

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA7069**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 09-Apr-2014

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 19-Apr-2014

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	World	<b>Project ID:</b>	P128437
<b>Project Name:</b>	Ocean Partnerships for Sustainable Fisheries&Biodiversity Conservation (P128437)		
<b>Task Team Leader:</b>	Tim Bostock		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	03-Jan-2013	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	19-Jun-2014
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	AES	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b>	Multi-focal area		
<b>Sector(s):</b>	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (25%), Other industry (25%), Public administration- Agriculture, fishing and forest ry (25%), Agro-industry, marketing, and trade (25%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Biodiversity (25%), Environmental policies and institutions (25%), Other Private Sector Development (25%), Other economic management (15%), Other rule of law (10%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	50.00	Total Bank Financing:	30.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			0.00
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			10.00
IDA Grant from CRW			30.00
Bilateral Agencies (unidentified)			10.00
Total			50.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		

<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No
------------------------------------	----

## 2. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The project's development objective is to catalyze investment into selected transformational public-private partnerships that mainstream the sustainable management of highly migratory stocks spanning areas within and beyond national jurisdictions.

## 3. Project Description

The PPP investments will be through a series pilot project business plans that are to be defined by the project and which represent key outputs from the four project regions. Business plans are expected to comprise a package of proposals that (depending on context) combine transition finance ('soft' investments into e.g. capacity building, further analytics, consultations, etc - typically donor financed from say WB or bilaterals) and debt-equity finance ('hard' investment responding to the pilot investment value proposition typically sourced from a private investor or investment bank / IFC).

The business plans will incorporate a value proposition for investment – the economic, technical, financial and political/institutional rationale needed to attract public and / or private sector investment. The business plans and associated planning processes will also inform regional and global solutions to improved management of shared highly migratory fisheries through high impact local private sector investments.

Once financed and implemented, each Pilot will contribute to increasing sustainable, net economic benefits to coastal and island developing countries while enhancing ocean biodiversity conservation. However, the actual pilots will not be financed out of the Project, and are beyond its scope.

The BPs will incorporate a value proposition for investment – the economic, technical, financial and political/institutional rationale needed to attract public and / or private sector investment. The BPs will also include the social and environmental instruments necessary to avoid, minimize, mitigate and if necessary compensate for potential adverse impacts arising from the piloting of the four business plans.

The project is a Technical Assistance (TA) operation that will finance prioritization, analysis and development of business plans for up to four globally significant areas covering fisheries of highly migratory stocks occurring within developing coastal and island states' exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and adjacent areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). Business plans will identify investments that support sustainable rights-based fisheries management.

Business plan development will be undertaken through regional or global Executing Agencies (EA). EAs will be selected during preparation of the project, and may include one or more of the following entities:

- Caribbean - West and Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC, [www.fao.org/fishery/rfb/wecafc/en](http://www.fao.org/fishery/rfb/wecafc/en))
- Eastern Pacific - World Wildlife Fund ([www.worldwildlife.org](http://www.worldwildlife.org)); Inter-American Tropical tuna Commission (IATTC - <http://www.iattc.org/>)
- West and Central Pacific - Forum Fisheries Agency (Pacific Islands FFA - <http://www.ffa.org/>)

int/)

- Bay of Bengal - Bay of Bengal Program (BOBP-IGO - <http://www.bobpIGO.org/>)
- Support to all 4 regions – Conservation International ([www.conservation.org](http://www.conservation.org))

The Project is organized into three components:

Component 1: Development of Business Plans to support public or private sector investment in up to four areas on sustainable fisheries. This component will support technical and financial development of up to four regional long-term business plans for fisheries on highly migratory stocks occurring within developing coastal and island states' waters and in areas beyond national jurisdiction adjacent to small island development states (SIDS) or coastal developing states.

Business Plan Candidates identified to date are as following:

1. Caribbean billfish and shark: Potential institutional mechanisms to support compensation payments to commercial / artisanal fishers to adopt catch and release, tagging or non-targeting of iconic species. Partners include (for billfish) Western and Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC).
2. Bay of Bengal India/Tamil Nadu (Sri Lanka and Maldives): Under consideration with Bank IDA (Tamil Nadu and Puducherry Coastal Disaster Risk Reduction Project). Covers regional (India, Sri Lanka, Maldives) tuna fisheries access management instruments, by-catch and conservation. Partners include Bay of Bengal Programme and the Ministry of Fisheries in Tamil Nadu.
3. Western and Central Pacific: Supporting efforts by Pacific Island Nations to develop and take forward initiatives on more effective management of tuna stocks. Under consideration with Bank IDA investment (Pacific Island Regional Oceanscape Program - PROP). Partners include the Forum Fisheries Agency and Parties to the Nauru Agreement Office.
4. Eastern Pacific Ocean: Exploring efforts to build on existing capacity measures under Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and ideas being tabled by industry and partners. Ideas emerging include (1) tradable bigeye tuna by catch quotas in exchange for an exemption to the annual closure; (2) trading of harvest capacity (expressed as hold capacity); (3) converting hold capacity into tradable tonnage quota. Partners wide ranging and embrace industry (Mexico, Ecuador, Spain), WWF, IATTC, ISSF.

