseline research and development of marine conservation strategies and funding proposals for pilot trial sites. With pilots identified, significant amounts of baseline scientific research on carbon sequestration capacities and habitat mapping will be conducted as a pre-requisite for any blue carbon projects to become viable. This sub-component will include the technical assistance, scientific and survey expertise, and legal and regulatory support in order to enable participating communities, partners and governments for pilot trials to assess their blue carbon potential, limitations and opportunities and participate in blue carbon markets. Analysis would assess costs and benefits and potential blue carbon values, and work with communities to identify key stakeholders, decision making frameworks and management requirements. In some cases, additional technical assistance may be needed for participating countries to strengthen and expand their policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks for habitat conservation, tenure, and participation in blue carbon markets.

Component 4: Regional Coordination, Implementation Support and Program Management
The objective of this component is to provide regional coordination, implementation support and program management, to ensure a coherent approach to program implementation and wide dissemination of results and lessons learned; as well as regional and national implementation support and training as needed for the program to achieve its objectives. Towards this objective, this

component would include the following activities:

- Regionally-Implemented Activities
 - o Program support unit located within FFA. This unit would work with participating countries as needed on project financial management and procurement. This unit will also support monitoring and evaluation, working closely with the participating countries to collect, compile, analyze and disseminate the results of the PROP as measured by the key results indicators.
 - o Global outreach and knowledge sharing by FFA. This would provide funding for FFA to exchange lessons learned and share results on behalf of the countries with other highly migratory fisheries around the world.
 - o Oceanscape unit located within the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat. This unit would be responsible for drawing upon program monitoring and evaluation, and coordination with other country, regional and development partner initiatives, to support the Pacific Oceanscape Framework. Program support would be provided in collaboration with the Government of Australia, and would include financing for a full-time staff person in the Secretariat's Oceanscape Unit, as well as support for convening meetings and learning exchanges around implementation. The PROP and other initiatives in support of the Pacific Oceanscape Framework would form a regional learning portfolio which could have a demonstration effect throughout the islands in regard to shared challenges and opportunities. This could also include support for a sub-committee of Finance Ministers from the region to monitor implementation progress of the PROP, and report annually to Forum leaders.
- Nationally-Implemented Activities (Implemented by relevant Government agency in each participating country)
 - o Program management, monitoring and evaluation in each participating country, including technical advisory support and support for fiduciary management and controls, and data collection, analysis and evaluation for progress according to the key results indicators. Opportunities to collaborate and coordinate with existing World Bank program management and technical support or that provided by bilateral donor agencies will be pursued to help ensure coherency and effectiveness of project implementation.

4. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The eleven PICs which are member countries of the World Bank are eligible to participate, as all share the transboundary fisheries and fish resources. These are areas characterized by the diversity of their marine ecosystem. They are also among the most vulnerable to effects of sea level rise. There are several hundred islands spread over this vast area and populated by a mere 9 million people.

The first five projects in the series - which corresponds to the PROP Phase 1 - are planned for the countries of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), the Solomon Island, Tuvalu and a regional IDA grant to the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). Each of these countries participates in the management of the shared purse seine tuna fisheries and so is essential to achieving the Program's overall objective, and each country has demonstrated by its interest in the PROP a willingness to continue to improve management of these resources.

A second phase is envisaged in 2015 for a second group of the remaining eligible countries, with a third and subsequent operations to follow. Taken together, the series of operations is expected to

span 9 years, at the end of which it will have covered all eleven eligible PICs.

Examples of the type of the proposed activities (salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis) under PROP Phase I, which have the potential to incur adverse environmental or social impacts:

Component 1:

Component 1, Subcomponent 1 specifically for Solomon Islands might include the construction of an operational center for surveillance of the fisheries, and two outlying enforcement centers for fisheries surveillance. The construction work may generate minor site-specific and time-bound adverse environmental impacts that can be readily mitigated through standard mitigation measures, if screened properly.

Component 2:

Component 2, Sub-component 2 may include support to restock bêche-de-mer if it is deemed a viable method to sustainably restore stocks. If so, hatchery facilities based on native brood stock would be used. And, support would include supplying fishers with juveniles to restock near shore habitats. This activity will not involve introduction of non-native species nor involve the purchase, distribution, use or disposal of bactericides during implementation. However, investments in the area of small enterprise development associated with bêche-de-mer valued added processing may include installation of small scale civil works (e.g., solar dryers) for drying.

