INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.:ISDSA19630

Date ISDSPrepared/Updated: 05-Aug-2017

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed   07-Aug-2017

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Tanzania	Project ID:	P150523
Project Name:	Tanzania: Resilient Natural Resource Management for Tourism and Growth (P150523)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Daniel Mira-Salama		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	31-Jul-2017	**Estimated Board Date:**	21-Sep-2017
Managing Unit:	GEN01	**Financing Instrument:**	Investment Project Financing
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:	150.00	Total Bank Financing:	150.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		

Financing Source	Amount
International Development Association (IDA)	150.00
Financing Gap	0.00
Total	150.00

Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment
Is this a Repeater project?	No

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve management of natural resources and tourism assets in priority areas of southern Tanzania, and to increase access to alternative livelihood activities for targeted communities

3. Project Description

The project will be implemented in and around four priority Protected Areas (referred to as priority PAs): the Mikumi National Park (MINAPA), Ruaha National Park (RUNAPA): Udzungwa Mountains National Park (UMNP), and the photographic section of the Selous Game Reserve (SGR).

The PDO will be achieved through the following four project components:

Component 1 – Strengthen capacity for management and development of priority Protected Areas (US$85 million). The objective of Component 1 is to improve the management and sustainability of natural resources inside the four priority Protected Areas (PAs) in Southern Tanzania. This will be achieved through policy and regulatory support, capacity/skills development activities and investments which are grouped under five sub-components:

a) Sub-Component 1.1 – Improve knowledge, policy, institutional and operational frameworks for improved Protected Area management. Strengthen the enabling environment for the activities to be implemented under this component, by generating and managing knowledge, strengthening policy and enhancing capacity at national, institutional, and PA level. Key activities include: (i) review PA General Management Plans, and prepare a tourism development plan to guide future development of the southern part of RUNAPA; (ii) improve payment systems to address delays entering PAs, and carry out sensitivity studies for entrance fees; and (iii) improve existing policies and regulations to promote participation and benefit-sharing.

b) Sub-Component 1.2 – Improve PA infrastructure. Enhance accessibility and basic infrastructure of the priority PAs to improve their management and the overall quality of the tourism products. Key investments include, amongst others: (i) earthworks - construction of new and upgrade existing roads, trails, bridges and upgrading of existing airstrips to improve connectivity and ability to patrol strategic locations; (ii) civil works - construction and upgrading of ranger posts, tourist arrival amenities, entry/exit gates, visitor information centers, youth hostels, rest houses, and "bandas" for official and educational/ research purposes, maintenance workshops, and construction of research centers to strengthen monitoring efforts.

c) Sub-Component 1.3 – Strengthen management capacity and infrastructure maintenance of PAs. Activities include: (i) upgrading of communications systems (radio repeaters, cellphone connectivity and others), monitoring and patrolling equipment; (ii) infrastructure management tools and contingency plans; (iii) basic light and heavy equipment; (iv) wildlife related research initiatives to inform policy dialogue and integrated management; and (v) targeted training.

d) Sub-Component 1.4 – Strengthen "Destination Southern Tanzania". Support activities that identify and build linkages between the range of attractions – including the priority PAs – in southern Tanzania and increase recognition of southern Tanzania as a destination. Among the activities included are: (i) an integrated tourism product development and marketing strategy for southern Tanzania that includes wildlife, forests, beach, cultural and historic products; (ii) implement marketing and branding strategies for the priority PAs; (iii) supporting and developing capacity to drive destination development and management; and (iv) scoping studies for Kitulo National Park, Katavi National Park and other southern destinations for possible future investment.

e) Sub-Component 1.5 – Tourism investment promotion. Identify, assess feasibility, promote and take to market opportunities for private sector investment in and around the selected PAs. This activity will, among others: (i) define opportunities for private sector investment in PAs and with communities; (ii) support the creation of a conducive investment climate to facilitate investments; and (iii) support the processes of investment promotion and facilitation.

Component 2 – Strengthen access to alternative livelihood activities for targeted communities in proximity to the priority Protected Areas (total cost US$27 million). The overall objective of this component is to provide access to improved economic opportunities within targeted communities living in the proximity of the priority PAs in order to enhance livelihoods, reduce vulnerability to climate shocks, and reduce pressure on natural resources and wildlife.

