

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA8500

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 06-Jun-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 09-Jun-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Rwanda	Project ID:	P131464
Project Name:	Landscape Approach to Forest Restoration and Conservation (LAFREC) (P131464)		
Task Team Leader:	Stephen Ling		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	03-Jun-2014	Estimated Board Date:	25-Aug-2014
Managing Unit:	AFTN2	Lending Instrument:	Specific Investment Loan
GEF Focal Area:	Multi-focal area		
Sector(s):	Forestry (80%), Flood protection (10%), Irrigation and drainage (10%)		
Theme(s):	Biodiversity (20%), Other environment and natural resources management (35%), Climate change (24%), Natural disaster management (21%)		
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:	12.18	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			2.65
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			5.49
Least Developed Countries TF for Climate Change Activities			4.05
Total			12.18
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The project development and the global environmental objective is to demonstrate landscape management for enhanced environmental services and climate resilience in one priority landscape.

3. Project Description

Component 1: Forest-friendly and climate-resilient restoration of Gishwati-Mukura landscape

This Component will support the application of the landscape approach to forest restoration and conservation for the improvement of ecosystem functions and services in the Gishwati forest area, and possibly adjacent parts of the Nile-Congo Crest. It aims to arrest and eventually reverse the ongoing land conversion in the area through forest restoration (to the extent feasible) and agro-forestry approaches in a manner that will maximize ecological connectivity and hydrological function in the landscape.

Sub-Component 1.a.: Upgrading and sustainable management of Gishwati-Mukura Protected Area

a. The project will support the planned upgrading of the Gishwati core forest area (the remnant natural forest areas within the former Gishwati Forest Reserve) and the Mukura Forest Reserve to a single protected area. The 19 km stretch of hills between the two reserves is also densely populated and mainly occupied by agricultural land (see Annex 2 for details on the challenges faced by the two reserves).

b. Investments in this protected area will complete the planning process, strengthen management and accelerate ecological restoration in support of upgrading to national park status and to improve the protection of two key biodiversity refugia within the Nile-Congo crest. Based on consultations with RDB, it was agreed that the priority investments to be supported will focus on:

c. Physical demarcation of the reserves. The boundaries of core forest areas and buffer zones for the national park are proposed in a draft law. The vegetation, use and co-management structure of the buffer zones will be discussed and agreed with local communities. The project will support consultation meetings and costs of physical demarcation for completion of this process.

d. Restoration of degraded natural habitats. In both reserves, assisted regeneration of degraded portions will be carried out involving planting of native species, and where necessary removal of exotics. In some limited areas where mining has taken place, there may also be needs for small-scale works to fill excavations. Local labor will be used for restoration works.

e. Development (and updating) of management plans. A management plan exists for Mukura, but it is outdated. None exists yet for Gishwati. A plan will be developed for the management of both areas as a single reserve. The management plan will address ongoing restoration and ecological management needs, a protection plan based on identification of the most critical biodiversity elements, and a strategy for eco-tourism development. Much of the plan, however, will address the management of needs of the local population, in particular provision of substitutes for resources which were previously accessed from the forest reserves, co-management and sustainable use arrangements for the buffer zone, and to the extent possible, benefit-sharing arrangements, including local participation in tourism development. The management planning process is also expected to result in the preparation of a Biosphere Reserve nomination to UNESCO for the Gishwati-Mukura National Park and surrounding the landscape.

f. Training and equipping of local eco-guards. After establishment of the National Park, the cadre of existing eco-guards is expected to be extended to 12 persons each for the Gishwati and Mukura sections. The project will provide basic equipment to the guards, as well as training to enhance their abilities to record systematic threat monitoring for the reserve, act as community liaisons. In addition to the community-based activities of the eco-guards, the project will provide resources to mobilize periodic spot-checks and support from local law enforcement agencies where serious issues are involved, taking a sensitive and graduated approach with local offenders. Chimpanzee habituation and tourist guiding will also be supported. Should there be a delay in the establishment of the national park, the Project may pay salaries of the existing eco-guards as an interim measure.

g. Installation of basic infrastructure. In accordance with the management plan, the project will provide basic infrastructure, such as the construction of visitor centers, a park headquarters, viewing platforms, signed nature trails, and patrol posts.

h. Environmental education. An environmental education program targeting local communities and environmental clubs in schools will be continued in the Gishwati area and extended to Mukura to explain the need for biodiversity protection and the specific responsibilities of local residents. Activities may also include creating literacy centers for adults as focal sites for environmental education, as well as local exchanges with communities around Volcanoes National Park.