Component 3:

Component 3 investments related to the TA for sustainable financing of MPAs, and potentially blue carbon. Activities under Component 3 Subcomponent 1 will support research to assess the unique physical and ecological aspects of the MPAs that would generate ecosystem services (like spawning or feeding grounds for tuna which migrate beyond EEZs of host nations) and that could be incorporated into a system of payment for environmental services. Subcomponent 2 will include TA in order to assess blue carbon potential and participate in blue carbon markets, and will help identify potential blue carbon sites. Small scale infrastructure works are not expected to be financed by the project. In case of downstream establishment of the MPAs, which could potentially restrict access to resources, IAs will select appropriate safeguard instrument(s) according to the responsibilities defined in the ESMF (and in particular the Annex on Process Framework).

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Valerie Hickey (GENDR)

Olha Krushelnytska (GENDR)

Ross James Butler (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The aim of the program is to help improve environmental and resource quality in the Pacific Islands Region in order to increase the economic benefits generated by the goods and services from healthy ocean ecosystems. As such, the overall impact of the program is expected to be highly positive and none of the eligible investments on

	<p>the menu of options include activities that would generate significant risk or irreversible adverse impacts in the coastal or oceans fisheries targeted by the program. However, some investments under Components 1 and 2 may generate minor to moderate site specific and time bound adverse environmental impacts that can be readily mitigated through standard mitigation measures, when screened properly.</p> <p>Additionally, Component 3 (Sustainable Financing of the Conservation of Critical Fishery Habitats) might result in creation of the Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), in which case any potential access restrictions will be addressed through a detailed Process Framework (Annex E).</p> <p>The project also envisages TA for sustainable financing and potential of protected areas, which may lead to potential minor environmental impact downstream. The Interim Guidelines on the Application of Safeguard Policies to TA Activities in Bank-Financed Projects and TFs Administered by the Bank is applied. Mechanism for administering safeguards in TA activities will include integration of safeguard policy requirements into the Terms of Reference of studies. As such, the safeguard documentation prepared for the project applies equally to the TA component(s) and Terms of References for the TA activities will be approved by the Bank to ensure the consultancy outputs comply with the Bank safeguard policies.</p> <p>At this stage in program design, the specific investments that may generate minor to moderate adverse impacts include: small scale infrastructure works to allow for inspection of fish catch at landing sites and restocking of beche-de-mer and establishment of the associated small scale drying facilities. Potential adverse impacts will be limited to waste management, construction noise, and health and safety of workers.</p> <p>Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared to guide</p>
--	---

		investments that may generate any adverse environmental impact. Screening form will be used to screen for environmental and social impacts.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>Program activities will not involve significant loss or degradation of natural habitats. Most of the program activities will be in the marine areas (coastal and ocean) of the Pacific Island which are known sites rich in biodiversity. All program activities are designed to enhance positive and sustainable returns to these important habitats.</p> <p>The Program level ESMF contains measures to properly manage the risk of any unforeseen adverse environmental impact on natural habitats, including critical natural habitats, as well as measures to enhance the program's positive environmental outcomes.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>As the project (sub-component 3.2) will include the technical assistance, scientific and survey expertise, and legal and regulatory support in order to enable participating countries to pilot trials to assess their blue carbon potential, limitations and opportunities and participate in blue carbon markets, and would create conservation incentives for coastal communities to conserve the mangrove habitats, the policy is triggered.</p> <p>The program level ESMF includes a screening form to ensure that the negative impacts on mangrove forests of any downstream activities under Component 3.2 are addressed, and any positive impacts are enhanced. TOR for the studies proposed under sub-component 3.2 will integrate policy requirements of OP 4.36.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project will not purchase, distribute, apply or dispose of pesticides, including bactericides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	The project will not involve any major civil works. It will support the construction of an operational center for surveillance of fisheries, and two outlying enforcement centers for fisheries surveillance (under Component 1) in Honiara, Solomon Islands. Additionally, small scale infrastructure works are foreseen to allow for inspection of fish catch at landing sites and

