

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA931

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 09-Feb-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 10-Feb-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Belize	Project ID:	P131408
Project Name:	BZ Marine Conservation and Climate Adaptation (P131408)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Enos E. Esikuri		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	09-Dec-2014	Estimated Board Date:	03-Mar-2015
Managing Unit:	GENDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (50%), Public administration-Agriculture, fishing and forestry (50%)		
Theme(s):	Climate change (40%), Biodiversity (30%), Environmental policies and institutions (20%), Natural disaster management (5%), Other environment and natural resources management (5%)		
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:	7.31	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			1.78
Adaptation Fund			5.53
Total			7.31
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The objective of the proposed Project is to implement priority ecosystem-based marine conservation and climate adaptation measures to strengthen the climate resilience of the Belize Barrier Reef System.

3. Project Description

Component 1 – Improving the Protection Regime of Marine and Coastal Ecosystems (US\$2 million): This component is aimed at supporting the conservation of marine and coastal ecosystems in the territory of the Recipient by, inter alia:

(1.1) Expanding and consolidating Selected Marine Protected Areas to achieve about 20.2% of area under protection and creating replenishment zones in Selected Marine Protected Areas through, inter alia: (i) spatially mapping and analyzing Selected Marine Protected Areas; (ii) field verification of spatial mapping activities under the Project; (iii) preparation of revisions to the zoning of Selected Marine Protected Areas based on Project field verification and consultation activities; (iv) finalizing zoning maps for Selected Marine Protected Areas and incorporating said maps in the respective management plans of the Selected Marine Protected Areas; and (v) re-demarcation of Selected Marine Protected Areas;

(1.2) Promoting effective management of Selected Marine Protected Areas, including its replenishment fishing zones through, inter alia: (i) strengthening surveillance, monitoring and enforcement; and (ii) supporting biological and water quality monitoring;

(1.3) Supporting pilot investments to re-populate coral reefs within replenishment fishing zones through, inter alia: (i) the establishment of coral nurseries within Selected Marine Protected Areas; and (ii) supporting coral out-planting; and

(1.4) Strengthening the Belize's legal framework for the management of marine protected areas and coastal zones through support for, inter alia: (i) the review and reform of the Belize's legal and institutional framework for protected areas; (ii) the review of mangrove regulations; (iii) the review and reform of the CZM Act; and (iv) the implementation of an ICZM plan.

These are aligned with the key components of successful MPA management repeated in various MPA effectiveness studies (e.g., Alder et al., 1994; Neis, 1995; Sumaila et al., 2000; Christie et al., 2009). These efforts are crucial to reduction in key local stressors to the reef, which is important for enhancing the ecosystem's functionality, resilience and capacity to adapt to climate induced changes. Such stressors include: (a) overfishing and harmful fishing practices (e.g., gill nets, spear gun fishing, unregulated fish traps); (b) unplanned coastal development and marine dredging which cause nutrient, sediment and other pollution, and also lead to loss of critical nursery habitats (especially mangroves and seagrass); and, (c) uncontrolled tourism expansion (e.g., cruise-ship industry, hotel construction) and associated unsustainable practices, pollution and pressures on the reef.

The major undertaking of this component is the expansion of MPAs from 13% to 20.2% (indicative) of territorial waters and Marine Replenishment (No-Take) Zones from approximately 2% to 3.1% (indicative) as identified in the NPASP in a participatory manner. The Project would also support the entire MPA network of Belize to improve its management effectiveness by strengthening the legal framework for the MPA network and implementing monitoring and compliance in the select MPAs. This will significantly enhance the ecosystems' functionality, resilience and capacity to adapt to climate induced changes. The specific emphasis would be on the area surrounding Turneffe Atoll, Southwater Caye Marine Reserve (SCMR), Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary (CBWS) and estuary lagoon systems. These three sites are critical in terms of the integrity and connectivity of marine ecosystem and climate impacts.

The Project would also support effective and participatory management of Belize's MPA network and the coastal zone, including the implementation of the ICZM Plan to increase protection of mangroves, seagrass, and tidal marsh areas. It aims to address the critical recommendations in the

CZM Plan for the long-term development of all coastal areas, including development of small, climate vulnerable cayes and of cayes found inside marine reserves. It also entails the enforcement of a 66-foot buffer zone as a reserve for coastal development and prevention of erosion in the buffer zone

Component 2 – Promotion of Viable Alternative Livelihoods (US\$2.45 million):

This component is aimed at promoting economically viable and sustainable alternative livelihoods for communities adversely impacted by climate change and by the expansion and consolidation of Marine Protected Areas and replenishment zones under the Project by, inter alia:

- (2.1) Supporting community mobilization for the development of Alternative Livelihoods Subprojects through, inter alia, undertaking community needs assessments and participatory workshops for Alternative Livelihoods Subprojects planning;
- (2.2) Carrying out Alternative Livelihoods Subprojects; and
- (2.3) Capacity building to transition to economically viable and sustainable alternative livelihoods through, inter alia, providing business and occupational skills training.

