

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA5446

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 23-Aug-2013

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 25-Aug-2013

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Indonesia	Project ID:	P127813
Project Name:	Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program- Coral Triangle Initiative (COREMAP-CTI) (P127813)		
Task Team Leader:	Marea Eleni Hatzios		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	29-Jul-2013	Estimated Board Date:	19-Nov-2013
Managing Unit:	EASIS	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity		
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (50%), Public administration- Agriculture, fishing and forestry (25%), Sub-national government administration (25%)		
Theme(s):	Biodiversity (60%), Climate change (20%), Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise support (20%)		
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:	66.00	Total Bank Financing:	50.00
Total Cofinancing:		Financing Gap:	0.00
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			6.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			50.00
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			10.00
Total			66.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	Yes		

2. Project Development Objective(s) / Global Environmental Objective(s)

A. Project Development Objective(s)

The PDO of the overall COREMAP Adaptable Program Loan is to establish a viable, decentralized management system for coral reef conservation and sustainable use in priority coral reef sites in Indonesia. The PDO of this third and final phase of COREMAP (COREMAP-CTI) is the same as the Global Environmental Objective: to manage coral reef resources, associated ecosystems and biodiversity in a sustainable manner for the welfare of coastal communities.

B. Global Environmental Objective(s)

3. Project Description

The PDO will be achieved through a three-pronged approach: (a) reinforcing the capacity of communities and local government to co-manage marine resources; (b) improving the management effectiveness of government in achieving biodiversity and sustainable-use objectives in the administration of National Marine Parks and Marine Conservation Areas through Marine Spatial Planning and co-management with Local Government; and (c) increasing incomes of project beneficiaries through development of sustainable marine-based enterprises in partnerships between communities, with Local Government and the private sector.. COREMAP- CTI will also contribute significantly to implementation of Indonesia's National Plan of Action for the CTI. These approaches are embedded in the following four components:

Component 1 Institutional Strengthening for Decentralized Coral Reef Management

The objective of this component will institutionalize best practices, interventions, and approaches developed under the two previous COREMAP Programs, and embed COREMAP institutions into Village administration with support from Local Government. A screening process, based on a combination of factors related to community ownership, performance, potential and geographic location will be used to determine which of the 357 COREMAP II Villages will participate in activities under this component. This component will finance the following four sub-components and associated activities:

- Sub-component 1.1: Strengthening and expansion of the COREMAP approach
- Sub-component 1.2: Robust ecological and socio-economic monitoring
- Sub-component 1.3: Strengthening surveillance of coastal ecosystems
- Sub-component 1.4: Human Resources Development (HRD)

Component 2 Development of Ecosystem Based Resources Management

The aim of this component is to bring about better management of MPAs (Marine Protected Area) and create enabling conditions for sustainable use of the surrounding production seascape through support for District level marine spatial planning (MSP) and zoning. It will be achieved by introducing: (i) ecosystem-based management of coral reef resources using best practices in Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and MSP and Zoning as major tools for conservation and sustainable use; and (ii) MMAF (Ministry of Marine and Fisheries)'s MPA Management Effectiveness (ME) Tool Kit to assess progress against a pre-determined baseline. The idea is to introduce a systems approach by combining MSPs with the ME tool kit in the planning and implementation processes. This would have synergy -- while MSP would provide a seascape

framework for enhancing sustainability of marine-based economic development, the ME tool kit would trigger constant actions for ME improvements. MSPs can be used to create opportunities for compatible, sustainable use of coastal resources, thus helping to achieve conservation as well as local economic development objectives. This approach will be integrated into managing small-scale fisheries and community rights-based approaches for capture fisheries activities.

This component will finance the following four sub-components and associated activities:

- Sub-component 2.1: Support for Marine Spatial Planning
- Sub-component 2.2: The Application of Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM)
- Sub-component 2.3: Management Effectiveness of MPAs and Threatened Species
- Sub-component 2.4: Piloting Community Rights-Based Approach to Coastal Resources Management
- Sub-component 2.5: Ecosystem Approaches to Managing Small-Scale Fisheries

