

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA12629

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 04-Jun-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 07-Jun-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	China	Project ID:	P122383
Project Name:	Landscape Approach to Wildlife Conservation in Northeast China (P122383)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Garoo J. Batmanian		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	19-Jun-2015	Estimated Board Date:	22-Jul-2015
Managing Unit:	GENDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity		
Sector(s):	Forestry (100%)		
Theme(s):	Biodiversity (100%)		
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:	20.58	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			17.58
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			3.00
Total			20.58
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The proposed project's Project Development Objective (PDO) and its Global Environmental Objective (GEO) is to help create the ecological conditions for recovery of threatened biodiversity in priority ecological landscapes in the far northeast of China, using the Amur Tiger as a flagship

species.

15. The Project will do this through: (a) integrating wildlife conservation considerations into economic development planning and sectoral policies and planning frameworks in targeted landscapes; (b) enhancing the effectiveness of protected area/network management; (c) increasing wildlife carrying capacity through restoration, expansion and connectivity of critical habitats, including the expansion of biodiversity-friendly landscapes adjacent to protected areas; (d) promoting more effective law enforcement and monitoring in both protected areas and the greater landscape to reduce mortality of flagship species; and (e) reducing human/wildlife conflict by increasing benefits to and buy-in from local communities for wildlife conservation.

3. Project Description

Project Components

Component 1: Institutional coordination to mainstream wildlife conservation across sectors. (Estimated at US \$1.73 million, including US\$0.72 million from GEF). This component would support:

? Policy and planning (identification of priority habitat areas for tiger protection, provincial conservation and restoration plans, development/updating policies and regulations to reduce human/tiger conflicts (e.g., through e.g., compensation mechanisms); and

? Institutional arrangements (establishing a Northeast wildlife conservation panel); promoting increased Sino-Russian cooperation for tiger conservation (e.g., promoting joint anti-poaching activities, staff training and consolidation of statistics).

The expected Intermediate Results are: (a) an update and new provincial-wide tiger conservation management plans submitted to the DRC for Jilin and Heilongjiang Provinces, respectively; (b) establishment of a NE China Advisory Tiger Landscape Conservation Committee; and (c) closer cross-provincial collaboration with Russian counterparts.

Component 2: conservation of priority ecosystems and increased effectiveness of habitat protection in the Changbaishan Landscape. (Estimated at US\$ 9.18 million, including US\$ 1.57 million from GEF). This component would support:

? Increased management effectiveness in 4 existing NRs (equipment, NR management plans and plan regulation plans and training);

? Creation of 3 new NRs (support for preparation & application materials and processes and limited investment in 2 of the 3 reserves);

? Habitat restoration (increase prey population, reforestation, snare removal); and

? Technical monitoring (wildlife/cats/prey, habitat).

The expected Intermediate Results under this component are: (a) increased management effectiveness among project supported NRs measured by NR specific METT scorecards (target to be defined during preparation), (b) 3 new NRs established creating 866 km² of new protected area for tiger and other wildlife, (c) 296 NR staff trained, (d) decreased incidence of snares in project area and (e) an integrated cross-provincial ecological monitoring program established.

Component 3: Reducing human wildlife conflict in priority forest landscapes (Estimated at US\$9.01 million, including US\$0.56 million from GEF). This component would support:

? Improved patrolling and enforcement through the implementation of SMART patrolling for

wildlife conservation in priority sites in Jilin and Heilongjiang provinces (with phased adoption throughout the PA network of the target area), and Training of forestry staff outside of NRs focused on local community participation and promoting tiger friendly land use; ;

? Pilot mitigation measures (e.g. compensation, tiger-friendly forestry production through reforestation, forest thinning and forest diversification); and

? Increased public awareness

The expected Intermediate Results under this component are: (a) 26 Construction and equipping of new and upgrading and equipping of existing wildlife monitoring stations outside of project supported protected areas (nature reserves); (b) 274 forestry staff trained and (c) people participation in public awareness events and other related activities over LOP.

Component 4: Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (Estimated at US\$0.66 million, including US\$0.15 million from GEF). This component would support project management activities to be carried out by the implementing agencies and coordination between provinces and across international boundaries.