This component will be implemented in direct partnership with co-managers of MPAs, local conservation NGOs, and fishing cooperatives and associations. The eligibility, eligible and ineligible expenditures, selection criteria, and process of Sub-projects will be clearly defined in the Project Operational Manual and made available for the target communities for transparency.

The promotion of alternative livelihoods would contribute to reducing the local anthropogenic stressors on the marine resource base and, in turn, to increasing the health of reefs and associated marine and coastal ecosystems, thus enhancing overall resilience of both human and ecological elements of the ecosystem to climate impacts. The preliminary targets for this component are the coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on the marine and coastal resources of Turneffe Atoll, Corozal Bay, and Southwater Caye as a principal source of income. The GoB has placed a very high priority on directly supporting measures for fishers, processors, those who engage in tourism, and indirectly many of the 105,000 people living in the target coastal areas of Belize. Many of these communities depend almost entirely on fishing for their livelihood. Other communities which used to engage in agricultural production have increasingly turned to fishing due to economic downturn in the agricultural sector.

Component 3 – Raising Awareness and Building Local Capacity (US\$0.56 million): This component is aimed at raising awareness of the impacts of climate change and the value of marine conservation and building local capacity for the adoption of climate resilient practices by, inter alia, carrying out a climate change KAP survey, disseminating information about the Project, designing and implementing a coordinated behavior change communication strategy, and supporting inter-community learning and dialogue.

The objectives of this component are (i) to increase the understanding by local stakeholders about impacts of climate change and the value of marine conservation to build support for the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan (NPAPSP) as a strategy to ensure the long term sustainability of natural resources; (ii) to build local capacity to develop and explore climate resilience strategies, and (iii) to provide regular and accessible public information on climate change effects in the marine ecosystems and coastal zone to promote behavior change designed to minimize climate risks in MPAs and replenishment zones.

Component 4 – Project Management, Monitoring and Assessment (US\$0.52 million):

This component is aimed at supporting: (a) Project management and implementation support including technical, administrative and fiduciary support and compliance with environmental and social safeguards; and (b) monitoring and evaluation, data collection, and stakeholder involvement and coordination.

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

The Project will support the entire MPA network of Belize to improve its management effectiveness by strengthening the legal framework for the MPA network, enhancing the enforcement and implementing a comprehensive monitoring protocol. The specific emphasis will be on the area surrounding Turneffe Atoll, Southwater Caye Marine Reserve, Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, and estuary lagoon systems.

The targeted MPAs are already in existence and are a reality that users including fishers already deal with on a daily basis. The level of management effectiveness varies from one MPA to the other. For the TAMR, given that its establishment is fairly recent, the effects of the restrictions are not yet fully realized. Nonetheless all the MPAs have management plans that outline what is currently taking place or planned to take place. The information below highlights the zonation schemes that are in place or are being contemplated for the specific areas under the project. These will be finalized and instituted during the implementation of the MCCAP. The information provided here is based on the management plans developed for the respective MPAs. These management plans were developed by the Fisheries Department for the SWCMR (2009) and TAMR (2012) and the Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development (SACD) for the CBWS (2012).

Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary (CBWS)

As a “Wildlife Sanctuary” under the Forest Department, legally, there is to be no extraction from the CBWS. The Wildlife Sanctuary designation is intended for the protection of nationally significant species, biotic communities or physical features, and allows for research, tourism and education but no extractive activities. Nonetheless, since its establishment in 1998 under the National Parks System Act of 1981, traditional and subsistence fishing has continued in the protected area. An estimated 33 to 35 fishermen are considered to be largely dependent on the small scale fishery of CBWS. The majority of these fishermen are from the coastal community of Sarteneja.

The CBWS encompasses approximately 178,000 acres (72,000 hectares) of the Belize portion of the estuary system, and much of the northern shelf lagoon behind Ambergris Caye. The SACD currently manages the CBWS on a de facto basis as it has no formal agreement with the Forest Department that allows it management rights and responsibilities. The Forest Department does not maintain a permanent physical presence at the protected area.