Sub-Component 1.b.: Forest restoration and land husbandry in the Gishwati landscape

Moving beyond the core forests, the project will work on management of the broader Gishwati-Mukura landscape to enhance both production and watershed values, whilst capitalizing on opportunities to increase the representation of native forest elements and therefore biodiversity connectivity in the landscape. The project would finance planning at the landscape level and with individual communities, and would support the implementation of tree-based landscape restoration approaches through provision of training, seeds, materials, and through payment for local labor.

The priority investments will focus on:

a. Sustainable land management with corridor communities. Establishment of a Gishwati-Mukura forest corridor has been adopted as a national goal and is reflected in the National Land Use Master Plan. However, the high population density and the almost complete agricultural conversion of the putative corridor area mean that there is no realistic potential for re-establishment of a broad swath of forest without major economic dislocation of local communities. The project will therefore focus on increasing the representation of native forest elements in the landscape, enhancing biological connectivity via an archipelago of ecological islands and soft boundaries. Set aside of highly vulnerable ridge-tops, extreme slopes, and riparian buffers (in keeping with national legislation that requires such buffers) and/or unproductive lands, combined with agroforestry techniques which favor native species, offers the potential to greatly increase biological connectivity whilst maintaining or enhancing the productive value of the landscape. Significant investments in land use intensification would be offered to communities in return for restricting agriculture in the most vulnerable lands and establishing protection forests. The project will pilot this approach through participatory micro-watershed planning with local communities to identify sustainable land management investments with a particular emphasis on the promotion of agroforestry techniques that incorporate native species. The planning process would result in agreement on a set of watershed rehabilitation actions, similar to those under other project, such as LWH, but with added emphasis on

identification of agroforestry potentials.

b. Silvo-pastoralism in Gishwati rangelands. Within rangeland areas of the former Gishwati Forest Reserve, the project will invest in establishment of silvo-pastoral techniques, emphasizing the use of native species. This would include establishing trees on ridge-tops, extreme slopes, riparian buffers, and as live fences, shelter belts and shade trees, through planting and managed natural regrowth. Although this would involve a marginal loss in the area of pasture, silvo-pastoral approaches are expected to improve the overall productivity of rangelands (in addition to enhancing forest cover and biological connectivity) by protecting against land degradation, providing shelter for animals from climatic extremes, and through provision of additional fodder and forest products. Silvo-pastoral interventions would be accompanied, where necessary, with training on improved livestock and pasture management.

c. Agroforestry and forest restoration support to MINAGRI and Forests Department. The Project may help finance the completion ongoing re-establishment of natural forest, ensuring the use of an appropriate and diverse mix of native species. In agreement with the Department of Forests of RNRA, the project may also finance the conversion of a portion of the production pine forests into natural forest. Furthermore, within the areas of the former Gishwati Forest Reserve that are being targeted for investment through LWH, the project would provide supplementary assistance in the form of technical advice and seedlings for diversification (and where feasible intensification) of agroforestry techniques.

d. Joint land use planning for the Gishwati landscape. The project would work with the Department of Lands in RNRA to establish a working group to revise and harmonize existing land use planning for the landscape. This working group, with participation from relevant ministries, agencies, and districts would agree on a land use planning framework within which LAFREC would operate, maximizing potential synergies and avoiding unnecessary conflicts. An early task for the working group will be to assign a task force to undertake a technical review of mining activities in the Gishwati-Mukura area.

Sub-Component 1.c.: Sustainable and resilient livelihoods

This sub-component will support demand-driven income-generating activities in order to increase (i) the breadth of the economic options and security of the livelihoods base of the population within the Gishwati-Mukura landscape, thereby improving climate resilience; and (ii) the sustainability of land and forest management investments within the landscape. Livelihoods support will be available to communities surrounding the Gishwati core forest area and the Mukura Forest Reserve, within targeted areas of the Gishwati-Mukura corridor, and involved in project re-forestation interventions in the area of the forest Gishwati Forest Reserve. Support will preferentially be provided to livelihood options which: (i) decrease dependency on unsustainable exploitation of forest resources, through provision of alternatives for products from protected forest and increased energy efficiency; (ii) depend directly on successful application of SLM technologies or management of resources; (iii) add value to agricultural or forest products, justifying increased investments in sustainable land and natural resources management; or (iv) provide additional income with negligible environmental impact.