		restocking of beche-de-mer and establishment of the associated small scale drying facilities. Given the small scale works involved, the policy is not expected to be triggered. A chance finds procedure is included in the ESMF and EMP.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>Although OP4.10 does not apply in all participating countries, this policy has been triggered as the project has a regional scope, and because specific sites and activities were not identified at the project preparation stage. It is possible that the project will affect Indigenous Peoples to some extent. Given the objectives of the project, and the extensive consultations designed into the project, it is expected that any impact would be positive. Notwithstanding, as the project beneficiaries are expected to be overwhelmingly indigenous peoples, the approach adopted will be to incorporate the elements of an IPP into overall project design. Guidance for incorporating elements of the IPP into overall project design is included in Annex B.</p> <p>In PROP Phase I, the only country where the policy will be triggered is the Solomon Islands. Countries for the next phases are not defined yet. Annex B of the ESMF provides guidance on incorporating elements of an IPP into overall project design.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>Project activities may require small-scale coastal land acquisition. It is expected that market-based or voluntary donation will be the common approach. Any voluntary land donations will meet the World Bank requirements through the application of the Voluntary Land Donation Protocol appended to the ESMF in Annex D.</p> <p>Although it is considered unlikely, certain program activities may involve the involuntary acquisition of land and/or removal of assets. Accordingly, the policy will be triggered and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF, presented in Annex C) has been prepared. Subsequently, Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plans will ensure that all affected persons are compensated for involuntary acquisition of land and/or removal of assets at full replacement cost.</p> <p>In case of downstream establishment of the MPAs, which could potentially restrict access to</p>

		<p>resources, IAs will select appropriate safeguard instrument(s) according to the responsibilities defined in the ESMF (and in particular the Annex on Process Framework).</p> <p>To address potential restriction of access to resources, a Process Framework (PF) has been prepared in compliance with requirements stated in OP 4.12 (See Annex E of the ESMF). Neither this project nor the possible downstream investments from project's TA will involve building dams nor depend on an existing dam.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	<p>Neither this project nor the possible downstream investments from project's TA will involve building dams nor depend on an existing dam.</p>
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	<p>Following discussion with LEGEN and the RSA, it was agreed that there will be no impacts from this project or its possible downstream investments on international waterways as described under OP 7.50.</p>
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	<p>Any project activities in areas which may be disputed will be declared ineligible and not included in the project.</p>

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

The overall impact of the program is expected to be highly positive and none of the eligible investments on the menu of options include activities that would generate significant risk or irreversible adverse environmental or social impacts.

The environmental and social impacts of each project will generally depend on the type of activities under each phase of the PROP. Each project would include investments for both 'physical' goods and services, as well as 'soft' activities such as technical assistance. Most of the physical investments would be made at the national level, while 'soft' activities would be implemented at both the national and regional level.

Examples of the type of the proposed activities (salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis), which have the potential to incur adverse environmental or social impacts are as follows:

- Component 1, Subcomponent 1 specifically for Solomon Islands might include the construction of an operational center for surveillance of the fisheries, and two outlying enforcement centers for fisheries surveillance. The construction work may generate minor site-specific and time-bound adverse environmental impacts that can be readily mitigated through standard mitigation measures, if screened properly.

- Component 2, Sub-component 2 may include support to restock beche-de-mer if it is deemed a viable method to sustainably restore stocks. If so, hatchery facilities based on native brood stock would be used. Support would include supplying fishers with juveniles to restock near shore habitats. This activity will not involve introduction of non-native species nor involve the purchase, distribution, use or disposal of bactericides during implementation. However, investments in the area of small enterprise development associated with bêche-de-mer valued added processing may include installation of small scale civil works (e.g., solar dryers) for drying.
- Component 3 investments related to the TA for sustainable financing of MPAs, and potentially blue carbon. Activities under Component 3 Subcomponent 1 will support research to assess the unique physical and ecological aspects of the MPAs that would generate ecosystem services (like spawning or feeding grounds for tuna which migrate beyond EEZs of host nations) and that could be incorporated into a system of payment for environmental services. Subcomponent 2 will include TA in order to assess blue carbon potential and participate in blue carbon markets, and will help identify potential blue carbon sites. Small scale infrastructure works are not expected to be financed by the project.

The scale and likelihood of adverse impacts arising from these activities is limited, and the types of mitigation activities well-known and proven. As such, the program is found to be Category B interventions.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

The potential impacts of the program will be identified during the preparation of the project activities for each PROP member country. The ESMF provides guidance for the project implementation agencies on the preparation of appropriate safeguard instruments to respond to the potential impacts found during the preparation.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

These will be considered within each project (each member country) in consultation with all affected stakeholders and knowledgeable and interested peoples.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The ESMF was prepared under the PROP to outline the process by which potential adverse impacts will be identified and robust instruments prepared as part of each project.