Component 3 Development of Sustainable Marine-based Economy

This component aims to support the development of sustainable, ecosystem-based marine enterprises that reinforce links between healthy marine ecosystems and economic benefits to communities, to create the economic incentives to sustain COREMAP local institutions. The focus will be on developing opportunities for sustainable use of the ecosystem capture of resource rents, as alternatives to unsustainable destructive- and over-fishing. This will require private sector investments in the development of economic opportunities. A key aspect of this involves putting in place the basic infrastructure to attract private sector investments. Equally important will be the provision of production software including training and mentoring of community groups to develop Sustainable Enterprise Alliances (SEA) between private sector investors and communities. The first activity under this component would start with the review of provincial and district economic development plans to identify potential SEAs. As a part of the activity, the project would support workshops with private sector companies, districts, and villages as well as feasibility studies to form SEAs. The district counterparts will be the District Agency of MMAF (Dinas KP) with support from the District Economic Development Boards under District Planning and Development Agency (BAPPEDA). For community enterprises within MPAs this will include the MPA Management Boards.

- Sub-component 3.1: Development of Basic Infrastructure
- Sub-component 3.2: Development of Sustainable Enterprise Alliances (SEA)

The basic infrastructure and capital assets to be financed under this component are all expected to be classified as Category B type investments. The Project will not finance any Category A type civil works.

Component 4: Project Management, Coordination and Learning

The project will support all implementing agencies in administration and financial aspects to meet the World Bank's requirements and Indonesian government regulations. The project will emphasize the coordination of program implementation with the Asian Development Bank, LIPI (Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia/the Indonesian Institute of Sciences), and the Sea Partnership Program as co-executing partners of COREMAP-CTI, and other sources of technical assistance, such as the CCRES (Capturing Coral Reef and related Ecosystem Services) Project—a GEF financed WB regional knowledge project under the International Waters (IW) Strategic Program Framework for Scaling Up

Investment Partnerships in the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia. To mainstream the COREMAP approach, the project will promote learning networks to disseminate innovation and lessons learned across COREMAP sites as well as through CCRES and the GEF IW: Learn websites.

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

As shown in Tables 1 and 2 below, the project's geographical coverage would include five provinces and seven districts as well as seven Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). As COREMAP-II experiences show, destructive and unsustainable fishing are carried out not only by local villagers, but also by fishers outside of the target villages. Awareness raising activities would target general public and small-mid size reef fishermen in key strategic ports as well as middle-men and aggregators in the live coral reef fish trade.

Table 1. Project Target Marine Protected Areas

No	Conservation Centre	Marine Protected Areas
1	National Marine Conservation Center (BKKPN)	Kupang TWP Padaido (Biak)
2	SAP Raja Ampat	
3	SAP Waigeo - Raja Ampat (West)	
4	TWP Kapoposang, (Lesser Sunda Is)	
5	TNP Sawu Sea	
6	SAP Aru - southeastern part	
7	TWP Banda (Moluccas)	

Table 2. Project Target Districts and Marine Conservation Areas

No	Province	District	MCA
1	South Sulawesi	Pangkep District	Kapoposang
2		Selayar District	
3	Southeast Sulawesi	Buton District	
4		Wakatobi District	
5	East Nusa Tenggara	Sikka District	
6	Papua	Biak Numfor District	
7	West Papua	Raja Ampat District	

Initial screening of the participating districts using the WB's IP distribution mapping (2010) and also experience of COREMAP II have shown that there are a number of indigenous groups in COREMAP-CTI districts, particularly in Kabupaten Buton and Wakatobi (see Table 3 below on the Distribution of IP in COREMAP-CTI Project Locations). In both these 2 districts Bajo people reside. The Bajo are an ethnic minority who live on the sea (as itinerant seafarers) or in coastal areas right on the water, and are, thus, highly dependent on the sea for their livelihoods and food. In Kabupaten Sikka, Biak and Raja Ampat, there are also indigenous groups. Based on the IP mapping, all the indigenous groups in Kabupaten Sikka and Biak live in highland areas, while in Kabupaten Raja Ampat, the groups reside in the coastal area. During project implementation, the PMO/project implementer will conduct further screening in the defined project area for the presence of indigenous peoples/ethnic minority and their vulnerability.