During preparation, an assessment of villages adjacent to the priority PAs was conducted. Villages were characterized, through the identification of specific challenges (occurrence of human-wildlife conflict, illegal wildlife poaching) and opportunities (potential to supply goods and services to the tourism industry, accessibility, potential to enhance landscape-scale biodiversity conservation and connectivity). This exercise resulted in the prioritization of 61 "hotspot villages" (with an estimated total of 34,000 households) that would be eligible to receive technical and financial assistance from the project. These villages, hereafter referred to as priority villages, include all those where human-wildlife conflicts, illegal wildlife poaching, or other unregulated uses of resources were described. The project may expand its interventions to additional villages based on

resources and identified impacts. Project sub-components are:

a) Sub-Component 2.1 - Improve the governance framework of conservation-related community-based initiatives. The component will, amongst others: (i) strengthen the legal and institutional framework of TANAPA's and TAWA's benefit sharing schemes; (ii) strengthen and/or develop the community outreach structures of TANAPA and TAWA, through technical assistance, capacity building and equipment; and (iii) develop a plan and/or strategy for development of cultural/historical tourism in the priority PAs.

b) Sub-Component 2.2 – Enhance alternative community livelihoods by improving economic opportunities and linking them with conservation of wildlife and landscapes. Through a demand-driven approach, the subcomponent would provide technical and financial assistance to support the creation, organization, training and operation of groups of households in the priority villages focusing on supplying services and agricultural products to tourism operators, promoting low-environmental impact agricultural micro-enterprises, and establishing incentive-based, conservation-friendly crop, livestock and forestry-related initiatives.

c) Sub-Component 2.3 – Capacity building of communities and government authorities. The sub-component will focus on targeted education and training to create new or strengthen existing mechanisms for improved natural resources management. It will include, amongst others: (i) scholarships for community members in tourism, wildlife, conservation, and facilitating access to vocational colleges (e.g., wildlife and tourism related skills); (ii) sensitization and promotion of conservation activities at community level, including education sessions, village game scout programs, joint community patrolling, and others; (iii) strengthening of eligible WMAs, through equipment and targeted training, targeted towards increasing their wildlife management effectiveness; (iv) targeted natural resources management training for local government authorities around the priority PAs; and (v) support the development or improvement of Village Land Use Plans (VLUP) in the priority villages targeted by sub-component 2.2.

Component 3 – Strengthen capacity for landscape management upstream of the Ruaha National Park (total cost US$27 million). The overall objective for Component 3 is to protect RUNAPA's water resources within the social and climatic context of the area. These resources are critical for the subsistence and preservation of wildlife and ecosystems, and for continued and expanded tourism in Tanzania's Southern Circuit. Primarily, the component will focus on short-term measures targeted towards the restoration of dry season flows in the Great Ruaha River, and as a secondary focus, the component will lay the ground towards mitigating future degradation of the RUNAPA resulting from climate change impacts, excessive abstraction of water upstream of the Park, deteriorated water quality, and increased sediment in inflowing rivers. All project activities are in line and follow the conclusions of the Rufiji Integrated Water Resources Management and Development Plan. Improving land and water management in the Usangu plains and the upper catchments, (which feed into the Ihefu wetland and the Great Ruaha River), is a long process, which will translate into improved quantity and quality of flow only in the medium to long-term. Therefore, given the critical water emergency inside RUNAPA (currently up to three-four consecutive months with zero river flow at the "Ngiriama" control point), the priority of Component 3 is to implement structural solutions, inside RUNAPA, to improve water availability during the dry season, ensuring sufficient, accessible water points for wildlife. These measures will provide results in the short-term, temporarily mitigating the impacts caused by no-flow days. However, they will not address the underlying causes for zero flows, and therefore, the second priority of the Component is to initiate a process to improve land and water management in the upstream catchments in the Mbarali District (where most of the cultivated land is located) through cross-sectoral coordination, efficient farming and irrigation procedures, and conservation of upstream water sources, to demonstrate the benefits and methods for subsequent upscaling and to promote climate change adaptation. The sub-components are:

a) Sub-Component 3.1 – Assess and implement measures to augment dry-season flows to the RUNAPA. Key infrastructure investments inside RUNAPA, along the Great Ruaha River, will be implemented in order to: (i) augment dry season flows to the river through storage of wet season flows; and (ii) generate water-stored areas, along the river and tributaries, that ensure increased water availability during dry season.