In Phase 1, Program implementation will involve a single agency as the national focal point entity and one or two regional agencies involved in implementing regional activities and overall program coordination and monitoring. These include:

- Fisheries Ministries, Departments, Authorities or Agencies
For Phase I they include:
 - a. Solomon Islands Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resource (MFMR)
 - b. Fisheries Department of Tuvalu's Ministry of Natural Resources (TFD)
 - c. Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority (MIMRA)
 - d. National Oceanic Resource Management Authority (NORMA) in Federated States of Micronesia
- Regional organization involved in fisheries (FFA in the first instance, and SPC, SPREP and others later on);
- The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) in regard to coordination and monitoring of

regionally executed activities.

There are 11 Pacific Island Countries eligible to join PROP. Each possesses differing levels of familiarity with Bank Safeguards Policies and Procedures; however the level of institutional capacity across the region as a whole is quite weak.

FFA, representing its member countries participating in the PROP, including the countries participating in Phase I, has experience with World Bank safeguards because of the link to IDA-financed operations. Additionally, all four national implementing agencies have a general knowledge on bank safeguard policies as they were briefed on the PROP safeguard requirements during the preparation mission.

Nevertheless, the World Bank will provide necessary training and development of staff to each Project implementing agency in the first year of the implementation to build their capacity and provide implementation support during the actual determination of the range of activities to be included in the “menu” of each country’s support.

Bank’s Interim Guidelines on the Application of Safeguard Policies to Technical Assistance (TA) Activities in Bank- Financed Projects and Trust Funds Administered by the Bank will apply for the TA provided by the project. Accordingly, Terms of References for the TA activities will be approved by the Bank to ensure the consultancy outputs comply with the Bank safeguard policies.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The ESMF require an inclusive, participatory community needs assessment process, screening criteria, and forms to document broad community support and consensus on priority subprojects. Subproject Consultation and Action Plans will be developed in the early part of implementation. Community consultations will be facilitated and documented by suitably qualified personnel in the Project Management Unit. Ongoing monitoring and community consultations by such personnel will assess whether broad community support is maintained during implementation.

Project stakeholders include both men and women from affected communities whose livelihoods are implicated and/or who depend on migratory fisheries; the private sector (fishing industry from harvesting through to value chains / processing and investment); the public sector (national ministries, regulatory and trade promotion authorities); and international bodies including regional fishery bodies. The numbers and specificity of stakeholders can only be determined once the precise nature and location of the activities under each project are identified.

Consultations on the Environmental and Social safeguard policies were conducted on August 15, 2014 in Majuro, RMI with representatives from the fisheries agencies of FSM (NORMA), RMI (MIMRA), Solomon Islands (MFMR) and Tuvalu (TFD), as well as the representatives from the FFA, PNAO and SPC. At this meeting, NORMA, MIMRA, MFMR, TFD and FFA (implementing agencies) agreed on the process of preparing and incorporating safeguard instruments in the implementation arrangements. After the consultations, countries worked with the FFA and agreed on the final version of the ESMF, which was formally submitted to the Bank on September 23, 2014 by the FFA on behalf of all IAs. In addition to the regional consultation in RMI, national consultations were held in Tuvalu and Solomon Islands – to ensure stakeholder awareness and feedback in regard to the specific country context within the Component 2 (which is not applicable to FSM). Consultation minutes are attached in the ESMF.

ESMF Disclosure: The ESMF is made available through the World Bank website (www.worldbank.org), as well as through the websites of the FFA (www.ffa.int).

Disclosure occurred in two phases:

- Disclosure of assessment documents (e.g. social assessment and environmental review) and draft safeguard documents (e.g. PF, IPPF, and RPF) during projects preparation and prior to final review and approval of the PROP. Disclosure during projects preparation aims to seek feedback and input from local communities, and as appropriate other stakeholders, on the activities proposed under the project and safeguard measures and documents.
- Disclosure of final safeguard documents prior to project finalization to inform local communities of implementation measures concerning safeguard issues.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Sep-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Oct-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Micronesia, Federated States of	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Marshall Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Solomon Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Tuvalu	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Sep-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Oct-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Micronesia, Federated States of	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Marshall Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Solomon Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Tuvalu	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Sep-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Oct-2014

"In country" Disclosure	
Micronesia, Federated States of	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Marshall Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Solomon Islands	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Tuvalu	23-Oct-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment		
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats		
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples		
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement		
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests		
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [] No [] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: John Virdin	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (RSA)	Date: 25-Oct-2014
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Iain G. Shuker (PMGR)	Date: 25-Oct-2014