The boundaries of CBWS are defined by Statutory Instrument 48 of 1998. The protected area does not include cayes within the Wildlife Sanctuary, which has implications on the ability to protect coastal and caye mangroves, important as bird nesting sites, storm barriers and as protective nurseries for many fish species. The boundaries of CBWS are contiguous with those of Bacalar Chico Marine Reserve (BCMR) to the east, and the Sanctuario del Manati of Mexico to the north.

There is currently no formal zoning or management use of the Sanctuary though community use

areas have been mapped. While fishermen are being engaged in catch monitoring and alternative livelihood initiatives, the full participation of the local communities in management, zoning and monitoring needs to be increased. There are currently no boundary demarcations for the CBWS so while community members are aware of its existence; it is not easy to discern exactly where it lies.

Turneffe Atoll Marine Reserve (TAMR)

The TAMR was declared as a Marine Reserve in 2012 under the Fisheries Act (revised 1983). Its management is guided by the same Act and the Fisheries Department's policies, which allow for zoned multiple use, conservation/no-take areas and areas open for extractive use, under a zoning system. The Fisheries Department is legally mandated to manage the Reserve but currently shares this responsibility with the Turneffe Atoll Sustainability Association, consisting mainly of Turneffe stakeholders.

The Fisheries Department is also responsible for management associated with the two protected spawning aggregation sites (Caye Bokel and Dog Flea Caye) located on the north east and south walls of the Atoll. Whilst these are created as non-extractive, they may be used for limited fishing by traditional users who are designated by Fisheries Department through the granting of special licenses at the recommendation of the co-managers (Statutory Instrument 161 of 2003). A third site at Mauge Caye regulates fishing of the Nassau Grouper spawning site. This is under Statutory Instrument 49 of 2009 which allows for permits to be issued for traditional fishing of Nassau grouper at Mauge Caye within a specified season. Also a Public Reserve was declared to protect Cockroach Beach as it was considered the most important American Saltwater Crocodile nesting site in the country.

The TAMR is one of the traditional fishing grounds, particularly for lobster fishermen, and used to be a major contributor to the marine export products of Belize, with 40% of products delivered to the cooperatives once originating from the Atoll. Approximately 25 fishermen camps are scattered throughout the atoll, many held as long term leases rather than owned property. Belizean fishermen have fished the area for many years, and are considered to have traditional rights to the fishing grounds, though this is regulated to some extent by the Fisheries Act, and will be further regulated now that the Atoll has been declared a marine protected area, with associated management zones.

The TAMR encompasses a total area of 131,690 hectares (325,412 acres/ 1,317 square kilometres). Of the three types of zone established at the TAMR, the General Use Zone is the largest, covering 84.7% of the Marine Reserve. The five Conservation Zones combined represent 11.7% of the area, and the Preservation Zone, with the strictest regulations, covers 0.9%. The zones are described as follows:

General Use Zone - The General Use Zone allows for the sustainable management of existing uses, with the focus being on commercial fishing and recreational activities. This zone lies outside the more critical protection zones, and is relatively accessible to established fishers (both those based from fish camps and those using sailboats), who use the area for commercial fishing. The existence of high connectivity between reef, sea grass and mangrove, presence of the two spawning aggregation sites and a number of fishing banks and nearby replenishment areas make the General Use Zone a valuable and fertile fishing ground. Regulated extractive activities such as commercial, recreational and subsistence fishing are permitted within this area. However, fishers are required to have a valid license, and gear restrictions are in place (the use of gill nets, long lines and beach traps is prohibited). Snorkelling, diving and sport fishing regulations will be enforced throughout this and the other zones.

Conservation Zone - The Conservation Zone covers 11.7% of the Marine Reserve and incorporates five separate areas:

- Zone I: Maugre Caye Conservation Zone
- Zone II A: Dog Flea Conservation Zone
- Zone IV: Blackbird Caye Conservation Zone
- Zone V: Long Bogue Conservation Zone
- Zone VI: Caye Bokel Conservation Area

The five Conservation Zones have identical management regimes, and provide areas free from commercial fishing, undisturbed replenishment areas for recruitment of commercial and other species, and enhance the value of the area for recreational and tourism activities. No-take recreational activities, such as snorkelling SCUBA diving, and kayaking, are permitted within this zone. Sport fishing is also allowed within the Conservation Zone, guided by a Sport Fishing Regulations, but only with a valid license, and only as catch and release.

