

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)**

**Appraisal Stage**

Report No.: 149159

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 12-Apr-2020

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Vietnam	<b>Project ID:</b>	P162605
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P124584
<b>Project Name:</b>	North Central Region Emission Reductions Program (P162605)		
<b>Region:</b>	EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	08-Apr-2019	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	15-Jun-2020
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy	<b>Financing Instrument:</b>	
<b>Borrower(s)</b>	Socialist Republic of Vietnam		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Carbon Fund			55.40
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			55.40
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B-Partial Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>			
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**B. Introduction and Context**

**Country Context**

Vietnam has experienced rapid and inclusive economic growth since the early 1990s. The political and economic reforms (Doi Moi) launched in 1986 have transformed the country from one of the poorest in the world, to lower middle-income status within a quarter of a century. Vietnam's per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth since 1990 has been among the fastest in the world. Vietnam's

economy has weathered recent turbulence in the external environment, reflecting resilient domestic demand and robust performance of export-oriented manufacturing. As of 2016, the population of Vietnam was 92.6 million people and the GDP USD 202 billion (GSO 2017). Social outcomes have improved dramatically across the board, with the fraction of people living in extreme poverty dropping from more than 50 percent in the early 1990s to 3 percent today. Despite considerable economic progress, high levels of poverty are concentrated in the forest areas where livelihoods depend on natural resources for subsistence. Ethnic minority groups make up 15 percent of the population, but account for more than half of all poverty.

The forestry sector timber industry play an important socioeconomic role in terms of job creation, income generation, and livelihood support for about 24 million people, especially poor and ethnic minority population living in and around forests in Vietnam. Forestry wages are an important income source in rural Vietnam employing about 300,000 persons full-time in the forestry sector and about 3,000 mostly small- and medium-sized wood processing enterprises. In addition to timber, forest resources and the services they provide are critical to the livelihood of many rural Vietnamese by helping to provide incomes, serving as a safety net during times of crises by contributing significant proportions of food and nutrition, and reducing environmental risks such as flooding and erosion.

Forests are at the core of Vietnam's international climate change commitments. Vietnam's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) was submitted to the UNFCCC in 2015. It entails an eight percent reduction of GHG emissions by 2030 (and 25 percent with external support) compared to the Business-As-Usual (BAU) scenario and an increase of forest cover to 45 percent. Commitment to addressing climate change and environmental protection is enshrined in the national constitution and has the support of the Communist Party and the Prime Minister. Climate change is mainstreamed into national development plans, which strongly promote improvements in forest management, conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. The recently endorsed National REDD+ Action Program 2017-2030 provides a framework of priorities for REDD+. For Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF), the scheme targets 20 percent reduction in GHG emissions (compared to 2005 levels). Vietnam is the first country in Asia to implement a national payment for environmental services (PFES) program.

### **Sectoral and Institutional Context**

Vietnam has moved away from a period of forest conversion and towards forest protection and sustainable forest use. Between 1943 and 1993 much of the country's forests were cleared, with forest cover declining from an estimated 43 percent to 28 percent. Since then forest cover has increased to 41.6 percent (13.8 million ha) of the total land area in 2012. Plantations (3.4 million ha) and natural regeneration (10.4 million ha) have helped to increase the total forest, with the 5-million-hectare forest program promoted by the central government significantly contributing to increase in forest cover by 2.45 million ha between 1998 and 2010. The forests are predominantly in the central highlands and northern mountains, and are classified into production, protection and special use forests.

The focus on afforestation mainly for wood supply, however, meant that while total forest extent increased, forest quality declined, and mangrove forest decreased. Primary forest is estimated to account for only 7 percent of total forest areas. Degraded secondary forests, which are extremely prone to fires, account for nearly 70 percent of the total forest area. Deforestation of mangrove and coastal forests over the past six decades, for land for shrimp production, infrastructure development and agricultural expansion, has deteriorated natural coastal defenses including mangroves and coastal forests with resulting implications for the effectiveness of dykes and reduction of coastal resilience. The ability of forest-dependent communities and other sectors of the economy to harness ecosystem services for livelihoods and incomes has declined.