Business Plan candidates will be selected based on their ability to demonstrate the potential to achieve rapid transformational change. Once selected for inclusion in the project, activities to support development of the Business Plans will involve: (i) preparatory analyses including identifying reform pathways and supporting sector analytics and scenario planning, (ii) investment plan development, and (iii) mapping of public and/or private capital to implement the final business plans.

The Project will not invest in the actual implementation of any of the suggested reform pathways that are described in the Business Plans.

Component 2: An Innovation Grant Facility. This grant facility will be led by Conservation International and will contribute to the transformational impact that the Business Plans are expected to realize. A \$2 million grant window will support further analytical work to inform development of the business plans. The aim of the fund is to stimulate innovation that directly supports preparation of the business plans including, for example, creation of links between market-based certification and rights-based management in target fisheries as well as new techniques for by-catch reduction.

Component 3: Inter-Regional Coordination, Implementation Support and Monitoring and Evaluation. This Component will provide parallel support for Components 1 and 2 in the two following areas:

- Global Think Tank:

Inter-regional coordination, outreach and collaboration between the four regional sub-project activities work will be achieved through a small, but potentially influential, Global Think Tank (GloTT). This will comprise the five project EAs together with a multidisciplinary group of thematic specialists, GEF and FAO Tuna Project interests.

- M&E tools:

With regard to monitoring and evaluation, this Component will design and deploy tools and approaches to enable effective benchmarking of performance and progress against agreed targets. It will also informally monitor any pilot projects that are successful in securing external finance during the project's lifetime, ensuring appropriate lessons are learned and disseminated.

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

Location: The project is global in scope and will invest in the preparation of business plans to support sustainable fisheries in up to four seascapes, including: the Caribbean, Eastern Pacific, Western and Central Pacific and the Bay of Bengal.

Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis: This is a TA project, with no physical footprint. Component 1 will finance analytical work and the preparation of business plans for up to four areas. Though these business plans will not be implemented under the Project, the investments will have a physical footprint and will generate both adverse and positive environmental and social impacts that will need to be addressed.

Examples of the type of business plan investments that will be proposed under the business plans include, among others:

- a) Investment into private enterprise including infrastructure works to enable improved postharvest handling on fishing craft and foster value creation; high-value / value-added processing with improved market access; innovative technologies to reduce bycatch and improve catching efficiency; buy-back schemes and other operations to reduce fishing capacity. Investments and the value proposition these offer, would leverage public-private commitment to institute secure and exclusive access, including appropriate allocative and enforcement mechanisms agreed by key parties.
- b) Investment into public sector schemes (such as national collective action initiatives) to improve the 'business model' of existing management schemes such as the Pacific Vessel Day Scheme, or new collective action models yet to be identified, in order to generate value proposition incentives for enabling reform and downstream private sector investment.
- c) Investment into tourism/fisheries schemes such as innovative information technologies in the Caribbean for monitoring billfish (also shark) catch / tag / release compensation programs involving recreational and commercial fishers.
- d) Integral with the above would be opportunities for investment in technologies for improved real time catch data generation and management to support future management and certification schemes, and cost effective fisheries monitoring and surveillance.

Similar investment opportunities in pollution control may be available where processing of high value fish may be impacted negatively by pollution from say urban outfalls. Asserting access rights

to hygienic and sanitary working conditions may provide a value proposition to exporters.

The business plans will require that all pathways proposed in each plan will be screened to ensure that potential adverse environmental and social impacts that may be generated as a result of each investment are identified, and appropriate safeguard instruments are prepared to avoid, minimize, mitigate and, in such cases where there are residual impacts, offset adverse environmental and social impacts. The screening of the business plans for environment and social impacts and the preparation of appropriate safeguard instruments for each plan will be guided by the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which will be developed during project preparation and disclosed prior to appraisal.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Josefo Tuyor (EASDE)

Valerie Hickey (AES)

Peter Leonard (EASDE)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	<p>While this is a TA project with no physical investment, the development of business plans under Component 1, when implemented regardless of the funding source, will have physical footprints and will generate both adverse and positive environmental and social impacts that will need to be addressed. For these reasons, OP4.01 is triggered.</p> <p>To ensure that the business plans are developed with due consideration of environment and social impacts and in compliance with OP 4.01, an ESMF was prepared during preparation. The ESMF will guide the screening of the business plans for environment and social impacts and the preparation of appropriate safeguard instruments for each plan. The ESMF contains an environmental and social assessment screening process associated with specific investments proposed in each business plan, as well as examples of good practice avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures for the breadth of reform pathways that the business plan may propose. This Framework will ensure that each business plan will put in place a robust approach to consider environmental and social risks and impacts in line with Bank safeguard policies, and to prepare appropriate good practice safeguard instruments for the actual reform pathways identified in the final business plan.</p>