Preservation Zone - The Preservation Zone covers approximately 0.9% of the Marine Reserve and incorporates a number of the shallow lagoon / inundated mangrove areas critical for replenishment. The objective of the zone is to preserve an area within Turneffe in an entirely natural state and with recognized recruitment functionality as an important area for commercial (and non-commercial) species. Entry to the Preservation Zone is strictly prohibited for anyone, except in an emergency or with prior written permission from the Fisheries Administrator.

Special Management Zones - The Special Management Zones cover 2.7% of the Marine Reserve, and have been established to protect important conch nursery areas in the shallow waters of the back reef flats. Two Special Development areas have been designated:

- Zone II B: Cockroach – Grassy Caye Special Management Area
- Zone III: Vincent's Lagoon Special Management Area

The Special Management Zones are similar to the General Use Zone except the harvesting of conch is not permitted.

South Water Caye Marine Reserve (SWCMR)

The SWCMR encompasses a total area of 117,875 acres, though there is limited boundary demarcation in place. Boundary demarcation of the Conservation Zone is considered a priority. South Water Caye Marine Reserve is divided into three zones to allow for the management of resources for sustainability, and to provide the flexibility needed to accommodate many users. These zones are currently in place however their enforcement is limited at the moment . The zones are as follows:

- General Use Zone
- Conservation Zone
- Preservation Zone

General Use Zone - The General Use Zone covers 95,597 acres (38,687 hectares) – 81.1% of the protected area. Fishing is permitted in this Zone by licensed fishermen, though there are gear restrictions, including a ban on gillnets, long lines and spear fishing. There is also provision for residents of the Marine Reserve to fish for subsistence purposes, under a Special License. Sport fishing is permitted within this Zone, (excluding spear fishing), but is generally catch and release, unless fish are being caught for subsistence purposes during the tour.

Conservation Zone - The Conservation Zone covers approximately 22,143 acres (8,961 ha, or 18.7%) of the Marine Reserve. Within this zone, marine life is fully protected, with strict regulations stating

that “no person shall harass or in any way tamper with any fauna...” Only non-extractive recreational activities are permitted within this zone, with no commercial, sport or subsistence fishing allowed. All boats are to be secured using officially designated mooring buoys, to prevent anchor damage to the seabed – except in emergency situations, or with prior written permission from the Reserve Manager.

Preservation Zone - The Preservation Zone covers approximately 190 acres (76.6 hectares) – 0.16% of the protected area, and has been established to protect the bird nesting colony of Man-O-War Caye – one of Belize’s original crown reserves. Activities are restricted here, with no fishing, sport fishing, diving or any other activity permitted within the Zone. Boats operating within this Zone require written permission from the Fisheries Administrator, though this zone is currently accessed regularly by local tour guides, and no mechanism is yet in place to enforce this requirement. This is likely to change with the implementation of the MCCAP.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Kimberly Vilar (GSURR)

Tuuli Johanna Bernardini (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project is classified as Category B as per OP/BP 4.01 and requires a partial Environmental Assessment (EA). Its main expected environmental impacts are positive. Since the exact location and/or nature of small-scale investments to support alternative livelihoods under the Project have not yet been determined, an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) has been prepared by the Government of Belize to conform to the environmental safeguard policies triggered by the Project and the applicable national regulations.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	This policy is triggered as the Project directly targets positive impacts in critical marine habitats helping to rehabilitate, restore, and protect degrading critical marine ecosystems (such as coral reefs) that are important to preserve marine and coastal biodiversity and the quality of water resources. The EMF explicitly forbids any support for livelihoods activities in areas supporting critical natural habitats or inducing conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats. The EMF includes guidance on avoiding introduction of exotic species (e.g., Red Hybrid Tilapia). Impact monitoring and evaluation will be defined for any harvesting activities.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The Project will not lead to the destruction of forests and forest ecosystems, but will in fact support rehabilitation/restoration of critical marine forest areas such as mangrove and littoral forests through community-based activities. Similar to the natural