Vietnam's 2006-2020 Forestry Development Strategy, articulated a broader vision for forests that focuses on delivering a wider set of ecosystem services that promotes sustainable development, livelihoods and growth. With this strategy, the Government has set objectives to increase the contribution of forestry to GDP from 1.2 percent in 2005 to between 2 and 3 percent by 2020, generate two million more forest-related jobs, and improve forest-based incomes. The Government in its 2016-2020 Socio-Economic Development Plan adopted a forest area target of 45 percent (15.1 million hectares) by 2020, which, if achieved, would support the aforementioned objectives. There is notable room for improvement in the performance of the forest sector of Vietnam in terms of governance and socioeconomic development. There have also been growing efforts to decentralize forest management, including through policies allocating forest land to households and individuals.

A new Forestry Law passed in November 2017 contains several elements that are crucial for the effective implementation of REDD+. The new forestry law reflects changes in forest management to help address Vietnam's increasing forest degradation and decline in numbers of wild species of fauna and flora. This has made revisions in the following areas: 1) strict management of conversion of natural forests except for security purposes (e.g., the Prime Minister will make the decision on any case of conversion - in the past, Provincial People's Committee could make this); 2) logging in natural forests can only be permitted if forests are certified Sustainable Forest Management (SFM); 3) focus of forestry as environmental services and limited logging from natural forests; 4) promotion of forestry business; 5) improve forest tenure to clearly identify forest owners/users; 6) national forestry planning; and 7) control of forest products through VPA/FLEGT and multi-sector engagement.

The new Law provides for strengthened forest governance and clearer laws on how to deal with deforestation with more emphasis on involving local communities in protection. It supports the Vietnam Timber Legality Assurance System and includes the issuance of the criteria, processes, procedures and competence on classification of the enterprises engaged in the harvesting, transportation, consumption, processing and checking of the legality and origin of forest products. It also stresses that forest ownership institutions must more closely follow the Civil Code 2013 (the constitution) and forests can now be preferentially allocated to ethnic minorities, households, individuals and communities with manner, customs, culture, beliefs and traditions which are closely attached to forests with more emphasis on sustainable forest management. The new Law will help State Forest Companies (SFCs) improve their forest management tasks. With the Government's roadmap to restructure these SFCs, some 500,000ha of forests as the result of restructuring will be re-allocated to households (Government Decree 118).

The National Target Support Program on Sustainable Forest Development is one of the country's key national target support programs approved by the Prime Minister. The program aims to improve the capacity and quality and uphold the value of each forest category, contributing to reducing natural disasters, protecting the ecological environment, responding to climate change, creating jobs and increasing incomes, reducing poverty and improving livelihood for local people. The program is implemented during the 2016-2020 period with three key tasks, including protection of forest and preservation of nature; development and improvement of forest capacity and quality; and enhancement of value-added forestry products. It also promotes the establishment of the Vietnam Forest Certification Scheme Program. Some 15% of the degraded forest ecosystem will be recovered and preserved. With Government's committed budget of over USD410 million in capital investment over the period of 2016-2020, the program aims to increase the forestry production value from 5.5% to 6% per year, the national forestry coverage of 42%, the forest area of 14.4 million ha, the value of timber and forest exports of US\$8-8.5 billion and maintain 25 million jobs.

Forests in Vietnam have the potential to support livelihoods, enhance resilience to climate change, and contribute to Vietnam's commitments to reduce GHG emissions. The wood industry in Vietnam contributed about 3 percent to national GDP in 2013 and can be a significant source of revenue to provinces. Trade of non-timber forest products can also be a key source of income for rural communities with recent analysis showing about 10 percent of income is derived from forests. Vietnam has demonstrated potential to generate finance from ecosystem services under PFES schemes. PFES helps finance watershed protection to support hydropower, clean water supply and to maintain landscapes that support tourism. From 2011 to the mid-2014, provincial level forest funds for PFES received around USD 157 million. A co-benefit of improved forest management is a reduction in Vietnam's GHG emissions. Vietnam's NDC estimates that forest land can be a major sink for carbon with emission reductions of 53.1 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e by 2030. The approach of managing forests for a diversity of services supports low carbon livelihood development and positions forest as an integral component of Vietnam's green resilient growth and development objectives.