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

The project will extend or strengthen the existing restriction of access in some existing wildlife protection areas in eastern Jilin Province and southeastern Heilongjiang Province. Forests cover about 55% of the region. Coniferous-broadleaf mixed forests is the primary forest cover with Korean pine and Manchurian Fir the dominant species intermixed with over 600 species of plants. It also provides habitat for more than 300 species of wildlife, among them are 44 species of China's national protected wildlife, including the Amur tiger (*Panthera tigris altaica*), Amur leopard (*Panthera pardus orientalis*), Siberian musk deer (*Moschus moschiferus*), Sika deer (*Cervus nippon*), the Japanese sable (*Martes zibellina*), Asiatic black bear (*Ursus thibetanus*), and Red deer (*Cervus elaphus*).

As a result of long-time logging, the original forest is almost completely gone, replaced by secondary growth, with remnant patches scattered along the Heilongjiang and Jilin border. The remaining forest is in good condition after years of protection and restoration. These are traditional forestry areas in China and currently covered by forest with low population density. There are totally 6 distribution areas for the Amur Tiger in Heilongjiang and Jilin Provinces but these distribution areas are isolated from each other. The project will use a landscape approach focusing on: (i) supporting core areas for protection through the strengthening of existing or the creation of new nature reserves; (b) areas outside nature reserves with some level of forest cover which can serve as corridors to ensure connectivity between nature reserves; and , (c) an area that encompasses those two other zones (a and b above) where environmental monitoring and enforcement would take place to ensure compatible conservation measures are implemented and enforced .

There are 25 forest farms and 14 villages in the project area, including three minority villages. Household income in the forest farms is mainly from salary. Only in four of the 25 farms income rely relatively more on other sources, mainly mushroom production, fungus production, herbs production, bee farming, and NTFP. The average annual income of the staff is about RMB 29,000. Regarding the affected 14 local communities, the income sources ranked by order of importance are; farming, NTFP, animal grazing and others (including eco-tourism and seasonal migration). Only two villages rely about 30 percent of their income on NTFP. The average annual income of those village households is about RMB 15,000.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Songling Yao (GSURR)

Yiren Feng (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed project includes improve management effectiveness of 4 existing protected areas (nature reserves), create 3 protected areas, increase population of prey to improve tiger habitat, Restore vegetation (forest enriching, planting cut areas) to improve tiger habitat, improve monitoring and enforcement outside protected areas, increase awareness of local communities (Env. Education) etc. The OP4.01 is triggered due to the potential impacts on natural habitats and social issues such as potential access restrictions to protection and conservation areas etc., The EA reports include an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) which has been prepared for the project.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The project includes the improvement of the management effectiveness of existing and creation of new ones, all on critical natural habitats as defined under the policy. The project also includes e potential impacts of increasing prey population on the ecological balance of the protected areas. The monitoring plan including the threshold levels for introduction of prey, and the quarantine plan for the preys to be introduced have been developed to mitigate the potential impacts on the ecological balance of the protected areas.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project will include limited reforestation with local indigenous species in areas which originally had higher forest cover/ tree density. Those actions will not entail conversion of natural forests, commercial harvesting operation or the introduction of any invasive species. However, the project has the potential to have impacts on the rights and welfare of people and their level of dependence upon or interaction with forests, therefore the policy is triggered. The livelihood recovery measures for the people whose income will be reduced by the impact on their reliance level on the forests are included in the RPF.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will include vegetation restoration, tending, and nursery management etc. A stand-alone Pest Management Plan (PMP) has been prepared to guide the application of pesticides for the forest activities.
Physical Cultural		Initial screening indicated that project sites are not located