		habitats, the EMF will explicitly forbid any Project activities possibly supporting destruction or conversion of forests and forest ecosystems. However, due to the presence of forest ecosystems at potential Project sites, this policy is triggered as a precaution.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Pest management may be necessary for livelihoods Sub-projects to be financed under the Project. In those cases, the Project will promote use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as defined and instructed in the OP/BP 4.09. The Project will not finance chemical pesticides or lead to increased use of other agricultural chemicals unless an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) is developed and applied. The EMF includes applicable screening guidance at the Sub-project level in order to define if a specific Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) will need to be developed before Sub-project approval and implementation.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The Project could involve small structural works and since Belize has thousands of Mayan Antiquities buried under the forests, chance finds might occur within the Project's intervention areas. Further, potential tourism-related livelihood activities could involve a known cultural site. Belize has a well-developed program for management of Mayan Antiquities in situ and ex situ. If antiquities are encountered during Project implementation, the Institute of Archaeology will be notified immediately, and as the competent authority, it will make the decisions on how any chance find would be managed. Additionally, the EMF explicitly forbids activities that would negatively impact any known cultural site, and refers to detailed guidance on how to manage any cultural site that would be developed for tourism purposes in a sustainable manner, aimed at causing a positive impact on the same. The EMF also mandates that in case of any difference/gap between the national legislation and the World Bank safeguard policy, the stricter approach will prevail.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The GoB prepared and disclosed a Culturally Appropriate Consultation and Participation Plan (Indigenous Peoples Plan). It has been disclosed in country and Infoshop, in full compliance with OP 4.10. The Plan includes a summary of the project's social impact assessment, description of stakeholder consultations, analysis of the project's potential

		social impacts and mitigation measures, culturally appropriate consultation protocol, steps for livelihoods restoration and diversification, and grievance redress mechanism. In sum, the Plan establishes the measures through which the GoB will engage in culturally appropriate ways with the indigenous Garinagu and Mestizo fishing communities who are adversely affected by the project, meaning engagement in culturally appropriate ways, -according to their own governance structures, language preferences and traditions- and ensure that the eligibility criteria used to allocate benefits under Component 2 are culturally-appropriate and fully inclusive of the country's culturally diverse communities.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	Project activities will likely result in involuntary restrictions of sections of MPAs that are currently used by local communities. For that reason, Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) is triggered. Under OP 4.12, a Process Framework has been prepared and disclosed in country and on the Infoshop. Its purpose is to establish guidelines for Component 2's livelihood restoration and diversification strategy to mitigate the impacts of restrictions on livelihood activities in target sites. In order to mitigate a range of social risks and to prevent, manage and resolve potential disputes, a Project-wide grievance redress mechanism has been established and described in the Process Framework.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Project will not support or rely on activities that trigger this policy.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy is not applicable. Corazol Bay is an international waterway because it is a "bay that is bounded by two or more states" as defined under paragraph 1(c) of the policy, and also serves a necessary channel of communication between the open sea and the countries concerned. The project will not finance any activities that will involve the use or potential pollution of the water in the bay. In the unlikely event that beneficiary communities propose to implement activities that may involve the use or potential pollution of the water in the bay, these will be excluded from financing under the Project.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	Yes	The Project will carry out activities in Turneff Atoll, South Water Caye, and Corozal Bay. Some of these

		<p>areas may fall in the southern half of the country and the surrounding islands, which has been determined to be a “disputed area” as per this policy, owing to the long-standing territorial claim over the territory by Guatemala. In accordance with the policy, a memorandum to the Managing Director laying out the nature of the dispute and making recommendations as to how compliance with the policy will be achieved has been prepared in consultation with LEGEN. Further steps towards ensuring compliance with the policy will be undertaken following guidance from the Managing Director.</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 Project is classified as Category B as per OP/BP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment and requires a partial Environmental Assessment (EA). Its main expected environmental impacts are positive as described along the Project Appraisal Document. Component 2 supports economically viable and sustainable alternative livelihoods for local populations whose economic activities are directly impacted by the adverse effects of climate change and the expansion of the no-take zones and MPA network. Potential alternative livelihoods activities include poly-culture of marine products such as seaweed farming combined with cultivation of other marine products (e.g. conch, lobsters, sea cucumber, and crab) in integrated cultivation systems. Training for other marine tourism-based activities such as tour-guiding, whale shark tourism, diving, and sailing will also be selectively supported by the Project, based on their economic viability and sustainability.

Environmental management of Project activities is required due to potential adverse impacts of the referred livelihood activities on human populations or environmentally sensitive areas. However, the same are expected to be readily mitigated as they are likely to be site-specific and reversible. Since the exact location and/or nature of small-scale investments to be financed under the Project have not yet been determined, an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) has been prepared by the GoB to conform to the environmental safeguard policies triggered by the Project and the applicable national regulations. The EMF will guide on identification of potential environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures and includes best practices for aquaculture/mariculture and tourism activities.