### **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

#### **Development Objective(s)**

The Development Objective of the Project is to make payments to the Program Entity for measured, reported and verified Emissions Reductions (ER) from reduced deforestation, forest degradation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) in the North Central Region of Vietnam and to distribute ER payments according to an agreed benefit sharing plan.

#### **Key Results**

- (i) Volume of CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Reductions measured and reported by the Program Entity, verified by a Third Party, and transferred to the FCPF Carbon Fund (tCO<sub>2</sub>e). The net ex-ante estimated GHG emission reductions is 19.5 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e (after discounting for measurement uncertainty and reversal risk) which would be potentially transferrable to the FCPF Carbon Fund
- (ii) Payment by the FCPF Carbon Fund for CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Reductions generated by the NCR-JERP (USD). For the financial analysis of the program, a unit price of USD5/tCO<sub>2</sub>e was assumed, which would yield an estimated USD 55.4 million in payments during the term of the ERPA; and,
- (iii) Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan.

### **D. Project Description**

This operation has two components: (A) Verification of and payment for measured and reported ERs generated by the Government's NCR-JERP; and (B) Distribution of the ER payments according to a BSP.

Component (A): Verification of ERs. The basis for payments under the ERPA are verified ERs reported by the Program Entity. In the ER-PD accepted by Carbon Fund Participants in February 2018, Vietnam detailed an approach to measure emissions in the NCR going forward. This approach is consistent with how baseline emissions were estimated and was rigorously assessed by an independent Technical Advisory Panel against the requirements stipulated in the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework. The Program Entity is proposing to submit three ER Monitoring reports during the term of the ERPA, which will trigger an independent verification using the same pre-agreed technical standards in the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework, respectively. The verified volume of ERs, combined with the negotiated unit price agreed in the ERPA, will then translate into corresponding payments. As part of this transaction ERs will be transferred from the Program Entity to the FCPF Carbon Fund via a centralized carbon registry managed by the Climate Change Group.

The Government's NCR-JERP comprises a combination of policy actions, improvements in forest management practices and measures to reduce pressure of forests from other sectors, notably agriculture. The specific program activities are largely financed through long-standing Government programs and include a number of donor-financed projects. The Bank ? through the ER payments ? will provide complementary financing. The NCR-JERP will work across key land use sectors to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and encourage forest rehabilitation and sustainable forest management.

The NCR-JERP will support a combination of enabling conditions and sector and cross-sectoral activities, with a focus on the forest and agriculture sectors. The four inter-related components of the NCR-JERP are: 1) Strengthening enabling conditions for REDD+; 2) Promoting sustainable management of forests and carbon stock enhancement; 3) Promotion of climate-smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people; and 4) Program management and emission monitoring.

Component (B): Benefit sharing. The proceeds from verified ER payments will be shared according to an agreed BSP (see Annex 12), designed based on the criteria in the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework and in a manner that is acceptable to the Bank. This BSP is based on the principles described in the ER-PD accepted by Carbon Fund Participants and describes distribution mechanism, funds flow and rules of allocation of proceeds to agreed beneficiaries. At the time of ERPA signing, an advanced draft BSP needs to be submitted by the Government. A final BSP is required prior to the first payment (if a final BSP is not provided at the time of ERPA signature, it becomes a condition of effectiveness of the ERPA). As per the ERPA General Conditions , the Program Entity shall share a significant part of the Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits achieved in connection with the implementation of the NCR-JERP with relevant stakeholders.