Table 3. Distribution of IP in the COREMAP-CTI Project Locations (Source: WB IP mapping (2010))

Table 3. Distribution of IP in the COREMAP-CTI Project Locations (Source: WB IP mapping

(2010))

No.	District (Province)	Sub-district	Village	Name of IP
1.	Pangkep (South Sulawesi)	Pangkep	No IP (or data no available)	
2.	Selayar (South Sulawesi)	Selayar	No IP (or data no available)	
3.	Sikka (East Nusa Tenggara)	Kec. Paga	Ranggarasi	
	Lio (highland)	Kec. Mego	Wolodhesa	No name
		Liakutu	No name (highland)	
		Parabubu	Lio Mego (inland)	
		Kec. Lela	Sikka	No name (highland)
		-	Wukur	No name (highland)
	Kec. Bola	Hale	No name (highland)	
		Egon Gahar	No name (highland)	
	Kec Talibura	Natarmage	No name (highland)	
		Pruda	No name (highland)	
		Werang	No name (highland)	
		Talibura	No name (highland)	
		Darat Gunung	No name (highland)	
		Hikong	No name (highland)	
	Kec. Waigete	Watudiran	No name (highland)	
		Runut	No name (highland)	
	Kec. Maumere	Samparong	No name (highland)	
4.	Buton (Southeast Sulawesi)	Kec. Lasalimu	Bonelalo	No name
		Kec. South Lasalimu	Metanauwe	No name (coastal)
		Kumbewaha		
		Umalaoe	Malaoge (inland)	
		Lasalimu	No name (coastal)	
		Kec. Pasar Wajo	Holimombo	No name (coastal)
		Wakaokili	Kaliwuliwu (inland)	
	Kec. Kapontori	Todanga	Buton (inland)	
	Kec. Lakudo	Lolibu	Malimpano (inland)	
		Kec. Telaga Raya	Kokoe	No name (coastal)
5.	Wakatobi (Southeast Sulawesi)	Kec. Binongko	Waloindi	No name (coastal)
		Wali	No name (coastal)	
		Kec Tomia	Lamanggau	No name (coastal)
6.	Raja Ampat (West Papua)	Kec. Misool	Waigama	Biak
		Kec. Samate	Samate	Biak (coastal)
		Yesawai	Biak (coastal)	
		Kec. Waigeo Barat	Gag	Biak (coastal)
		Kec. Waigeo Utara	Andey	Biak (coastal)

7. Biak (Papua) Kec. Biak Utara Wonabraidi Biak (highland)

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Juan Martinez (EASIS)

Ninin K. Dewi (EASIS)

Cary Anne Cadman (AFTSG)

Dennie Stenly Mamonto (EASIS)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The environmental impact of the project is not expected to be significant, as the overall objective of the project is to enhance biodiversity (including coral reef and associated ecosystems) and the welfare of communities through better management. The Project aims to achieve this through a community-based approach, which by its nature involves communities in both planning and implementation of activities.</p> <p>Any impacts associated directly with the proposed activities are judged to be minor to moderate, reversible, and site-specific. Mitigation measures are achieved through community participation and community-based subproject management. It was noted that the project team is updating the project operations manual, reflecting the most recent lessons of experience, in particular those relating to both environmental and social safeguards.</p> <p>However, to minimize the likelihood and scope of any minor environmental impacts that may result from the proposed activities, the project provides a negative list and environmental checklist as mitigation tools.</p> <p>If the screening process suggests that a negative environmental impact might result, the project will follow the guidance in the ESSF and project operation manual to prepare the relevant safeguards instruments. These include, for example, an environmental management/ monitoring plan (EMP) or Statement Letter of Ability in Environmental Management and Monitoring.</p>

		<p>Further improvements to mitigate minor impacts include better site management for any civil works and continuous environmental awareness programs for communities.</p> <p>An important precautionary measure is to ensure the implementation of high quality, basic civil engineering procedures. Mitigation measures for this potential impact include training modules and procedures, the dissemination of environmental codes of practice and the development of criteria for design evaluation based on basic civil engineering standard and construction practices.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>COREMAP-CTI project activities will include support for enhancing management effectiveness of seven existing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) to protect critical habitat, as well as for seven district level Marine Conservation Areas which have already been demarcated in Eastern Indonesia. The overall impacts on Natural Habitats as a result of Project interventions are expected be highly positive. Combining a community-based approach with capacity building for management and protection of coral reefs and associated ecosystems at all levels of government—from national to village level--the conservation interventions are expected to be sustained.</p> <p>The project will not finance sub-projects to be undertaken in prohibited, critical natural habitats, nor will it result in the significant conversion of natural habitats. The main activities in no-take zones and sensitive habitats, would be patrolling and maintenance activities. No extractive activities would be allowed. This is already clearly defined in the negative list of the project. The project operation manual will also provide specifications on the management of small construction works to avoid any potential degradation or conversion of natural habitats on a small scale.</p> <p>The impacts of access restriction to natural habitats will be mitigated in the Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF), which also includes process framework for the access restriction.</p>

Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	<p>The project will not finance activities that would involve significant conversion or degradation of critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats as defined under the policy. No net loss of mangroves would occur as a result of project activities, to the contrary, the project would support management interventions to protect the ecological integrity of these systems and allow communities to benefit from the ecosystem services they provide. Among the alternative livelihood activities to be explored under COREMAP II would be the possibility of developing carbon offsets for protecting or enhancing (through reforestation) carbon stored in mangroves (i.e., Blue Carbon). If successful in generating revenue streams from the sale of Carbon Emissions Reduction Credits, such Blue Carbon markets would create added incentives for communities to invest in protecting these valuable coastal wetlands.</p> <p>The ESSF contains guidance on how to address considerations under this policy should the alternative livelihoods explored lead to reforestation or re-vegetation activities, etc.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	<p>The project will not procure any pesticides, nor will any use of pesticides result from the project.</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	<p>No activities affecting archeological, paleontological, historical, religious, or unique natural values as defined under the policy will be eligible for support under the Project. Standard appropriate clauses will be included in all construction contracts regarding the procedures to be followed in the event of “chance finds” of culturally significant artifacts.</p>
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The project could have an IP/ethnic minority presence in some of the villages selected for project activity, such as in Kabupaten Raja Ampat, Buton and Kabupaten Wakatobi. In Kabupaten Buton and Wakatobi, there are Bajo peoples who live on the sea or in coastal areas and depend highly on the marine resources. Findings from COREMAP II indicate that no adverse impacts on IPs were identified in the course of the Project’s implementation. The Project will need to ensure the involvement of these indigenous groups, particularly in areas</p>

		<p>where the IP groups are a minority. The project will ensure that information reaches these IP groups and they get an equal opportunity to benefit from activities initiated by the project.</p> <p>An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been developed to mitigate any adverse impacts and to help ensure that Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Minorities will actually benefit from the project. Since COREMAP-CTI will strengthen zoning and support needed small scale infrastructure to attract private investment in ecotourism activities, there will be opportunities for Bajo people and other minorities in these locations to take part in alternative livelihood to fishing which would generate more benefits and be more sustainable.</p> <p>The IPPF is embedded in the Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework (ESSF).</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>The project does not anticipate any significant land acquisition or resettling any people. Any piece of land that is acquired will be done through voluntary donations, such as was the case in COREMAP II. If there is a land acquisition, it will be on a small scale and be acquired on a voluntary basis with willing seller and willing buyer. The project will keep a record of all such transactions and also ensure that no individual will be negatively affected by such land acquisition/land donation. Requirements for small-scale land acquisition as well as land donation are provided in the Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF)</p> <p>Component 2 will support marine spatial planning at the District level, including zoning. This is expected to interface with Village level MPAs established under COREMAP II. Any access restrictions that may result from zoning marine space for specific uses—and thus prohibiting fishing or aquaculture in sensitive areas-- triggers the policy. Similarly, the project will pilot community rights-based approach to fisheries management in two locations. This will involve formalizing traditional use rights of communities to grant them exclusive rights to fish</p>

	<p>in the fishing grounds adjacent to them, thus closing these areas to outside fishers and allowing these communities to harvest the “spillover” benefits from the No-Take Zones they have voluntarily set up.</p> <p>To offset any lost revenue that might result in the near term from such restrictions, as well as from the introduction of good fisheries management practices, including bringing overall fishing effort in line with environmental carrying capacity, the Project will support an alternative livelihoods program under Component 3. The Project will facilitate access by affected fishers to such programs. Other options of compensation will also be considered upon consultation with the affected people.</p> <p>For example, through a participatory process (participatory framework); community members will ensure that revenue streams from any access restrictions are fully and sustainably mitigated in line with OP 4.12. If communities choose to engage and endorse access restrictions, it is anticipated that losses will be compensated by one or more available alternatives such as sharing in revenue streams from the marine park, gaining wages from employment in the marine protected area and related activities, value addition and sale of non-timber forest products, including alternative livelihood development activities identified during the participatory process. These in line with the OP 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement, which defines project-affected persons as anyone who (a) through involuntary taking of land, is relocated or loses shelter, loses assets or access to assets, or loses incomes sources of means of livelihood, or (b) suffers adverse impacts on livelihood because of involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and/or protected areas. Such persons are to be informed about their options and rights and consulted on and offered choices among feasible resettlement alternatives. In the case of access restrictions, the natures of the restrictions and of the measures to mitigate their adverse impacts are to be determined with the</p>
--	---