Direct social impacts on community livelihoods are expected to result from the implementation of activities under Component 1 given that restrictions will be imposed in order to expand, secure and enforce the marine protected areas and replenishment (no-take) zones in the target areas. The main direct impact is that approx. 2500 fishers will lose income due to displacement and reduction in fish catch. The main concern the fishers have regarding protected areas is the effect they may have on their livelihoods and potentially negative effects on their income. This reaction is strong especially in those communities where dependence on fishing is high. There is the potential for this to occur for direct users and it can also have an indirect effect on the employment of those employed by the fishing cooperatives. Because MPAs and managed areas limit access by fishers’

<p>loss of income may occur through reduced catch. Related social impacts include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of traditional fishing grounds: Most fishing households have been fishing for generations especially indigenous communities. It is possible that they could lose access to traditional fishing areas through the realignment and establishment of MPAs and RZs. • Loss of choice regarding fishing grounds: In terms of displacement and relocation, fishers expressed that they use areas in the MPAs for their current fishing activities due to the high volume of fish there. Enforcing the boundaries and enhanced vigilance in the MPAs will mean that they will have to move out and will therefore see them lose out on their former fishing grounds. • Congestion in alternative fishing grounds: Fishermen displaced by the establishment and enforcement of MPAs and RZs will have to identify new fishing areas/ground which will lead to both congestion and competition with other fishers for those same areas which can potentially lead to conflicts among users. Fishermen generally use identified fishing grounds and as such will not necessarily be open to others joining them especially those from other districts. • Conflicts arising from enforcement of MPA regulations. Not every fisher will cooperate with the management agencies in enforcing the laws and regulations governing MPAs and NTZs. There are those who will challenge the rangers' authority for instance. If this is not handled properly it can encourage others to engage in a similar fashion, solidify a convergence of opposition and such conflicts can escalate to a broad group and become intractable.
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>The Project strives to positive long-term socio-environmental impacts focusing on the still rich marine biodiversity hosted by Belize through different types of targeted measures that address its greatest stressors and climate-related threats. The embedded promotion of alternative livelihoods, capacity building activities, and awareness raising target longer-term behavioral changes that will naturally depend both on the overall Project success as well as a number of external factors. The project's social assessment has identified the following risks related to the above mentioned direct impacts on livelihoods: Increased time burden on participating fishers and their families, increase work burden for women; Increased occupational risks; Loss of independence and traditional way of life; Increased stress reaction, anxiety and concern over wellbeing; Decrease in trust in political institutions and government; Increased incidence of poaching activities, therefore higher number of fishers processed, detained and/or arrested for infractions and non-compliance; Reinforced perception of bias towards special interests in tourism and ecotourism; Process capture by elite and special interests; Diminished stake for fishers in marine resources and its conversation related to decreased valuation of fisher's local ecological knowledge vis-à-vis scientific evidence; and Resistance to new MPAs.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>Not relevant as the Project design has been developed with the objective of promoting enhanced conservation, climate resilience and sustainable use of marine natural resources within and adjacent to the three targeted MPAs. The selection of said MPAs was based on the Government's on-going protected areas rationalization exercise, which aims to provide recommendations for "building on the current network of protected areas, improving functionality, connectivity and socio-economic benefits as Belize moves into a future with increasing anthropogenic pressures, overshadowed by the need to adapt to current and predicted climate change impacts." The three targeted MPAs are critical in terms of the integrity and connectivity of marine ecosystems and climate impacts. Relative shoreline stability is high in areas with mangroves and coral reefs close to the shore and in areas well protected by multiple lines of defense, such as in Turneffe Atoll and</p>