**Component Name:**

**Comments ( optional)**

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

The proposed ER-P Accounting Area encompasses the entirety of the North-Central Agro-Ecological Region, including the six provinces of Thanh Hoa, Nghe An, Ha Tinh, Quang Binh, Quang Tri, and Thua Thien Hue. The region is bordered to the north by the North West and Red River Delta Agro-Ecological regions, and by the Southern Coastal Agro-Ecological Region to the South. The North Central Region (NCR) comprises the mountainous hinterland of the Northern Annamites, separating Vietnam from Lao to the West, and a narrow coastal plain along the margins of the East Sea. The ER-P area has a high population in the eastern coastal plain and with more sparsely populated and forested areas in the mountains of the Northern Annamites. It contains most of the country's remaining broadleaf evergreen forest, and a number of sites with globally important levels of biodiversity. Natural forest covers 2.1 million ha, which is 41% of the total accounting area. Most of this is evergreen broadleaf forest (EBF). The largest portion of natural forest is poor EBF (1.3 Mha), followed by EBF of medium quality (526,394 ha) and rich EBF that covers only 167,988 ha (4% of the accounting area). Other forest makes up 152,936 ha. This includes bamboo forests and mangrove forests which cover only about 1,500 to 2,000 ha. Plantations cover 749,627 ha, making up 12% of the accounting area. Most plantations are monocultures of Acacia (various species), Melia azedarach, with some pine, and eucalypt plantations.

The region contains some of Vietnam's most notable forests with high biodiversity value. The NCR lies within four of WWF's 200 Globally Important Eco-regions and contains five Endemic Bird Areas (EBA) and 63 Important Bird Areas (IBA) as identified by Birdlife International. The capacity of these forests to provide various environmental services continues to decline. Forest degradation and fragmentation is destroying valuable habitats and putting a large number of already rare vertebrate species at risk of extinction. The landscape of the ER-P includes five internationally recognized conservation corridors, and includes 17 protected areas, 19 important international biodiversity areas, the Western Nghe An UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserve and the Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park UNESCO World Heritage Site. The region supports significant populations of 14 globally endangered or critically endangered species (Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) 2012; IUCN 2013)

#### **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Haddy Jatou Sey( SEAS1 )

Son Van Nguyen( SEAE2 )

## **II. IMPLEMENTATION**

### **III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY**

<b>Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The environmental and social risks from ER Program would arise in the event that the strategies fail to achieve their objectives, thereby creating unexpected direct and indirect adverse impacts on forest, land use, forest dependent communities, and landowner rights. The potential social and environmental impacts of the ER program have been assessed in detail through the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and environmental and social Management Framework (ESMF) processes. which have been completed.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	This policy is triggered as the ER-P will work both within existing protected areas and other forest habitats of varying significance, although it is not expected to involve conversion of critical natural habitats. The ERPD includes activities in SUFs, and High Conservation Value Forests. The ESMF includes provisions to assess possible impacts prior to actions being undertaken on the ground following OP4.01 and Vietnam's environmental assessment legislation. This



		<p>policy will ensure that the interventions in the ER-P area take into account biodiversity conservation and critical natural habitats. During the implementation phase, monitoring activities will be established to ensure that biodiversity and critical natural habitats are not adversely affected and that risk of displacement of forest conversion (planned and unplanned) to regions outside the ER Program accounting area is monitored. This is expected to be kept low due to improved national control on and a reduction in planned conversion of forest to agriculture and plantation tree crops.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>The overall program objective includes reduction of deforestation and forest degradation and interventions are expected to have significant positive impacts on the health and quality of forests. This policy is triggered due to the potential changes in the management, protection, or utilization of natural forests or plantations that could arise from REDD+ and activities may indirectly affect the rights and welfare of people and their level of dependence upon or interaction with forests. The ERPD includes activities affecting management, protection, or utilization of natural forests and/or plantation forests. Potential impacts and proposed enhancement/mitigation measures will be included in the ESMF. Community forest management plans are expected to be prepared during implementation and will conform to OP 4.36 and include use of NTFPs.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>Agricultural and agroforestry practices supported by activities under the ER-Program may involve the use of pesticides for nursery management and possible crop intensification. Impacts and risks of any potential use of chemicals in forest management and agroforestry activities, if needed, will be analyzed and mitigated through actions contained in forest management plans. The ESMF provides guidance on development and implementation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) which provides principles on prevention, early detection, damage thresholds, and design, mechanical and biological control methods rather than</p>