		<p>participation of the affected groups</p> <p>A Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF) which also covers the Process Framework to mitigate any impacts due to land acquisition activities as well as the access restriction to natural resources has been prepared by the MMAF. This LARPF is part of the Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework (ESSF) which has been consulted with key stakeholders and been disclosed in the MMAF and LIPI website as well as the InfoShop.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance construction or rehabilitation of any dams, nor will it rely on the performance of an existing dam or a dam under construction.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	There are no known project components involving international waterways as defined under the policy. None of the project sites will be in the international water boundaries.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not located in any known disputed areas as defined under the policy.

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the Restructured project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The COREMAP-CTI aims in general to strengthen the capacity of institutions in conserving and managing coral reef ecosystems and its resources, it also aims to empower coastal communities to sustainably manage their coral reefs and associated ecosystems, and through such efforts, enhance the welfare of these communities.</p> <p>This project will not create any large-scale, significant, or irreversible environmental or social impacts, therefore the safeguard issues and impacts associated directly with the proposed project are minor to moderate, reversible, and site-specific. Mitigation measures are carried out through community participation and community-based sub-project management. The Safeguards aspects are contained in the Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF), which is an annex to the project operations manual (OM). The ESSF was developed to reflect recent lessons in implementing environmental and social safeguards and the set of environmental code of practice for COREMAP-CTI.</p> <p>Environment side. The experiences from the COREMAP II projects have shown that there are no significant, irreversible negative environmental impacts resulting from activities implemented under the project. Any adverse environmental impacts are typically site specific and small in scale. Typically, such impacts can be managed locally by adopting screening criteria, good engineering designs and construction practices. This will also be the case for COREMAP-CTI, which follows</p>

the same principles as its predecessors. Nonetheless, because of the national scope of the program and its operation in environmentally and socially sensitive areas, it is essential to ensure that sufficient attention is paid to the application of safeguard guidelines and to ensure adequate monitoring and oversight of these safeguards.

On the social side, the anticipated impacts are the zoning and associated activities of component 2 that may limit access by the community, including indigenous peoples, to areas previously utilized for income generating activities and cultural rites. In the introduction of some alternative livelihood activities, land acquisition may be inevitable. However, it will be small scale, as these are mostly CDD subprojects with small scale infrastructure. All these impacts are manageable and will be mitigated with measures provided in the environmental and social safeguard framework that has been prepared. There are no potential significant or irreversible impacts anticipated.

The COREMAP-CTI project will retain an Environmental Category B classification

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

No long term adverse impact due to project activities is envisaged.

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

N/A.

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 Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework (ESSF) has been prepared to set out procedures required by COREMAP-CTI to minimize adverse environmental and social impacts that may occur due to implementation of this project and any of its subprojects. The Framework provides a negative list as well as specific environmental and social screening procedures for each subproject. The ESSF document covers the Environmental Management Framework, Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF) which includes a process framework for access restriction, and an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF).

The Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF) establishes principles and procedures to guide project implementers in dealing with land acquisition activities, including access restrictions which may result from activities in Component 2, related to marine spatial planning and zoning. However, given that the area of No Take is typically quite small relative to the overall management area to be zoned and that traditional fishing is typically allowed in areas surrounding a No-Take Zone, it is not anticipated that any major access restrictions will result. Should economic displacement occur as a result of zoning or reduction in fishing effort, alternative livelihood or other compensation options will be available.

The LARPF guides the preparation of action plans (LARAP) for any subprojects involving land acquisition/land donation as well as access restriction. The LARAP will provide a mitigation plan to ensure that the affected people, those whose lands are acquired or those who lose access to natural resources (e.g., fishing areas), will not be worse-off due to project activities and that they will be consulted during subproject preparation and implementation.

The Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF). Provides general principles and procedures that will be applied during subproject preparation and implementation. The IPPF requires

subprojects that will adversely affect indigenous peoples/ethnic minority to conduct a social assessment which will become a main input to the formulation of an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) during subproject preparation. If the indigenous peoples or ethnic minority are the main/only ethnic group in the subproject area and are the main target beneficiaries, a stand alone IPP may not be required. The process to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples (IP) are included as beneficiaries and participate in any activities will be incorporated in the subproject design.

Rapid Social Assessment has been carried out during project preparation to see the potential impact of the COREMAP-CTI to the community. The result of the RSA are that: i) IP exists in several coastal villages of the COREMAP-CTI sites, particularly in 3 districts that are Buton, Wakatobi, and Raja Ampat. ii) Gender participation in COREMAP II improved in many districts where participation of women has increased not only in program activities (mainly in meetings), but also in resource management. However, their capacity to develop alternative sources of income was limited to food production; iii) Social conflicts may also occur during implementation.

Borrower capacity

To ensure that the safeguard issues are adequately monitored, 2 (two) persons will be assigned as safeguard focal points at MMAF. They will be responsible for ensuring the implementation of ESSF for any subprojects. Each district PIU (Project Implementation Unit) and the BKKPN in Kupang will also assign a safeguard focal point, whose job will be to screen each activity against the safeguard screening checklist as well as prepare the action plans (EMP/LARAP/IPP), as necessary.

The capacity of the MMAF to plan and implement the impact mitigation measures as described in the ESSF needs to be strengthened. Although in COREMAP II there was an Environmental and Social Impact Management Framework (ESIMF) to address environmental and social safeguard issues, the Framework was not followed well during project implementation. Specifically, no one in the project implementing unit was assigned primary responsibility for overseeing and monitoring safeguards implementation. This has been addressed in COREMAP-CTI with a specific budget allocated to fund Safeguards staff and Safeguards training for staff assigned to monitor safeguards at national and district levels. Training in the implementation of the ESSF will be part of the curriculum.

As part of the strengthening of the Borrower's capacity, during project preparation of COREMAP-CTI, the World Bank's safeguard specialist has intensively worked with the MMAF and its preparation consultant to prepare the ESSF. The 3 consecutive consultations of this ESSF to the stakeholders has also provided better understanding of the MMAF and the PIUs of participating districts to the environmental and social safeguard issues.

Capacity building such as training for the project institutions, i.e PMO, PIU, including village level institution is required during the project preparation or at the early stage of project implementation, when the implementers are going to propose subprojects for financing.

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

The primary stakeholder of the project will be fishers and remote coastal households within the project target districts and villages, which will be the beneficiaries of the project. They will benefit directly from the project's support in developing local institutions and marine-based natural

resources management, as well as the project's investments in developing production partnerships with the private sector and basic production infrastructure. The project will also access people outside of the project target villages through awareness raising and communication to curb destructive fishing and other reef degrading practices. The project will also build the capacity of government staff with updated skills and knowledge, including best available practices, in fisheries and coral reef management, integrated coastal zone management and marine spatial planning. This will involve a range of training, from short courses and training of trainers in extension, to postgraduate degree level (Masters and PhD) training and collaborative research.

As part of the project preparation, consultation with stakeholders on the ESSF has been conducted in Sorong (July 2 & 3), Makassar (July 5 & 6) and in Jakarta (July 23). The consultations were attended by NGOs, district PIUs, community representatives, village institutions (LPSTK) members and consultants of COREMAP 2 and academia. Comments and inputs from the consultations have been incorporated into the draft ESSF.

The Framework provides procedures for consultation with the affected people. During project implementation, relevant action plans (e.g., EMP, LARAP, IPP) for each subproject will be prepared and consulted on with affected people, including with Indigenous Peoples as set out in the IPPF.

The ESSF document has been disclosed in Bahasa Indonesia on MMAF's and COREMAP's website: www.kkji.kp3k.kkp.go.id and www.coremap.or.id The ESSF English version has also been disclosed and is also available through the Bank's Infoshop.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	24-Jul-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	25-Jul-2013
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Indonesia	26-Jul-2013
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	24-Jul-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	25-Jul-2013
"In country" Disclosure	
Indonesia	26-Jul-2013
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	24-Jul-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	25-Jul-2013
"In country" Disclosure	
Indonesia	26-Jul-2013
<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"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" 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 Sector Manager?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<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"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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:	Marea Eleni Hatziolos	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name:	Date:
Sector Manager:	Name: Nathan M. Belete (SM)	Date: 25-Aug-2013