Resources OP/BP 4.11		in or next to any known areas with physical, cultural, or natural relics. The chance findings procedure has been included in the EMP and the bidding document and contract.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Three ethnic minority villages were identified to be affected by the project. The main impact would be mainly related to strengthening restriction of access, and wildlife-human conflicts. Therefore, the proposed project triggered the World Bank Policy on Indigenous People, OP 4.10. An EMDP and social action plan were prepared which include detailed and specific measures to help affected indigenous people on restoring their incomes and develop alternative livelihoods.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Livelihood of people on 14 villages and 25 forest farms will be potentially affected, mainly due to loss of income relate to strengthening restriction of access to certain areas/ resources. There is no physical relocation planned, however, the possibility of potential land acquisition cannot excluded in the implementation stage. Therefore, the proposed project triggered the World Bank Policy on Involuntary Resettlement, OP 4.12. A resettlement policy framework (RPF), a process framework (PF), and SA including social management plan were prepared. A RP has not been prepared because there are no identified activities related to land acquisition.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance nor are any of its activities dependent on a dam as defined the Safety of Dams policy.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project is not located in any international waterways as defined under the policy. No action is required under this policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not located in any known disputed areas as defined under the policy. No action is required under this policy.

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment (EA) conducted during the project preparation has not identified any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts. The works to be constructed under the Project are classified into small civil works, which will not cause significant conversion or degradation of the significant natural habitats. The project is to help create the ecological conditions for recovery of threatened biodiversity in priority ecological landscapes in the far northeast of China and it will bring significant net positive environmental and ecological benefits in the project area. At the same time, strengthening the existing restriction of access in seven forest areas will affect livelihood/income of 14 villages and 25 forest farms, including three minority</p>
--

villages.

OP4.04 Natural Habitats. The project includes the improvement of the management effectiveness of existing protected areas, and creation of new protection areas, which are both critical natural habitats as defined under the policy, and the project also includes the potential impacts of increasing prey population on the ecological balance of the protected areas. The monitoring plan and the quarantine plan for the preys to be introduced have been developed to mitigate the potential impacts on the ecological balance of the protected area.

OP4.36 Forests. The project will include limited reforestation with local indigenous species. It will not entail conversion of natural forests, commercial harvesting operation or the introduction of any invasive species. However, the project has the potential to have impacts on the rights and welfare of people and their level of dependence upon or interaction with forests, therefore the policy is triggered. The livelihood recovery measures for the people whose income will be reduced by the impact on their reliance level on the forests.

OP 4.09 Pest Management. The project will include vegetation restoration, tending, and nursery management etc. It may potentially increase the use of the pesticides within the project areas, the policy is therefore triggered. A Pest Management Plan has been prepared to guide the application of the pesticide for this project.

Social Side. The project will strengthen the existing restriction of access in seven forest areas, among which there are 14 villages and 25 forest farms to be affected, mainly on income. At the same time three ethnic minority villages were recognized in the project area. Therefore, the proposed activities trigger the World Bank Policies: Indigenous People, OP 4.10 and Involuntary Resettlement, OP 4.12. The potential impacts on local communities mainly relate to strengthening restriction of access, land reclamation, and wildlife-human conflicts, etc.

The major impacts the project will bring to livelihood (income) of forest farm staff include: 1) banned logging, 2) decreased materials for fungus production due to ban of logging, 3) restriction of cattle grazing in the NRs, 4) restrictions of collection of NTFP within the core and the buffer zones. Project impacts to livelihood (income) of local villagers include: 1) the NRs will claim back the farmland leased to local farmers, 2) higher risks of wild animal ? human conflict, 3) banned logging will increase cost on fungus production, 4) restricted access to collect NTFP products, 5) restricted access of grazing in NRs. The impacts are listed upon their importance on livelihood. As defined by the SA and Process Framework, the safeguard issues may include: 1) enhanced NR management may increase the conflict between patrolling and using of natural resources; 2) results of the livelihood restoration and alternative livelihood activities may not be successful enough to meet local people??s expectation; 3) governmental led capacity buildings and income generation activities may not adequate for meeting needs of local women; 4) increased vulnerability of those who are already vulnerable including the elderly, the sick, female-headed households and the poorest households; 5) strengthen of wild animal protection will increase the risks of wild animal / human conflict and hence increase risks for NR management; 6) no high risk but still possible, the risk of poaching.