<p>South Water Caye. Preserving the reefs in these areas would contribute to the stability of at least 200 km of the mainland coastline. The reefs in these areas are estimated to contribute to 24–40% of the shoreline stability. Mangroves are also vitally important to the stability of the shoreline of mainland and cayes throughout Belize.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>The GoB contracted technical consultants to prepare the necessary safeguard instruments with guidance and review provided by the Bank team’s specialists.</p> <p>Regarding environmental safeguards, the GoB has prepared an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) to conform to the environmental safeguard policies triggered by the Project and the applicable national regulations. The EMF provides (i) a basic environmental characterization of the Project intervention areas; (ii) a diagnosis of the legal framework related to the environment theme in the different sectors that the Project will support, and the institutional framework that will be involved during the project cycle; (iii) assessment of potential adverse environmental issues or impacts commonly associated with alternative livelihood projects and the ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate them; (iv) establishment of clear procedures and methodologies for environmental planning, review, approval and implementation of sub-projects to be financed under the Project; and (v) specification of roles and responsibilities and the necessary reporting procedures for managing and monitoring environmental concerns arising from the sub-projects. The EMF will guide on identification of potential environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures and includes best practices for aquaculture/mariculture.</p> <p>The Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development (MFFSD) is responsible for the overall implementation of the Project with the fiduciary assistance of Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT). MFFSD houses key units for the implementation of the Project, including Fisheries Department, National Protected Areas Secretariat (NPAS), Forest Department, and Department of the Environment (DOE). The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will support general Project strategic guidance and implementation oversight. The PSC will be chaired by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the MFFSD, and comprised of representatives of key ministries/organizations, including the Coastal Zone Management Authority & Institute (CZMAI), DOE, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, NPAS, PACT, Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development (SACD), Turneffe Atoll Marine Reserve management agency; South Water Caye Marine Reserve, Belize Fishermen’s Federation, and Belize Fishermen’s Cooperative Association.</p> <p>Project Implementing Agency Group (PIAG) within MFFSD will carry out the day-to-day management of the Project, and Ssub-projects, including coordination, supervision, monitoring, quality control, socio-environmental management, and reporting in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the Project Operational Manual (POM). The PIAG will consist of a Project Coordinator, a Senior Technical Officer, staff from Fisheries Department, and fiduciary staff of PACT. PACT will be responsible for ensuring sound fiduciary management of the Project’s resources. Funds will be transferred to PACT under a Subsidiary Agreement with the Government. No funds will flow directly to the Ssub-project beneficiaries.</p> <p>None of the participating bodies have earlier experience on implementing World Bank safeguards measures. The technical staff to be hired for the PIAG will be the main responsible for the Project compliance with the Bank’s safeguards with oversight by the NPAS and technical support by the</p>

DoE that has an overall capacity and experience on environmental screening of projects within the framework of the national legislation. The Bank team will provide applicable safeguards training to the responsible MFFSD and Project staff and other relevant stakeholder groups at the Project inception and during implementation on as-needed-basis.

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

The key project stakeholders are:

- Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development
- Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)
- Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute
- MPA co-managers: (a) Turneffe Atoll Sustainability Council; (b) Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development; (c) Belize Fishermen's Federation; (d) Belize Fishermen's Cooperative Association; (e) Southern Environmental Association; and (f) Dangriga Fishermen's Association.
- eco-tourism operators
- fisher households
- coastal communities

The Environmental Management Framework, the Process Framework and Culturally Appropriate Consultation and Participation Plan were disclosed and consulted on September 26th, 2014 at the MCCAP's Cзмаi Training Room in Belize City. Participants to the consultation meeting included representatives of fisher groups, Fisheries Department, Coastal Zone Management Authority & Institute, Marine Protected Area Co-Managers, Non-Government Organizations and Garinagu fishers. The overall objective of the consultation workshop was to finalize the project's environmental and social safeguards instruments with the main project stakeholders. The process focused on documenting stakeholders' concerns and inputs, and the free, prior and informed consultation process resulting in the achievement of broad community support, inter alia, of the indigenous peoples' representative organizations. The feedback received in the consultation workshop has been used to revise the instruments.

Regarding previous consultations on the project design itself, all major Government and non-governmental stakeholders were consulted during the development of the original concept document from February to November 2011. The first set of consultations with key stakeholders held between February 21-24, 2011, arrived at the main conclusion that Belize must manage its natural resources in a more sustainable manner and strengthen resilience to climate shocks in order to achieve its medium- and long-term development goals. To this end, the MCCAP was jointly conceived by the Government of Belize and non-governmental partners including local communities. The concept and its design were well received by high level Government officials, and resulted in a request to the World Bank for further assistance in developing the project. Further consultations on the content and scope of the concept document were held with Government officials on April 15th, 2011, between May 9th and 13th, 2011, and between November 14th and 18th, 2011. Consensus was achieved with regard to the main objective and expected outcomes of the project, as well as the approximate budget allocations for the three components. The concept document was approved by the Adaptation Fund Board in March 23, 2012.

A plan for stakeholder consultation, including consultation with the relevant fishing communities

and other agencies was prepared. Based on the plan, several meetings and site visits were held between September 20 and December 14, 2012. All the key stakeholders had an opportunity to comment on and provide feedback on the three components of the project. Community consultations and focus group sessions, and one-on-one meetings were conducted. The consultation process involved:

Community consultations were held with potentially-affected fishing communities in all three fishing regions. Both men and women were involved in the consultations at the community level. Women were specifically targeted in Sarteneja, the largest fishing village, and in Dangriga and Hopkins, both being indigenous communities. It was determined that a rapid participatory appraisal approach would be used with the women as most of the literature available only addressed male participation in the fishing industry. This lack of information of female representation in the literature and general community consultations meant that simply presenting project information to the women would not be sufficient to gain the women's input while at the same time trying to identifying potential impacts on them. The participatory nature of the process allowed women to share their views on the project and contribute to the identification of potential impacts that could arise from the project from their perspective.