b) Sub-Component 3.2 – Improve the irrigation efficiency and water savings in irrigation areas. This sub-component will focus in the extensive irrigation lands upstream the Ihefu wetland, promoting water savings

through: (i) Farmer's Field Schools to raise awareness and knowledge of System Rice Intensification (SRI) as a farming method for increasing crop yields and reducing water use; (ii) improvement of irrigation infrastructure in selected irrigation areas to demonstrate water-efficient methods (water controlling structures, lining of canals and drainage); and (iii) revisiting water use permits and assessing incentive mechanisms for controlling excessive use of water or increase of irrigation areas utilizing drainage water.

c) Sub-Component 3.3 – Catchment conservation activities in selected sub-basins. This would include: (i) surveying hotspots in the upper catchment areas where climate variability and change, together with present and future human activities, comprise severe risks for water sources; (ii) integrated water and land-use planning activities to reduce the risks in these hotspots; and (iii) implementation of selected watershed management activities such as river boundary protection and sustainable agricultural land management practices.

d) Sub-Component 3.4 – Support the consensus-building process for land and water management and climate change adaptation in the Usangu plains. The sub-component includes: (i) facilitating cross-sectoral interaction and consultations at the district level, including social and physical surveillance studies when needed, for water resources management; and (ii) strengthening the monitoring and management capacity of Irrigation Organizations and Water Users Associations, including operation and maintenance training.

Component 4 – Project management, institutional strengthening, and monitoring and evaluation (US$11 million). This component will support the implementation of the project. It will facilitate the technical management and coordination of the project, financial management (FM), procurement and safeguards oversight. It also covers monitoring and evaluation of project implementation progress towards objectives, preparation of regular monitoring, mid-term, and evaluation reports; procurement and FM including audits, environmental and social safeguards. It will also provide for impact evaluation and adaptive improvement activities.

a) Sub-Component 4.1 – Project Management and Institutional strengthening. This subcomponent will finance project implementation, management, and coordination support, together with capacity-building initiatives to benefit the various actors involved in project implementation (particularly government agencies and LGAs). Specifically, this support includes: (i) project oversight and coordination costs; (ii) establishment and operation of a Project Coordination Unit (PCU); (iii) fiduciary management, including external/internal audits and accounting; (iv) performance monitoring and reporting; (v) environmental and social safeguards management, including implementation of mitigation measures; (vi) development and implementation of a communication plan; and (vii) short-term training, tailored towards project management.

b) Sub-Component 4.2 – Monitoring and Evaluation. A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system will be financed and operated to capture data on physical and financial progress, the performance of implementing agencies and service providers, and the achievements of outcomes and impact vis-à-vis the PDO and associated indicators. In addition, since REGROW would be implementing a development model for tourism promotion and environmental protection, social inclusion and water resources management, it can potentially be scaled up to other protected areas and to other basins. This sub-component will therefore finance a baseline study, the data collection process, satisfaction surveys, extraction of lessons, knowledge generation and exchange, annual networking among key project stakeholders (at local, regional and national level, including active involvement from the private sector) and an impact evaluation.

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

Most of the project activities, in terms of number and financing amount, will take place inside four priority Protected Areas (PAs). These are the Mikumi National Park (MINAPA), Ruaha National Park (RUNAPA), Udzungwa National Park (UMNP), and Selous Game Reserve (SGR). The areas were selected after a strategic tourism development study identified them as having the highest, most immediate potential for boosting tourism in the South, increasing jobs and creating spill-over effects. The four are large and unique: RUNAPA encompasses 13,000 km2, representing the largest National Park in East Africa. SGR is Africa's largest Game Reserve and a UNESCO World Heritage Site, it extends over 44,000 km2. MINAPA and UMNP cover an area

of 3,230 km2 and 1,990 km2, respectively. Combined, they cover over 62,000 km2 (for reference, Switzerland covers 41,285 km2). For the specific case of SGR, the project will be implemented solely in the photographic area (Matambwe sector, as defined in SGR's current General Management Plan).

RUNAPA, MINAPA, and UMNP are National Parks, within the National Parks system, and are managed by TANAPA (Tanzania National Parks Authority), whereas SGR is managed by the recently-created TAWA (Tanzania Wildlife Authority).