		chemical pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy is triggered as the activities proposed in the ER Program could indirectly affect areas containing sites with physical cultural resources. Ethnic minority (EM) people often have close connection with forest areas, including spiritual connections, it is possible that in isolated cases REDD+ activities could interfere with villager defined sacred forest sites. The ESMF includes procedures and guidance on development and implementation of a Physical Cultural Resources Management Plan.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The OP/BP 4.10 on Indigenous People is triggered. The ER Program area covers the North Central Coast Region (NCC) of Vietnam,</p> <p>The implementation of the Program interventions with PFMBs SFCs and SUFs MB is expected to affect EMs and other forest dependent communities, Program implementation may also catalyze restrictive land zoning processes throughout the area that may put EM livelihoods at some risks. An Ethnic Minority Planning Framework (EMPF) has been prepared in compliance with the Bank's OP/BP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples. The proposed mechanisms will help address the underlying problem of adequate consultations with specific communities in specific locations for proposed interventions through process plans (REDD+ Needs Assessment and a management plan and a Social Screening Report) requiring the development of an impact and mitigation and to avoid or address potential undesirable effects.</p> <p>The EMPF takes into consideration emission reduction interventions that could impact on EM peoples' lands and livelihoods. The EMPF will guide for screening and preparation of site-specific Ethnic Minority Development Plans (EMDPs) during the implementation of the ER Program under the principle of free, prior and informed consultation. Site-specific EMDPs will be developed based on the result of the SESA and free, prior and informed</p>



		<p>consultations (FPIC), and disclosed locally before Program interventions which the EMDP supports start implementation. The EMDPs will be disclosed prior to appraisal for all the sub-projects that will be identified prior to or by appraisal.</p> <p>Extensive consultations with broad community support were carried out during the SESA/ESMF in the ER program. It included the engagement of mass organizations (Fatherland Front, Farmer Association, Women's Union, etc.), NGOs, and CBOs who work on EM supported the consultation process and promoted the meaningful participation of the EMs in the ER Program area. The engagement of all level Committee for Ethnic Minority Affairs (CEMA) were also important. SESA documented where there is such broad community support.</p> <p>A Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for the ER Program area has been development, led by the UN-REDD Program to receive, identify and resolve concerns and grievances. The FGRM is developed consistent with Vietnam's laws and that it fully encompasses the need for free, prior and informed consultation of not just affected EM peoples but also the majority Kinh people. The FGRM is introducing a Grassroots Mediation Group which is supported by Technical Support Group (TSG), further refinement of the FGRM would be done during program implementation.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>With the proposed interventions in the NCC ER Program, potential impacts, including scale and scope of land acquisition, economic or physical displacement or restriction of access to natural resources, remains unidentified. OP/BP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement is triggered to ensure affected persons (including land owners, land users and forest dependent communities and/or individuals) are properly consulted and not coerced or forced to accept or commit to REDD+ activities or other forest management/reforestation activities involuntarily, and that best practice</p>

		<p>approaches as informed by OP/BP 4.12 are adopted.</p> <p>A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared which lays down the principles and objectives, eligibility criteria of displaced persons, modes of compensation and rehabilitation, participation features and grievances procedures that will guide the compensation and potential resettlement of program affected persons. The RPF will guide the preparation of site-specific Resettlement Action Plan (RAP).</p> <p>There is higher potential for an involuntary restriction of access (for example, NTFPs/ fuelwood collection) to legally designated production and protection forest areas and protected areas (special use forests) resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of affected persons. A Process Framework (PF) has been prepared to guide procedures to identify, assess, minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts on local livelihoods by restriction of access. The PF is to ensure adequate consultations with specific communities in specific locations for proposed interventions through the preparation of process plans when working with the management board entities and with a benefit sharing agreement mechanism for the natural resources use. The forest sector already has experiences of this type of process and agreement.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered as the program will neither support the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will it support other investments which rely on services of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The program does not have any investments will be located on international waterways so this policy is not triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Neither the program nor related investments will be located in disputed areas as defined in the policy.