Building on what was achieved during project preparation, identification of livelihood potentials will largely occur as an integral part of community-based participatory planning activities in the course of the landscape restoration activities discussed above. This ground-up approach will also be

complemented with top-down advisory services from a rural livelihoods / markets consultant/NGO that will organize trade fairs; and identify and support establishment of production and marketing linkages with the private sector. This will take into account community production strengths and opportunities in a limited number of value chains, identification of bottle necks and quality requirements, and the development of new economic opportunities during the course of the project associated with ongoing regional development activities.

Identification of livelihood potentials will largely occur as an integral part of community-based participatory planning activities in the course of the landscape restoration activities discussed above - i.e. protected area and buffer zone management planning, micro-catchment planning in the corridor area, and planning for rangeland management activities in the former Gishwati Forest Reserve. This ground-up approach will also be complemented with top-down advisory services from an agribusiness consultant/NGO that will organize trade fairs; and identify and support establishment of production and marketing linkages with the private sector. This will take into account community production strengths and opportunities in a limited number of value chains, identification of bottle necks and quality requirements, and the development of new economic opportunities during the course of the project associated with ongoing regional development activities.

Development and start-up of alternative livelihoods will support capacity-building for farmer groups and cooperatives, as well as training (including peer learning, local exchange visits and study tours), initial inputs (e.g. seed) and tools in support of specific livelihood interventions. Within the project area, farmer groups are already established, and many have significant capacity to manage group activities and finances. Need for additional support to build organizational, technical, financial and business capacities will be therefore be assessed in terms of past performance and current linkages to other forms of support. Linkage to restoration activities will also be promoted in terms of piggy-backing on the use of local labor for landscape restoration work.

Sub-Component 1.d.: Flood forecasting and preparedness

Floods have had a great impact on human development, properties, infrastructures as well as the environment in northwestern Rwanda. Steep slopes, soil instability, heavy rains, insufficient drainage systems combine with inappropriate land management to create high vulnerability. This sub-component aims to improve the technical capacity of flood forecasting institutions and complement identified important milestones required to have a fully integrated Early Warning System (EWS) in an effort to reduce economic losses and risks to life in pilot flood-prone watersheds.

LAFREC project will focus on establishing an EWS through the introduction of operational precipitation and flood forecasting. This is a multi-sectoral activity which will be a joint effort of the Rwanda Meteorology Agency (RMA, responsible for development of precipitation forecasts, including utilization of data from a Doppler radar that will be installed soon, and issuing warnings to authorized government and municipal authorities), RNRA (real time stream gauging, flood modeling and forecasting), and MIDIMAR (issuing warnings to public, guiding mitigation activities) and local authorities/communities. It is expected that this activity will be piloted in a few small/medium size watershed with high risk of flooding.

Main activities in this sub-component will include: (i) a flood mitigation study in the selected pilot watersheds to provide a clear analysis of the flood issues and highlight the existing gaps that should be addressed within the scope of the sub-component; and (ii) technical assistance:

- a. to REMA for maintenance and calibration of existing weather stations, introduction of rainfall forecasting using the Doppler radar, supply and installation of limited equipment packages such as real-time stream and rain gauges including rain gauges for calibration of Doppler radar, capacity building to use Common Alerting Protocol Platform for Early Warning;
- b. to RNRA for capacity building and operational support for the introduction of hydrological modeling, installation of automated hydromet stations;
- c. to MIDIMAR for development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for flood warnings and response, assessing vulnerability of communities exposed to hazards, capacity building for community disaster preparedness.

Component 2 – Research, monitoring and management

Sub-Component 2.a.: Applied research and impact monitoring

The project aims to demonstrate the potential and inform future implementation of forest-friendly land rehabilitation approaches to leverage the much larger land husbandry investment programs being led by the agriculture sector, as well as any potential future investment programs in the water resources or forestry sectors that may also be interested in adopting the approach. To this end, support for applied research and systematic impact evaluation that goes beyond the immediate needs of the project is a sound investment.

Impact monitoring would support: (i) the establishment of a national modeling platform to map indicators of landscape health, and identify landscape management priorities, based on hotspots of degradation, and the feasibility and benefits of restoring lost environmental and economic functions; and (ii) comparative field-based monitoring of a range of environmental and associated economic functions, to demonstrate the effectiveness of land rehabilitation techniques.