In addition to the four priority PAs, REGROW will work with priority villages around them in alternative livelihoods (through component 2), and in the irrigation areas of the Usangu plains (mostly in Mbarali District), upstream from the Ihefu wetlands, for improved water resources management in irrigation areas (through component 3).

MINAPA: MINAPA is located approximately 300 km west of Dar es salaam in Southern Tanzania. It extends from longitude 37o00' to 37o30'E and latitude 7o00' to 7o45'S. The area covered by MINAPA includes water catchments for the Ruaha, Ruvu and Wami Rivers systems that provide significant water resources for eastern Tanzania. MINAPA covers an area of 3,230 km2. It is known for its diverse habitats, fauna & flora. In 1951 the area was awarded Game Reserve status to conserve the rich wildlife resources found in the area. In 1964 it was gazetted as a National Park with initial area of 1070 km2. In 1975 MINAPA was extended to the north & south by incorporating 2160 km2. The extension southwards covered the area between the park and Selous Game Reserve (SGR). This was done to achieve ecological balance and diverse habitats to meet the needs of a wide range of species requirements and ensure movement between the park, the SGR and adjacent protected areas in the ecosystem.

UMNP: UMNP is found in Morogoro and Iringa regions at 36.35oE and 7.65oS. The park was gazetted in 1992 from the existing Forest Reserves of Mwanihana, Iwonde and parts of Matundu and the West Kilombero Scarp forest. It covers an area of 1990 km2, a mere 20% of the whole of Udzungwa Mountains Ecosystem which is nearly 10,000 km2. UMNP is the seventh largest National Park among the sixteen (16) National Parks after Ruaha, Serengeti, Katavi, Mkomazi, Mikumi and Tarangire. A significant part of the foregoing beauty and attractions remain untapped due to several challenges, notably accessibility. It is expected that with sustainable investment aimed at unlocking UMNP's full tourism and ecological potential, the park will, over time, be transformed into a world-class destination.

SGR: SGR is the largest single PA in Africa covering an area of about 50,000 km2. It was established in different phases from 1898 to its current boundaries that were created around 1970s. In 1982 the reserve was inscribed in the list of UNESCO World Heritage Site due to its outstanding universal value. Due to its enormous size, it is divided into eight (8) sectors/zones for management purposes. Two forms of wildlife utilization characterize the reserve - consumptive (trophy hunting) that occupies about 90% and non-consumptive (photographic tourism) that occupy the remaining 10%. The SGR Northern Sector-Matambwe covers an area of about 4,741km2 and is the only area that practices non-consumptive tourism.

RUNAPA: RUNAPA is situated in South Central Tanzania between 7 and 8 degrees south, covering part of Iringa and Mbeya Regions. It covers an area of 20,226 km2 to the West of the Southern highlands, between the Great Ruaha River in the southeast and the Mzombe River in the north-west. Ecologically, RUNAPA is unique because it covers a transition zone where East and South African species of both flora a nd fauna converge. These zones together with the Usangu wetlands and the Great Ruaha River are among RUNAPA's tourist attractions. Due to climate variabilities potentially induced by development around the PA and movement of wildlife, RUNAPA faces a number of challenges that include drying up of the Great Ruaha River and the subsequent ecological effects in the Greater Ruaha Ecosystem. There is eminent loss of ecological connectivity within the ecosystem, as a result of anthropogenic activities (agriculture & livestock keeping) in areas adjacent to the park, sparking human-wildlife conflicts. Additional challenges include increased poaching in the entire Ruaha-Rungwa ecosystem, poor visitor access to the park and inadequate visitor accommodation facilities that

TANAPA and RUNAPA Management are striving to address.

In 2008 GoT made a decision to annex the Usangu wetlands which contains the Ihefu swamp and some of its surrounding catchment areas to RUNAPA as one of the measures to address water resource management and associated challenges . Results from a simple hydrological model developed for the Ihefu swamp indicated that, between 1958 and 2004, dry season inflows declined by approximately 60% and the dry season area of the swamp decreased by approximately 40% (i.e. from 160 km2 to 93 km2). This was considered a sustainable approach to ensuring conservation of natural resources and restoration of perennial flow of Great Ruaha River and continued Hydro-power production at Mtera dam throughout the year.