The consultations held with fishing communities in general confirmed the project components and helped to further define the specific activities to be undertaken. Community engagements were done in the spirit of the free, prior and informed consultation principles for both indigenous and non-indigenous communities alike. During the consultation with the fishers of Dangriga and Hopkins (the largest groups of indigenous fishers) they were provided with all the information on the project details including the budget and it was done prior to finalizing the full design of the project. The consultation meetings in Hopkins and Dangriga were public meetings open to all fishers. In Hopkins, the local NGO SEA assisted with organizing the meeting and it was held at night; a time convenient to the villagers. In Dangriga, the Dangriga Fishermen Association (DFA) assisted with arranging the meeting and identifying a convenient venue. They also helped to decide the time of the meeting based on their own schedules. There were no inducements, considerations or duress of any kind for their participation as the sessions were held in a transparent environment. Invitation to the consultations sessions were done by the leadership of the respective groups as is customary.

During the consultations the project components and proposed activities were outlined and feedback on suitability and relevance to needs was solicited. Communities were also asked to indicate whether the project conflicted with or complemented other projects currently being done or which had been recently completed. Concerns of the community were documented even if they did not relate directly to the project subject areas. As a result of consultations, key feedback was received that formed the basis for the elaboration of the project activities. A list of organizations and community members consulted are shown in the Annex section of this document.

In general, there was support for the project from the local communities. The recognition of the importance of improving the management of marine resources among fishers was validated during community consultations. There were no opposition or objection to the project and its main components among the indigenous communities visited. Community members clearly recognize the need for conservation of marine resources as it not only benefits the environment but also secures their livelihoods and long term wellbeing. More so for the Garifuna communities, fishing and the sea play an important role in their culture and traditions. They were keen on ensuring that livelihoods support came along with the management measures and are willing to engage with the

project once it started. It also became clear that a mobilization aspect to the project was necessary to ensure a strong uptake of project resources given the fact that fishers have a low level of education and without support would not necessarily be able to navigate formal requirements. Indigenous fishers also provided advice about potential challenges of alternative livelihoods such as organizing community members and enabling market access for local products. Based on this input, the project was designed to ensure that community mobilization is the first step in the development of alternative livelihood activities and a marketing expert will be engaged in the development of new enterprises. Perhaps due to the fact that since the SWCMR is already in place, indigenous fishers did not raise any objections to the project. Instead they expressed that they would like the SWCMR be properly defined and marked so they know exactly where the MPA actually lies.

Aside from the community consultations, it should be noted that indigenous Garifuna fishers are members of fishing cooperatives that make up the (Belize Fishermen Cooperative Association) BFCA and they too were consulted on the project in a similar fashion with them being given full information on the project. Consultations will continue throughout the life of the project and will involve the key Government authorities, as well as the key non-governmental organizations, and fishermen associations and cooperatives such as the SACD, TASA, SFA, DFA, Northern Fishermen Producers Society Limited, National Fishermen Producers Society Limited, Placencia Fishermen Producers Society Limited, and the BFF. The future consultation efforts will build on the methodologies used in the project development phase and extend to include: on-going evaluation of interventions, periodic meetings with stakeholder groups (e.g. local fishermen's cooperatives, and associations), and feedback mechanisms established via the Project Steering Committee and the Project Implementing Agency Group such as the grievance redress mechanism. These types of consultations are considered critical to the process of adaptive management and ownership-building necessary for successful project implementation among all stakeholders.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Nov-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	///
"In country" Disclosure	
Belize	12-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> To be confirmed	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Nov-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Belize	12-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> To be confirmed	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Nov-2014

"In country" Disclosure	
Belize	12-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> To be confirmed	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	///
Date of submission to InfoShop	///
"In country" Disclosure	
Belize	12-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> As part of EMF.	
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"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<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"/>]	NA [<input 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"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management			
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources			
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input 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"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<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 type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP 7.60 - Projects in Disputed Areas	
Has the memo conveying all pertinent information on the international aspects of the project, including the procedures to be followed, and the recommendations for dealing with the issue, been prepared	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the PAD/MOP include the standard disclaimer referred to in the OP?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

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 [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
--	---

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Enos E. Esikuri	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Emilia Battaglini (PMGR)	Date: 10-Feb-2015