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>The business plans developed by this TA will lead to subsequent investments that are likely to impact natural habitats, although most of these impacts are expected to be positive.</p> <p>The ESMF prepared for the project includes provisions of how each business plan will screen for potential impacts related to natural habitats, and will describe the necessary measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate these adverse impacts.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Following discussions during preparation, it was agreed that the business plans developed by this TA will not impact mangrove forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	Following discussions during preparation, it was agreed that there will be no impacts from this Project related to pest management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	Following discussions during preparation, it was agreed that there will be no impacts from this Project related to physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>Indigenous Peoples are likely to be present in some of the areas and are likely to benefit from reform pathways when implemented.</p> <p>Each area and business plan will be screened to determine whether Indigenous Peoples are present. The ESMF prepared for the project includes an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), the main elements of which would be a free, prior and informed consultation process to ensure that IPs are not adversely affected by project activities (e.g. siting of infrastructure and construction work related to component 2) and that they are not excluded from project benefits.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>The subsequent investments identified from the business plan may result in loss of access to natural resources in legally designated parks.</p> <p>The ESMF prepared for the project includes a Process Framework (PF) that describes the procedures and requirements in case there is loss or restriction of access to natural resources.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Neither this project nor the implementation of the business plans will involve building dams nor will

		any of the future investments envisaged depend on an existing dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Following discussion with LEGEN and the RSA, it was agreed that there will be no impacts from this Project or downstream implementation of Business Plans on international waterways as described under OP 7.50.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	There may be unresolved territorial claims or disputes within the project boundaries identified during the preparation of Business Plans. In this case, the Business Plan activities in these areas will be declared ineligible and removed from the Business Plans.

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>The project is global in scope and will invest in the preparation of business plans (BPs) to support sustainable fisheries in up to four seascapes, including: the Caribbean, Eastern Pacific, Western and Central Pacific and the Bay of Bengal. This is a TA project, with no physical footprint. Component 1 will finance analytical work and the preparation of business plans in each of the four seascapes mentioned above. Though these business plans will not be implemented under the Project, the investments will have a physical footprint and will generate both adverse and positive environmental and social impacts that will need to be addressed. Thus the project is given a Category B rating.</p> <p>The business plans will be screened to ensure that potential adverse environmental and social impacts that may be generated as a result of each potential pilot investment are identified, and appropriate safeguard instruments are prepared to avoid, minimize, mitigate and, in such cases where there are residual impacts, offset adverse environmental and social impacts. The screening of the business plans for adverse environment and social impacts and the preparation of appropriate safeguard instruments for each plan will be guided by an Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF).</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p> <p>The potential impacts will be identified during the preparation of the BPs. The ESMF provides guidance on the preparation of appropriate safeguard instruments to respond to the potential impacts found during the preparation of the business plans. Though these plans will not be implemented by the Project and are beyond its scope, each BP will include robust safeguard instruments to guide the agencies who will implement them.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p> <p>These will be considered within each BP in consultation with all affected stakeholders and knowledgeable and interested peoples.</p>
<p><b>4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an</b></p>

**assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.**

The Project has prepared an ESMF to outline the process by which potential adverse impacts will be identified and robust instruments prepared as part of each BP. It also includes a Process Framework (PF) that describes the procedures and requirements in case there is loss or restriction of access to natural resources.

A rapid assessment of the institutional capacity of each Project Executing Agencies to comply with the World Bank's safeguard policies was conducted during Project preparation. The results of the rapid institutional assessment suggest that each of the Agencies has sufficient capacity to understand their role and the technical capacity to undertake consultations and produce safeguard instruments. For example, one agency, Conservation International has broad experience managing Bank safeguard policies and instruments based on its work with another global biodiversity operation (e.g., the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund). This experience includes successful development, implementation and active supervision of a range of World Bank-approved safeguard instruments. WWF also has similar experience given its past role as recipient of World Bank funding. The Bay of Bengal Programme and the Forum Fisheries Agency both have experience with World Bank safeguards because of their respective link to IDA-financed operations.

Nonetheless, the World Bank will provide a series of refresher trainings to each Project Executing Agency in the first year of the Project to build their capacity and provide implementation support during the actual determination of the range of activities to be included in each BP. The budget for this training will be included in the Project.

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

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

Disclosure: The ESMF is made available through the World Bank website ([www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)), as well as through the websites of each of the Project Executing Agencies. During the preparation of BPs, any safeguard instrument prepared as part of a BP will also need to be publicly disclosed, including locally in a language and format accessible to affected communities.

Disclosure will occur in two phases:

- Disclosure of assessment documents (e.g. social assessment and environmental review) and draft safeguard documents (e.g. IPP and PF) during business plan preparation and prior to final review and approval of the BP. Disclosure during business plan preparation aims to seek feedback and input from local communities, and as appropriate other stakeholders, on the business plan proposal and safeguard measures and documents.
- Disclosure of final safeguard documents prior to business plan finalization to inform local communities of implementation measures concerning safeguard issues.

***B. Disclosure Requirements***

**Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other**



Date of receipt by the Bank	27-Mar-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	09-Apr-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
World	01-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	27-Mar-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	09-Apr-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
World	01-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	27-Mar-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	09-Apr-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
World	01-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>		
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>		
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>		

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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
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:	Name: Tim Bostock	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (RSA)	Date: 10-Apr-2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Valerie Hickey (SM)	Date: 19-Apr-2014