RUNAPA has always been a High value, Low density destination that offers a unique wilderness experience for visitors.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Jane A. N. Kibbassa, Environmental Safeguards Specialist

Kristine Schwebach, Social Safeguards Specialist

6. Safeguard Policies That Might Apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The objective of the project is to improve natural resources management which is expected to result in positive environmental and social benefits. However, the EA policy has been triggered as the expected investments in works and infrastructure will likely result in environmental and social risks which will need to be managed. The project is envisioned to support investments of infrastructure, including: low-volume roads, bridges and improvements in airstrips within the priority PAs; structures to augment dry season flow inside RUNAPA; improvements in existing irrigation infrastructure in selected areas; catchment conservation activities and community based activities. An ESMF has been prepared to provide criteria and procedures for identifying, assessing, and mitigating potential environmental and social impacts of project investments.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	TThe project will support: watershed management activities in the catchment of Great Ruaha River; and construction of infrastructure and facilities in Ruaha National Park, Mikumi National Park, Udzungwa National Park, and Selous Game Reserve. Natural habitat issues will be addressed as part of the ESIA and the ESMP for specific project investments.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Implementation of selected watershed management activities may happen in forested areas, or may promote the reforestation of some areas or planting of woodlots as catchment protection measures for erosion control. The ESIA and ESMP will provide the analysis of potential impacts and define

		mitigation measures to address any such adverse impacts.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project is not expected to involve the purchase nor the use of significant quantities of pesticides. However, Component 3 includes activities to improve the efficiency of agricultural practices and water conservation in the Great Ruaha catchment, and will include support through farmer's field schools. In this regard, the project might involve or inadvertently promote the use of pesticides during the implementation of those activities. Therefore, the policy is being triggered as a precaution, and specific instructions will be included as part of the ESMF to promote best practices in case of pesticide use or handling in the project area.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The project is not expected to affect or impact any physical or cultural resource, or be conducted in the vicinity of them. However, there will be some infrastructure works, and therefore, as a precaution, investigations, rescue, and chance finds Procedures Plan will be required in cases when the Policy is triggered.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no groups in the project area that meet the criteria of OP 4.10.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Project activities related to construction are expected to occur mainly within priority Protected Areas' boundaries, and therefore are unlikely to trigger the Involuntary Resettlement Policy. If, however, land acquisition is needed, the project will follow the provisions set out in the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) in the preparation of a Resettlement Action Plan which will be implemented prior to project activities impacting the identified assets. The project is not designed to enforce existing boundaries or introduce new restriction of access to the PAs. However, through the construction of infrastructure such as additional ranger posts and roads, and provision of equipment, the PA authorities will have better ability to detect illegal uses of resources (illegal tree logging, waste dumping, illegal farming or grazing, etc). For this reason, a Process Framework (PF) has been prepared, and will be applied as a precautionary measure to the extent surveillance activities would marginally contribute to increasing existing restrictions of access, with a focus on communities where illegal activities (in particular poaching) are prevalent, which are the ones most likely to be

		affected
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The policy is not applicable in the project area. The irrigation schemes that will be improved through the project in the Usangu flats do not depend on any existing dam or dam under construction.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The policy is not applicable in the project area.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The policy is not applicable in the project area.

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 not expected to have any large scale, significant and/or irreversible impact. It has been designed with the double objective of improving environmental management of Protected Areas and improving access to sustainable livelihoods of communities around those Protected Areas. If successful, the project will facilitate the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) and the Tanzania Wildlife Authority (TAWA) in their efforts to curve poaching and illegal extraction of PA resources, improve their ability to manage the extensive territory covered by those PAs, and increase the revenue collected by the increased tourism activity in order to properly cover the expenses incurred for said environmental management. The project is not anticipated to implement any type of complex infrastructure (the most complex will be one or two bridges across rivers, in points where bridges existed and collapsed due to poor design/maintenance). Temporary impacts, however, are expected, especially during construction. These impacts are well-known, and can be mitigated with appropriate measures.

Some of the positive impacts that REGROW is expected to have include improved connectivity and accessibility of PAs, increased direct and indirect employment and business opportunities in priority villages and in tourism development inside the PAs, community education and awareness for the reduction of human-wildlife conflict, improved water use efficiency and improved crop yields.