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

The project will bring significant net positive environmental and ecological benefits in the project area. Through tiger-friendly forest tending activities, the habitat quality of the Amur tiger in the project area will be significantly recovered and improved, and population of main prey (wild boar,

red deer, roe deer and sika deer) will rebound significantly. Key habitats will be recovered and expanded, and the establishment of new protected areas will increase the area under protection. All these will increase the area of suitable habitat for the Amur tiger and its prey population. Thus the current isolated distributional areas of the Amur tiger will connect with each other, extend and expand in stretches to the deep forest of China.

While generating significant environmental and ecological benefits, the project will have impacts on livelihood and production patterns of both local villagers and staff of related forest farms. In fact, although various measures were adopted in the preliminary design for the establishment or extension of NRs in this project in order to avoid land acquisition and house demolishing, it is inevitable that the strict management and protection of natural habitats in this project will influence the surrounding rural communities and the living of those in state-owned forest farms. If these influences are not properly solved or alleviated, they will bring long-lasting pressure and conflicts to the management of reserve, posing a threat to the success of the project.

So far in China, co-management is not commonly used owing to constraints on the conventional management practice. The Bank's support on adopting social safeguard instruments including co-management plans and VDPs (including EMDP) which are based on participation, consultation and mutual understanding among players are expected to be effective ways to ease tension between the reserve and the surrounding communities.

The effect of the project on the local population (including the surrounding villagers, forest farm workers and their families,) is mainly on people's livelihood activities due to strengthening the protection and management of reserves, access restrictions, logging ban and other measures. It is expected that with implementation of the project safeguard instruments, the alternative livelihood mode and pattern could be established and practiced that allow local people to co-exist in a sustainable manner with the NRs.

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

During the project preparation, the design of the protected areas has been carefully defined through comparison of several alternatives so as to avoid the need for relocation of people and minimize the impacts on the livelihood of the people.

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.

A partial environmental assessment report has been prepared by Planning and Design Institute of Forest Products Industry of the State Forestry Administration. The EA reports include an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report and Environmental Management Plan (EMP). A stand-alone EMP has been developed based on the findings of the EIA report. It contains Environmental Protection Guidelines (EPG) for plantation to be followed during preparation and implementation of forests related interventions, Pest Management Plan (PMP), and Environmental Code of Practice (ECOP) for small civil works. The EMP detailed the environmental management and supervision organizations and responsibilities, mitigation measures, training plan, monitoring plan, and budget estimates of EMP implementation. EPG, PMP, and ECOP were prepared as a standalone annex to the EMP. To address the potential adverse environmental impacts of the plantation activities under the project, EPG was prepared. To address the potential impacts caused by small construction activities, an ECOP was prepared. Environmental mitigation measures developed in EMP will be fully incorporated into the bidding documents and contracts of Contractors.

A Pest Management Plan (PMP) was also prepared to guide the application of pesticides for the forest activities. The PMP covers preface, major pest issues, pesticides management methods and their scope of application, and provided recommendations for different situations. It summarizes the IPM approaches adopted by the project, and lists all chemicals that might be potentially needed for the project, which fulfill the Bank's requirement and within the World Health Organization's recommended categories. It describes pesticides management organizations in project areas and their respective responsibilities. It includes a training program, monitoring program and cost estimation for project implementation.

To address the social impacts, a social assessment (SA), a resettlement policy framework (RPF), an Ethnic Minority Development Plan (EMDP) and a Process Framework (PF) were prepared by SFA. These documents were reviewed by the Bank's Task Team including the social specialist and were found satisfactory and in compliant with the World Bank policies.

The SA survey identified and investigated possible impacts by the proposed activities in the project area of both provinces, and found that 8903 persons in 39 communities, including 4559 persons in 14 villages and 4344 persons in 25 forest farms, will be affected mainly on strengthening restriction of access, etc. The main impacts are from prohibiting grazing, collection, cutting, etc. in the NRs. The main measures to minimize and compensate the impacts consist of: income-generated training, greenhouse, ecotourism, study tour, etc. and the total cost is US \$313,000. With the designed measures, the income of the affected would be fully restored. With extensive consultation among affected villages, forest farms, and forest bureaus, the PF identified the possible impacts by the planned strengthening restriction of access to the protected areas (nature reserves- NR) in the two provinces, and concluded that the above mentioned persons will be affected mainly on income decrease from the strengthening of restriction of access. The PF established a framework to further identify the affected villager/individual, as well as potential impacts and possible measures in the project implementation stage. Further, the PF recommended the preparation of a NR Co-management Plan together by village and forest authority, as well as Village Development Plan in the project implementation stage, to achieve the win-win between the communities and authorities.