#### IV. 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:**

Environment:

The purpose of the ER-Program is to promote a reduction in the rates of deforestation and degradation by the measures to protect and conserve forests; therefore, the impacts are expected to be mostly positive. As forest cover improves so too will the associated benefits associated with forests, including healthier natural habitats. Not only as a sink for carbon but also for the many environmental services forests provide such as watershed protection, provision of important habitats, sustainable source of NTFP and other forest based livelihoods. However, there would be potential negative impacts associated with implementation of the Program.

The Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and ESMF prepared for the ER program area have identified the following main potential environmental impacts:

**Soil erosion:** Soil erosion can be triggered by poor management practices such as vegetation clearance followed by burning during site preparation; excavation of tree stumps/roots using machines in sloping areas; cultivation, planting and harvesting of agricultural crops on sloping areas; improper construction and poor maintenance of access tracks; soil disturbances during harvesting operations and yarding of logs; cutting/removal of native vegetation along drainage canals and stream banks.

**Loss of soil fertility:** Loss of soil fertility as a consequence of soil erosion as described above, and by the burning of vegetation in site preparation, and removal of biomass in harvesting.

**Pest and disease infestation:** Risk of pest and disease infestation increases with the increasing area of monoculture plantations especially through the use exotic species, such as Acacia which has the potential to bring new pests and diseases. The use of pesticides to control important pests and diseases could have several potentially adverse environmental impacts, including on the health of the workers applying them and community health, and adverse impact on biodiversity.

**Loss of biodiversity and habitat fragmentation:** Impact of smallholder planted forests on biodiversity and habitat will be small to moderate even if little biodiversity remains in small forested areas.

**Invasive alien plants:** It is possible to have invasive alien species in the plantation if agroforestry or NTFP species are introduced without proper control at planting stage. They are one of the greatest threats to biodiversity, impact adversely upon biodiversity, potentially resulting in a decline or elimination of native species - through competition, predation, or transmission of pathogens ? and through the disruption of local ecosystems and ecosystem functions.

**Fire risk:** Risk to plantation damage caused by fire is expected to be minimal, if plantation species are limited to Acacia and Eucalyptus species, which are less susceptible to fire than Pinus merkusii.

Nevertheless, these impacts are localized, short term, moderate and can be mitigated with the readily designed mitigations measures. Therefore, the ER-Program is proposed to be classified as a Category B project.

Social:

The overall approach and design of the program to address the drivers and underlying causes of forest loss and barriers to SFM and forest enhancement is to build on and support implementation of the current ambitious national and sub national policies and initiatives in

the NCC region while at the site-level, an Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach (ACMA) process implemented through a Forest Management Council (FMC) that engages and encourages dialogue between local forest users and the Forest Management Entities (FMEs) to achieve sustainable forest management will be supported. The ER Program will support a combination of enabling conditions for emissions reduction and sectoral activities - with a focus on the forest and agriculture sectors. However, there could be potential negative impacts associated with implementation of the Program. Land tenure, access to resources and livelihoods are consistently cited as the most important social issues identified through the SESA and quantitative survey with relation to the implementation of REDD+ activities in the ER-P area. The Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and ESMF prepared for the ER program area have identified the following main potential social impacts:

**Restriction of Access:** The activities for strengthening and implementing policies controlling conversion of natural forests and forest governance and law enforcement may have the potential for reduced access to forest and NTFP resources for forest dependent communities through improvements to forest governance; possible short term reduction in volume of NTFPs may result in food insecurity or less income for NTFPs that are sold; some possible impacts on livelihoods i.e. improved governance may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas. OP4.12 is triggered and a Process Framework is prepared to mitigate any potential access restriction

**Land tenure insecurity:** ER-P conservation and reforestation interventions could lead ethnic minority households and communities experiencing involuntarily resettlement issues, lose productive land (particularly lands which are customarily used) and/or access to natural resources. In addition, Ethnic minority ancestral or other socio-cultural traditions related to land are not given constitutional or statutory recognition, making their tenure rights insecure in many areas where statutory rights have not been formally recognised. The lack of recognition of customary land rights is considered a safeguard issue