Applied research would support the establishment of partnerships with key research and knowledge institutions to improve management knowledge of the Gishwati-Mukura landscape, and to improve restoration techniques, particularly in relation to scope for incorporation of native species.

A list of priority topics would include: (i) Biodiversity inventory and forest ecology for Mukura and Gishwati reserves; (ii) Ecological investigations on the health, needs and constraints of the chimpanzee population and other primates, with a view to developing a long-term recovery (and potentially eco-tourism strategy); (iii) Forest restoration ecology; (iv) Propagation of native tree and forest species; (v) Integration and productive use of native species within agroforestry systems; (vi) Benefits of agroforestry techniques in rangeland and estate crop settings; (vii) Improved woodlot management; (viii) Rural energy solutions.

Sub-Component 2.b.: Project management

Project management expenditures will cover routine administrative overheads, such as coordination between project implementing partners, work-planning, procurement and contract management, accounting and audit costs, field supervision, maintaining an internal project M&E system, and reporting.

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

Rwanda is a small, landlocked and mountainous country. The westernmost fifth of the country lies within the Congo basin, whereas the remainder is part of the Nile basin. The Nile-Congo Crest

divides these two catchments along a north-south line, and forms part of the Albertine Rift Montane Forest Ecoregion, which hosts 52% of all bird species and 39% of all mammal species on the African continent. Rwanda's two most important forest protected areas lie at either end of the crest – to the north the Volcanoes National Park, and Nyungwe National Park to the south. The ridge in between had been largely deforested, but includes two forest reserves – Gishwati and Mukura – which have been designated Key Biodiversity Areas for supporting population of eastern chimpanzee and an endangered swamp warbler, respectively. The project target landscape includes the Gishwati Core Forest (1439.72 ha) and the Mukura Forest Reserve (1987.74 ha) which are planned to be gazetted as a single national park, a roughly 20km long corridor area between the two, and the area of the former Gishwati Forest Reserve, which extends beyond the remaining Core Forest. Its forests were largely intact in 1978, and substantial forest cover still remained in 1986 despite a significant decrease. But by 2001, following the settlement in the area of refugees from the conflict in the mid- 90s, only a small circular patch of native forest remained, and today the remaining forest is less than 1,000 ha with some additional areas under natural regeneration. The remainder of the landscape is composed of agricultural land, rangeland, tea plantations and pine plantations, and currently has little biodiversity value.

Rainfall and topography are most severe in western Rwanda. Risks of flash floods and landslides are highest where recent deforestation has occurred, such as within the former Gishwati Forest Reserve. Deforestation is believed to have exacerbated local flooding, with one event in 2007 alone causing more than a dozen deaths and leading to extensive crop and property damage. A study on the Economics of Climate Change in Rwanda estimated that the direct economic costs of the 2007 flood ranged from US\$4 m to US\$20 m in 2 districts alone. Landslides and erosion are estimated to cause the loss of a million tons of soil per year, reducing local agricultural productivity and causing heavy siltation of the Sebeya river, increasing water supply and hydropower maintenance costs. The districts around Gishwati were identified as priority areas for disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation in Rwanda's NAPA. The project aims to use an integrated landscape management approach to both biodiversity and climate resilience functions in this important by vulnerable landscape.

The target landscape is around 40,000 ha in total size and intersects cells with a total population of 224,533, around 15,000 of whom live in the immediate vicinity of the two remaining forest patches. The local population mainly lives on agriculture, including crop cultivation and livestock rearing (especially cattle in the rangelands of the former Gishwati Reserve). Their crops include tea, potatoes (mainly Irish), maize and beans, etc. However, in addition to these main activities, people (especially around Mukura) also derive income from small-scale mining, mainly practiced by young men and focused on coltan, cassiterite and wolfram. Livelihood activities that adversely affect the remaining forest areas include firewood collection, some illegal mining within the forest, and setting fires. The fires were often started by people who wanted to expand grazing land, but the practice has now been contained and monitored.