Some of the anticipated negative impacts from REGROW are expected to happen mostly during the construction phase, and include: noise pollution from operation of construction machinery; visual natural landscape interference from non-natural landscape developments such as accommodation facilities or workshops; pollution of land and water sources from mismanagement of solid waste resulting in an increase of rodents, flies, scavengers; soil contamination from mishandling of fuels at workshops; land destabilization and soil degradation (in form of erosion, compaction, sealing and/or waterlogging) from construction works (road grading, vegetation clearance and cut-and-fill); inadequate disposal of waste generated during construction, leading to habitat damage, land and water pollution, and visual impacts; occupational health, security and safety hazards to public and construction workers; fires leading to damaged property or injury (natural and manmade bush fires); ambient air pollution from operation of construction machinery; and disturbance of local community's social dynamics due to migrant work force.

Most of the above negative impacts are well-known, and they can be minimized with appropriate mitigation measures, which are generically described in the ESMF that was prepared. Specific ESIAs and ESMPs, which will be prepared for sub-projects, will describe any additional mitigation measures needed.

The four priority PAs, and their specific regulations on allowed and non-allowed activities, have been in place for many years - in some cases, for several decades. The REGROW project is not designed to enforce existing boundaries or introduce new restriction of access to the PAs. However, through the construction of infrastructure such as additional ranger posts and roads, and provision of equipment, the PA authorities will have better ability to detect illegal uses of resources (illegal tree logging, waste dumping, illegal farming or grazing, etc). For this

reason, a Process Framework (PF) has been prepared, and will, in part, be applied as a precautionary measure to the extent surveillance activities would marginally contribute to increasing existing restrictions of access, with a focus on communities where illegal activities (in particular poaching) are prevalent, which are the ones most likely to be affected. The PF details the participatory process by which stakeholders are involved and receive benefits from the project. The framework identifies measures to be used in an effort to improve livelihoods of priority villages living near the priority PAs while also maintaining the sustainability of the PAs. The PF also identifies arrangements for implementing and monitoring the process by which priority villages benefit.

Component 3 will be working with farmers to improve agricultural output with improved water management. It is expected that improved management will increase livelihood and standard of living through increased yields and better use of water resources.

Component 1 of the project will support infrastructure investments inside the four priority PAs. These investments vary, from resurfacing of low volume roads, to the upgrading of existing airstrips, to construction of new airstrips, ranger posts and walking trails. Most of the infrastructure will be implemented in already-existing trails, and none will consist of tarmac (National Parks and Game Reserves have both strict regulations on the type of infrastructure that is allowed). All infrastructure will be preceded by a detailed ESIA, and contractors will be required to follow the highest standards of environmental performance through cautiously-designed and properly-costed ESMPs.

Through Component 3, the project will implement small-scale activities in the vicinity of the Great Ruaha River, in order to mitigate the effects of upstream unregulated water extraction for agriculture, currently causing the drop of river flow to zero for several months. The zero-flow days have significant impacts on wildlife, causing stress in hyppo pools and widespread lack of water availability for drinking purposes. The Component will tackle this issue by implementing emergency measures such as small (less than a meter) weirs to capture water during wet season and maintain in during dry season, troughs, or sub-surface dams. All these investments will be fully identified during project preparation, and detailed ESIAs will be carried out before commencement of work.

Regarding infrastructure activities inside the priority PAs, each PA has a General Management Plan (GMP) in place, which, through a comprehensive approach, guides the day-to-day management of the areas in view of ecosystem and tourism management, park operations, and community outreach. The tourism strategies under the GMPs aim at enhancing visitor access and use, while at the same time minimizing disturbance to key habitats and wildlife populations. Ongoing tourist activities are, for example, regulated based on high, low, and wilderness zones, to minimize negative impacts, and environmental impacts of tourism facilities are monitored and regulated. For new tourism products, the GMP provides clear measures to mitigate any negative impacts. The REGROW design follows the recommendations of the GMPs, which through the above described measures, regulate and mitigate cumulative, indirect, and induced impacts from increased tourist arrivals and infrastructure interventions. In addition, environmental assessments for the project will not be carried out for individual, isolated pieces of infrastructure, but rather on infrastructure systems (for example, the road network inside each PA). As such, the impact assessment will be able to provide insights on the consequences of the entire investment.