The EMDP identified three ethnic minority villages, two are Korean villages and one is Korean and Manchu village. A series of consultations campaigns were carried out and found that the three villages broadly supported the project. The potential impacts and their measures were separately identified and explored through participatory planning. The critical impacts relate to the strengthening of access restriction which results to prohibiting grazing, collection, cutting, etc. in the NRs, and their measures mainly rely on: income-generated training, greenhouse, ecotourism, study tours, etc.

Monitoring Arrangement. Internal and external monitoring on implementing the RPF/PF/EMDP were designed and agreed in the relevant documents, including institutional and financial measures to ensure the proper implementation of the documents. Experienced external monitor will be contractually engaged to conduct semiannual monitoring in the project areas and the report should be submitted to the Bank periodically.

The SFA is responsible for ensuring that the three PPMUs implement the institutional and financial arrangement in the documents, and to on time engage qualified external monitor to conduct monitoring work and submit the Bank the semiannual monitoring reports. The SFA is responsible for enabling preparation and submission of semiannual progress reports on the implementation of the social documents.

The National PCU is located within the State Forest Administration and the three PPMUs are the

Jilin Provincial Forest Department and Heilongjiang Provincial Forest Department, which have no enough capacity for WB safeguard policies. During project implementation, the team will have their capacity strengthened to prepare and implement the project in line with World Bank environmental and social safeguard policies. The PCU and each PPMU will assign a specific staff to take charge safeguard issues and experienced environment and social consultants will be entrusted to assist preparation work related to the safeguard instruments.
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
<p>Key project stakeholders are SFA, Jilin Provincial Forest Department and Heilongjiang Provincial Forest Department, Heilongjiang Forest Industry Group, experts, individual rural residents (households), village groups and communities as well as active NGOs in the project areas. In addition, the existing coordination mechanism (cooperation agreement for the conservation of the Amur tiger) between China and Russia will be supported to help the planning and management of the nature reserves in China and Russia. Through this coordination mechanism, Russian side was consulted in June 2014. The Russian side had no objection regarding the project.</p> <p>Public consultations and information disclosure have been carried out during the preparation of the environmental assessment documents. A combination of expert consultations, questionnaires, and interviews in the project area of influence has been implemented during EA preparation. The consulted people cover different gender, socioeconomic and educational backgrounds, and occupations. The majority of those consulted people expressed strong support to the project. The public concerns have been incorporated either in the project design or in the environmental management or resettlement plan. The full draft EIA/EMP was disclosed locally on March 30, 2015 and is publically available, and also disclosed at The World Bank Infoshop on April 1 2015.</p> <p>Social Side</p> <p>Apart from information distribution in the provinces and local communities by local governments and forest authorities, the project preparation team also conducted extensive consultation among the 39 project affected villages/communities in the process of impact investigation and measure development. Further consultation with and participation by the affected communities will be continuously implemented in the implementation of the RPF/PF/EMDP, as well as in the development and implementation of the NR Co-management Plan, and Village Development Plan.</p> <p>In the case that land acquisition would be needed as part of a project activity, the respective PPMU should prepare a resettlement action plan satisfactory to the Bank.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Mar-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Apr-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
"In country" Disclosure	
China	30-Mar-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	

Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Mar-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Apr-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
China	30-Mar-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Mar-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Apr-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
China	30-Mar-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Mar-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Apr-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
China	30-Mar-2015
<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 Practice Manager (PM) 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 type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" 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 PM? 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 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input 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 Practice Manager?	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 Practice 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 type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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(s):	Name: Garo J. Batmanian	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (SA)	Date: 07-Jun-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Iain G. Shuker (PMGR)	Date: 07-Jun-2015