The Social Assessment (SA) identified several social groups in LAFREC area that are in a clearly disadvantaged or vulnerable position. These include: the disabled, women headed households; unemployed and landless youth, orphaned children, child family heads, elderly and single parents. The SA indicates female-headed households as follows: Rutsiro District 28%, Ngororero District 34%, Nyabihu District 53.2%, and Rubavu District 30.1%. A significant proportion of female headed households are made up of widows in childbearing age. Female headed households with smaller family size but access to land face a shortage of labor. They depend on external labor, either through renting or share cropping farming arrangements, leaving them only with partial benefits from their

farm lands. Women from poorest households as well as resource poor female headed households and the elderly women are stuck in poverty, their main livelihood being charcoal and fire wood collection and sale.

The project landscape includes areas from which the GoR resettled some 1,500 households in 2007, as they were deemed to be highly vulnerable to natural disasters. This includes the relocation of 152 households from the Kinyenkanda area, which is now under forest regeneration as an extension of the Gishwati core forest area. A report on this resettlement indicates that due to the small size of land parcels in the resettlement sites the resettled households face a lack of economic opportunities to meet their livelihoods, and also a sense of having lost their original homes. The Kinyenkanda households will be eligible for livelihoods support through the project, given that they are amongst the more vulnerable persons within the broader project area, and their traditional relationship with the Gishwati forest.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Yasmin Tayyab (AFTCS)

Jane A. N. Kibbassa (AFTN3)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The project will support investments in soil and water conservation, small farm crops and livestock, community demand-driven income generating activities and other rural livelihoods. Because the exact locations of such investments have not been identified ex-ante, an ESMF was prepared.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The project area contains small, but biologically important remnant natural habitats. The project is intended to benefit natural habitats, and the ESMF aims to ensure that inadvertent negative impacts do not occur.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project will establish community forest management systems, forest restoration in Gishwati and agroforestry approaches to improve the ecosystem functions and services. These may entail planting of trees and possibly enhanced management of forests on state or communal lands. Large-scale commercial forestry operations are not included within the project. In the case of this project, requirements for this policy overlap with those of the natural habitats one.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will support SLM activities, including improved agricultural practices which may involve the need to control agricultural pests. IPM plan prepared for the purpose of LVEMP II has covered most of the pest problems in the whole country and is adequate to address the

		requirements of this policy for the implementation of this project.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The policy is triggered as a precautionary measure in case cultural artifacts are unexpectedly found during implementation of works. Chance find procedures have been included in the ESMF.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no Indigenous Peoples in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Although physical resettlement is very unlikely to occur, the project will support activities, such as livelihoods interventions and establishment of reserve buffer zones, which could lead to small amounts of land acquisition. Improved management of the Mukura and Gishwati reserves will also lead to restrictions in the use of natural resources. Based on the outcome of the social assessment, the livelihood component will include the households experiencing loss of income resulting from earlier resettlement instances. An RPF and PF have been prepared.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	SLM investments could potentially include the construction of very small in-stream structures to attenuate stream flow and trap sediment. These would not qualify as large dams, and the ESMF includes screening tools and guidelines to address any potential issues.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	The policy is triggered as the project concerns flood control in the Sebeya catchment (part of the Congo basin) and potentially other small watersheds (within the Victoria-Nile system). However, the project should receive an exception to the notification requirement under clause 7b of OP 7.50 due to the fact that no water storage infrastructure will be built. The flood risk mapping and hydrological modelling included in the project fall under the category of water resource surveys and feasibility studies. TORs for that work will include consideration of downstream impacts, but the project activities are not expected to cause any appreciable harm to other riparian, or to be harmed by their possible water use.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The target landscape does not overlap any disputed areas.

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:

Overall, the project is expected to provide significant environmental and social benefits, both on-site and downstream. Nevertheless some of its activities may have (i) localized and/or temporary small adverse environmental impacts; and/or (ii) involve some limited land acquisition, and/or restrict access to some natural resources. For these reasons, the proposed project is classified as Category B. No significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, unprecedented or irreversible are anticipated.

The main project activities are intended to improve the environment by restoring natural forests, improving soil retention, watershed function and biodiversity in productive landscapes through sustainable land management techniques focused on the use of agroforestry and silvo pastoralism, and emphasizing the use of native species where possible. The project is anticipated to result in increased empowerment of the people living in the Gishwati-Mukura landscape and the improvement of their livelihoods, through systematic adoption of participatory natural resources and environmental management approaches, and also implementation of livelihood improvement activities. Therefore, the project's planned social development outcomes of greater empowerment and social inclusion are likely to be achieved. This is because priority watershed management investments will be done in a participatory, transparent, and accountable manner. This implies active participation in decision-making by key actors, including civil society and affected communities. Similarly, gender and other concerns of most vulnerable groups, who are targeted for improved watershed management, shall be addressed through the same participatory processes.