Also through Component 3, selected existing irrigation schemes will be supported with infrastructure. The scope of this is to improve the management of water inside paddy fields, so that farmers can regulate the amount that enters and leaves the field. All these measures will be implemented in existing schemes, and are expected to have positive impacts through improved water availability.

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

The project is expected to have an overall positive impact in the short, medium and long terms. Some of these expected positive impacts include: increased water availability in the Ruaha National Park during dry season, allowing wildlife to survive; increased ability of TANAPA and TAWA to access remote areas of their territory, and a likely reduction of illegal wildlife poaching; increased ability of the PAs to attract low volume, high value tourism, with expected increases in revenue that in turn ensure long-term sustainability of the PA system; and benefits for improved access to alternative livelihood activities of priority villages around PAs, with consequent benefits to their economies and reduction of pressures to the PAs.

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

Project interventions will consider use of the most appropriate green technologies and approaches in the implementation of the components. All activities implemented inside the four priority PAs will adhere to strict codes and regulations, by TANAPA and TAWA, and to international standards. They will comply and implement part of the General Management Plans of the areas.

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.

As a result of a marginal increase in the restriction of access to the already existing priority PAs, a Process Framework has been prepared to identify ways in which impacted communities can benefit from project activities. Although the project does not expect toacquire land, a Resettlement Policy Framework has been prepared. If, in the unlikely event, the project requires land acquisition, a Resettlement Action Plan will be prepared, reviewed by World Bank, and implemented prior to acquiring land. Throughout the life of REGROW project, the GoT has agreed that, for any action taken outside of the REGROW project but within the area of the priority PAs in which REGROW will be working, which would result in economic or physical displacement under OP4.12, GoT would voluntarily follow the Resettlement Policy Framework guidelines and standards. The Ministry will assign a social specialist to assist in oversight of social issues throughout the project area. This will include ensuring close consultations with stakeholders and ensuring a maximizing of benefits.
The borrower has also prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework. The ESMF was prepared in close consultation with a wide variety of stakeholders, and provides clear guidance on how each specific project investment needs to be prepared for adequate safeguards implementation. Most of the anticipated negative impacts will take place during construction, and the borrower has committed to selecting contractors with highest levels of environmental performance, through international bidding processes.
Environmental and social assessments in Tanzania are at present guided by the Environmental Management Act of 2004 (EMA), which mandates the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to ensure compliance with laid down environmental and social impact assessment procedures in planning and execution of development projects.
The borrower, through MNRT, TANAPA and TAWA, have significant experience in undertaking environmental and social assessments, implementing mitigation measures and maintaining infrastructure inside their PAs, and this experience is expected to be made available for project implementation. MNRT, TANAPA and TAWA have significant experience with community engagement and development, which is usually channeled through two main mechanisms: the Wildlife Management Areas (WMA), administered by MNRT, and the Support for Community Initiated Project (SCIP), led by TANAPA. Since TAWA is a recently-created institution, they lack a formal community outreach programme, but one is being prepared, and is expected to have similar objectives to those implemented by TANAPA under the SCIP. The current and ongoing outreach programmes have the purpose to create links with the local communities in conservation of wildlife, and share benefits accrued from wildlife with the communities. The SCIP mechanism supports community needs, and is sustained by mandatory contributions of 7.5% of revenue from each PA. In addition, each priority PA has several community officers, tasked with community relations and implementation of community development projects.
Protected Area ecologists, engineers, foresters, community outreach, and tourism specialists will all participate in project implementation and supervision, and are expected to contribute to environmental and social management of project impacts.

The borrower, through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, will appoint an overall environmental and social safeguards coordinator, who will facilitate dialogue with the World Bank team, and ensure adequate implementation of safeguards throughout all components and activities.

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

Key stakeholders for the REGROW project can be grouped into government, communities, private sector, civil society organizations and development partners.
- Government. A number of ministries and government agencies are key stakeholders of REGROW, including: MNRT (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism); TANAPA (Tanzania National Parks Authority); TAWA (Tanzania Wildlife Authority); TAWIRI (Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute); TTB (Tanzania Tourism Board); TFS (Tanzania Forest Service Agency); MoWI (Ministry of Water and Irrigation); NIRC (National Irrigation Commission); RBWB (Rufiji Basin Water Board); MALF (Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries); PO-RALG (President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government). All these institutions have important roles to play in the project. They have all been proactively engaged during the preparation phase, and they all have clear mandates, responsibilities and specific skills to fulfill the tasks.
- Communities. It is estimated that the total population living around the boundaries of the priority PAs is around 405,000 inhabitants (based on the 2012 National Census). During project preparation, comprehensive surveys and assessments were conducted on all villages adjacent to the priority PAs. All villages were characterized, through the identification of specific challenges (occurrence of human-wildlife conflict, poaching and/or encroachment levels) and opportunities (potential to supply goods and services to the tourism industry, accessibility, existence of WMAs). This exercise will result in the prioritization of a significant number of villages (estimated to include around 25,000 households) for direct engagement through the project. Social assessments of communities, and direct consultation with them, were carried out during the preparation of the ESMF the PF and RPF.
- Private sector. The four PAs house a number of privately-owned lodges and safari companies. These companies are all represented through an apex body, the Tourism Confederation of Tanzania. The Chief Executive Secretary of the TCT is a member of the project preparation team, and private sector is regularly invited to meetings, inception workshops and consultation events.
- Civil society organizations. The priority PAs selected by the project are renowned natural habitats, which have attracted the attention and support from a number of national and international NGOs. Some of the most relevant include WWF, IUCN, PAMS Foundation, Ruaha Carnivore Project, Frankfurt Zoological Society, Africa Wildlife Foundation, and many others. Most of these organizations have similar goals to those of the project, and some are partnering or are expected to partner with the project.
- Development partners include other bilateral and multilateral institutions, some of which (like USAID, GIZ/KFW, UNDP, UNEP or DFID) have similar objectives and projects as REGROW in the area. These institutions are regularly consulted through the Development Partners Group on Environment (DPG-E), of which the World Bank is co-chair together with UNDP. Furthermore, DPG-E's working group on wildlife is co-chaired by the Bank and USAID.

Various consultations have been undertaken during preparation of safeguards documents. Finalized documents will be disclosed in the WB InfoShop and in-country at the national, district and local government levels that overlap with project protected areas. All impacted communities, especially with regards to Component 2, will be provided with the safeguard documents (through Village Committees and District Councils) which will also include an explanation of each document. A Stakeholder Consultation and Disclosure Plan has been prepared for the project to enhance stakeholder engagement in planning and implementation of REGROW project activities.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	04-Aug-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Aug-2017
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Tanzania	04-Aug-2017

Comments: The ESMF, and the Stakeholder Consultation and Disclosure Plan, were disclosed in-country at the web pages of MNRT and TFS (Tanzania Forestry Service). In addition, the documents were sent to project parnters TANAPA, TAWA, RBWB, TAWIRI, TTB, and several of them are uploading in their web-pages. Documents will also be made available at the district and local government levels that overlap with project protected areas.

http://www.mnrt.go.tz
http://www.tfs.go.tz

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	04-Aug-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Aug-2017
"In country" Disclosure	
Tanzania	04-Aug-2017

Comments: Two documents were prepared and disclosed in-country and to InfoShop: A Resettlement Policy Framework, and a Process Framework. Both documents were received on August 4, disclosed in-country on August 4, and submitted to InfoShop on August 4.
The documents were disclosed at the web pages of MNRT and TFS (Tanzania Forestry Service). In addition, document was sent to project parnters TANAPA, TAWA, RBWB, TAWIRI, TTB, and several of them are uploading in their web-pages. Documents will also be made available at the district and local government levels that overlap with project protected areas.

http://www.mnrt.go.tz
http://www.tfs.go.tz

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	A
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of submission to InfoShop	
"In country" Disclosure	
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	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]

OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats							
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes	[]	No	[X]	NA	[]
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	[]	No	[]	NA	[X]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management							
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	[]	No	[X]	NA	[]
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	[]	No	[]	NA	[X]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources							
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement							
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes	[]	No	[X]	TBD	[]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes	[]	No	[]	TBD	[X]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests							
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes	[]	No	[]	NA	[X]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes	[]	No	[]	NA	[X]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes	[]	No	[X]	NA	[]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information							
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
All Safeguard Policies							
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project	Yes	[X]	No	[]	NA	[]

include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [X] No [] NA []

III. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name:Daniel Mira-Salama	
Approved By:		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Nathalie S. Munzberg (SA)	Date: 05-Aug-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Magda Lovei (PMGR)	Date: 07-Aug-2017