Nevertheless, LAFREC activities could potentially create negative environmental and social impacts during the course of implementation if not appropriately managed. The possible negative impacts include:

- Land rehabilitation works (e.g. terraces, anti-erosive ditches) could result in land-taking, loss of natural habitats or changes in drainage if not well-planned.
- Changes in agricultural (including agroforestry) activities related to sustainable land management could result in changes in the use of agrichemicals and/or introduction of invasive species.
- The introduction of new livelihood activities could involve a range of negative impacts (e.g. increasing pressure on natural resources, increasing use of agrichemicals) if not appropriately screened and planned.
- Minor construction activities (e.g. guard posts or visitor center infrastructure for the Gishwati-Mukura National Park, small-scale community structures such as storage or agri-processing facilities related to livelihoods activities) could involve land-taking, loss of small areas of natural habitats or local pollution if not appropriately planned and managed.
- Upgrading of the Gishwati and Mukura Forest Reserves to a National Park may involve stricter enforcement of conservation regulations and therefore restriction of access to natural resources, and some small incidences of land-taking from re-delineation and rehabilitation of the buffer zone.

Restoring a mixed use landscape involving agricultural, agroforestry, grazing, production forest and protection forest elements can potentially result in land taking and/or restriction to forest reserves. With the activities mentioned above under Component 1, there is a small chance of physical resettlement and/or land acquisition related to project interventions as the buffer zones

have not yet been demarcated. There is also a potential for limitations on access to natural resource use in or around protected areas. As such, OP 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement is triggered.

Overall, the project is expected to provide significant environmental and social benefits, both onsite and downstream. Nevertheless, some of its activities may have (i) localized and/or temporary small adverse environmental impacts on human populations or environmentally important areas - including wetlands, forests, grasslands, and other natural habitats; and/or (ii) involve some limited land acquisition, and/or restrict access to some natural resources. As the project is not likely to have significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented, the proposed project is classified as Category B.

Nonetheless, new or increased restrictions of access to natural resources in the reserves, such as changes in zoning between buffer and core zone, or introduction of a new, buffer zone with increased restrictions from the experimental zone, may be needed to ensure sustainability of the reserves. In some cases, changes in zoning may adversely impact livelihoods. Increased restriction of access cannot be ruled out until the management plans for LAFREC are developed during implementation since core zones and buffer zones are yet to be properly and physically demarcated. However, the nature of any proposed restrictions, as well as the type of measures necessary to mitigate adverse impacts of those restrictions, would be determined in consultation with the project-affected groups.

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

The project is instituting cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms for landscape planning that should help to moderate future development or investment plans by ensuring that environmental and social objectives are taken on board. The project is not expected to induce activities with negative impacts, although in the longer run, successful landscape management may induce tourism development that could have adverse impacts if not well managed. Longer term safeguarding and appropriate management of the landscape is expected to be addressed through development of an application (and related management plans) to UNESCO for the designation of the landscape as a Biosphere Reserve.

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

NGOs previously involved with conservation efforts in Gishwati had made plans to establish a contiguous forest corridor between Gishwati and Mukura. However, that was considered unfeasible due to the high competition for land uses in the corridor area. Instead, the project will take a participatory approach to increasing the representation of natural forest elements through micro-catchment rehabilitation activities that benefit both people and the environment.

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 main project activities have substantive similarities with the watershed management activities in the on-going Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP II). The project therefore adopted the ESMF (with some revisions reflected the reduced scope of activities under LAFREC in comparison to LVMEP, which includes sanitation infrastructure investments) and the IPMP (which was already national in scope) developed under LVEMP. The ESMF proposes mitigation measures and their monitoring plans an integral part of the project design and costs. This includes the institutional responsibilities for the screening of activities and assigning an environmental category, undertaking Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) in the

event of Category B activities, monitoring, public consultation and disclosure, and supervision. Mitigation measures under the Natural Habitats and Forests policies are covered under each ESMF. The project will not finance interventions which destroy natural habitats or forests. Instead, it will support those which reverse degraded natural habitats, such as overexploited wetlands.

The IPMP has: (a) identified the key pests of major crops and livestock (b) assessed the impact of the current pest control methods in the; (c) analyzed the institutional, policy and legal frameworks for pest control and management; (d) developed an IPM strategy and its monitoring framework; and (e) identified key researchable areas in pest management. The IPMP will serve as a guidance/reference document for the preparation of specific livelihood or land management interventions in a manner consistent with good IPM practice.

Owing to the nature of the project, the exact location, nature and magnitude of all the interventions to be financed by the project cannot yet be determined until full feasibility is undertaken and the buffer zones are mapped and demarcated. The Resettlement Policy Framework & Process Framework has been developed in line with (OP 4.12).

RPF provides guidelines on how the project activities will avoid, manage or mitigate potential risks and the process by which Resettlement Action Plans will be prepared and implemented if the occasion arises during the project implementation period. The RPF presents the objectives, principles, organizational arrangements and funding mechanisms for any displacement and resettlement that may be necessary during implementation of LAFREC as per the applicable Rwanda laws and regulations and the World Bank safeguard Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12). The RPF provides the basis for preparing Resettlement Action Plans for project activities once their location and scope are known. Resettlement plans for specific activities causing displacement due to LAFREC will be prepared using this RPF and submitted to the World Bank for approval.

The Process Framework (PF) establishes the process for how to involve potentially affected communities in planning and implementation of the project while at the same time it identifies how affected communities will be assisted in restoring their livelihood, as a consequence of lost access to traditional natural resources. The Process Framework outlines the criteria and procedures as described in OP 4.12, which will be followed as part of the Project, in cases where project-induced involuntary restriction of access to forest reserve resources results in adverse livelihood impacts, to ensure that eligible, affected persons are assisted in their efforts to restore or improve their livelihoods in a manner which maintains the environmental sustainability of the nature reserve in question. More specifically, it describes: a) the criteria for eligibility of affected persons will be determined; b) measures to assist the affected people in their efforts to improve or restore, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels, their livelihoods (e.g., as appropriate, alternative grazing areas, cultivation of non-timber forest products, or investments in community infrastructure) while maintaining the sustainability of the identified reserves and (c) potential conflicts involving affected people will be resolved. It also provides a description of the arrangements for implementing and monitoring the process.

The project will undertake field appraisal of the planned project interventions, and the Bank will approve all RAPs prior to commencement of the subprojects. Compensation for physical resettlement and loss of land will be funded from government budget. The grievance mechanism has been documented in RPF and the project will utilize the existing systems and structures from the lowest levels through local governments.

The institutional environmental management capacity in country has been assessed as part of the project design. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA) is responsible for the protection and management of the environment per the Organic Law on Environmental Protection, Conservation and Management. Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) was established through Article 65 of this law. REMA is charged with a responsibility of ensuring compliance with laid down environmental impact assessment procedures in planning and execution of development projects. This Project will be executed by REMA.

REMA has adequate in-house capacity to supervise, monitor, and guide the implementation of safeguard policies amongst the other implementing sectors. Furthermore, it has experience of applying the ESMF for LVEMP, upon which that for LAFREC is based. Supervision of safeguard work at district level will be carried out by district environment officers, supported by project field staff. The project envisages strengthening the project implementing entities by providing training for its operation officers mainly at district and community levels to ensure systematic implementation and monitoring of environmental and social issues.

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

The safeguard documents were prepared in consultation with representatives from national and local stakeholders, such as REMA, MINIRENA, the target districts, sector and cell staff, and local communities. All safeguard documents were cleared by REMA and the Bank. They were then disclosed at the World Bank's Infoshop and in-country on June 5, 2014.

All safeguards documents (Social Assessment, Resettlement Policy Framework and Process Framework) were prepared through participatory approaches. Interactive discussions were held with relevant stakeholders and implementing partners including Interested and Affected Parties who were identified during the stakeholder analysis process. These discussions are the basis for most of the measures contained in the Social Assessment, Resettlement Policy Framework and Process Framework.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-May-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Rwanda	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	19-May-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Rwanda	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	

Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-May-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Rwanda	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] 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 type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or SM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - 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"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests			
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways			
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	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:	Name: Stephen Ling	
Approved By		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Alexandra C. Bezeredi (RSA)	Date: 06-Jun-2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Jonathan S. Kamkwala (SM)	Date: 09-Jun-2014