**Clarification of forest and land boundaries through demarcation:** ER activities that support clarification of land boundaries could adversely impact EM and reduce their possibility to use land on an ongoing basis, land boundary and usages of land could result in disputes and could also affect land tenure arrangements OP 4.10 is triggered and an EMPF is prepared to mitigate adverse impacts on EMs

**Polices, Laws and Regulations Framework:** There is no definition of customary rights, limited recognition of community rights and any special rights for ethnic minority peoples and different socio-cultural relations to forest and land management although the 2013 Land Law and the 2018 Forest Law is making good progress in recognizing some of these customs. OP 4.10 is triggered and EMPF is prepared to mitigate impacts on EMs

**Livelihoods and Forest Dependency:** Food security, especially rice, is becoming increasingly problematic and the GoV programs to overcome food insecurity by providing rice for ethnic minority households create passivity and dependency. There is also a high degree of cash income poverty among such households. Their livelihoods are highly land-dependent which is exacerbated by limited access to forest land resources. There is no system of compensation payable for restricting people's access to forest land resources. Firewood from the forests is still a major source of fuel for both most rural households and even many urban households. OP 4.10 is triggered and EMPF is prepared to mitigate impacts on EMs

**Gender/Social Exclusion:** ER activities implementation could resulted negatively on women

in terms of: access to NTFP, access to land, participation in ER implementation, lack of consultations. Women are disadvantaged on access to and use of forest land and their land rights are less secure than those of men's. In particular ethnic minority women have greater need for common property resources, especially related to forests. Their access to information is less than men's and are less likely to be actively involved in consultations. Poor persons irrespective of gender or ethnicity are less likely to receive adequate information. OP 4.10 is triggered and EMPF is prepared to mitigate impacts on EMs

Cultural heritage: ER-P activities proposed in the ER Program could indirectly affect areas containing sites with physical cultural resources. Ethnic minority (EM) people often have close connection with forest areas, including spiritual connections, it is possible that in isolated cases REDD+ activities could interfere with villager defined sacred forest sites. OP4.11 is triggered and mitigation measure are in place to address impacts

Effective consultation and outreach: lack of meaningful consultation and outreach could seriously impacted negatively on EM active participation in the ER implementation, and monitoring. There is no legal provision for BDC/FPIC with adequate numbers of local people, especially ethnic minority people. REDD is a high risk program and people are worried that any payments based on results may or not be paid and are therefore difficult to convince that participation in the ER-P is worthwhile. There has been a lack of 'clarity' and some 'disinformation' and there are a very few CSOs that exist that can offer an independent voice and those that do exist do not employ many ethnic minority people. OP 4.10 is triggered and EMPF is prepared to mitigate impacts on EMs

The issues identified above are not insoluble and the ACMA processes embedded in the Forest Management Councils are designed to ensure that the negative impacts, which stem from existing forest governance issues are addressed and will facilitate very positive outcomes. The ER-P as a standalone program will only incrementally contribute to an overall reduction in poverty but if leverage to also take advantage of existing GoV livelihood improvements will simultaneously contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions while also the livelihoods of forest-dependent households.

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

No long-term adverse impacts were identified during the development of the safeguards instrument.

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

Not Applicable.

**4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.**

As part of the REDD+ Readiness Preparation process of the FCPF Readiness Grant, the SESA for the ER program has been conducted. The ESMF, a main output from the SESA, has also been prepared. In addition, a Resettlement Policy Frameworks (RPF) and a Process Framework (PF) have been developed to address potential involuntary resettlement issues that may occur during the program. An Ethnic Minority Policy Framework (EMPF) has been prepared and includes safeguard measures in relation to Free, Prior and Informed Consultation (FPIC) of Ethnic Minorities in the ER-P area. A Benefit Sharing Plan (BSP) has been

prepared. These measures are designed to ensure ethnic minority people have the same opportunities to derive benefits from the ER Program as non-ethnic minority persons. A Gender Action Plan has also been prepared to promote women participation in the program, share in the benefits, and maximize gender equality.

**Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment.** Given the types and locations of the proposed activities/subprojects and the nature of the environmental and social of the ER program area, the SESA has been prepared to ensure that environmental, social and gender concerns are integrated into the development and implementation processes for ER Program; offer a platform for consultation with and participation of relevant stakeholders to integrate social and environmental concerns into the decision-making process REDD+; and to enhance the country's PRAPs by making recommendations to address gaps in relevant policy and legal frameworks, and institutional capacity to manage environmental and social impacts/risks associated with ER Program. The SESA concludes that environmental and social sustainability of the program will be ensured through improving land-use planning, enhancing security of land tenure and recognizing traditional land management systems, strengthening protection of SUFs and PFMBs, promoting environmentally sound forest management, applying socio-economic plantation development guidelines, and involving all stakeholders including ethnic groups and women in planning and forest management.

**The Environmental and Social Management Framework.** The ESMF has been prepared to ensure that activities to be financed under the ER Program would not create adverse impacts on the local environment and local communities, and that the residual and/or unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated. The ESMF establishes the modalities and procedures to address potential negative environmental and social impacts from the implementation activities identified in the ERPD (and PRAPs), including the screening criteria, procedures and institutional responsibilities. The specific process in the ESMF includes: (i) clear procedures and methodologies for the environmental and social assessment, review, approval and implementation of interventions to be financed under the program; (ii) appropriate roles and responsibilities, and outline reporting procedures, for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to program interventions; (iii) the training, capacity building and technical assistance needed; and (vi) a budget to successfully implement the provisions of the ESMF.

The ESMF provides guidance for some key mitigation measures including:

**Mitigation of soil erosion and loss of soil fertility:** Implementation of landscape level planning in each participating village and compliance to the landscape plantation plan and design must be strictly monitored. Forest cover must be maintained on very steep slopes, watercourses and ridge crests. Harvesting of wood and other forest plantation products must be done in a manner to minimize soil disturbance.

**Mitigation of pest and disease infestation:** Integrated Pest Management (IPM) be applied as much as possible with primary reliance on prevention, early detection, damage thresholds, and design, mechanical and biological control methods rather than chemical pesticides; do not allow the use of pesticides that are unlawful under national and/or international laws; do not allow the procurement or use of pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants under the Stockholm convention; and only workers and farmers trained on the safe handling, storage and use of the chemicals can apply pesticides.

**Mitigation of loss of biodiversity and habitat fragmentation:** Strict implementation of regulations on monitoring possible conversion of forests required in the Government Notice



No. 191/2016 on measures to restore sustainable forests to respond to climate change 2016 ? 2020 and the actions to be taken to ensure the non-conversion of natural forests for other land use purposes, including degraded natural forests to plantations and a ban on logging from natural forests; Ensure effective implementation of the Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach (ACMA) as an additional safeguard to prevent the conversion of natural forest. Mitigation of invasive alien plants: Proper selection of species that matches the site and management objectives. Planting of native species in a mixture with exotic, fast growing species should be encouraged. Only native species shall be allowed in SUFs and in the native species areas of the protection forest management area

Mitigation of fire risk: Forest fire prevention and control must be an integral part of the management plan for village or commune plantations which is already an integral part of SUFMBs, PFMBs and SFCs forest management.

Mitigation of impacts by access road construction and maintenance: Proper implementation of Environmental Codes of Practices included in the ESMF.

Policy and regulation development activities: Environmental and social issues will be included in the relevant Terms of Reference (TOR) for the policy and regulation development activities. Public consultation of the proposed policy reforms and assessment of the environmental and social risks and impacts of policy reforms will be conducted.

Application of the safeguards of the ERP:

Bank's safeguards policies apply to the entire ERP irrespective of financing source. The ESMF and other safeguard frameworks provide clear guidance on how to comply with the safeguards of the program. The future projects that are financed by bilateral donors, located within the program area, and contributing to the program objectives need to adopt and follow the safeguards of the program. This can be done by signing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between MARD as the PE and the project owner. The MOU will cover background of the ERP and the project, comment objective, commitment to compliance with the safeguards of the program, implementation arrangement, and monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.

Alternatively, if bilateral donors' safeguards are considered for use under the ERP, MARD will conduct a due diligence to assess if the safeguards of the respective donor at the program level are consistent with the Bank's safeguards policies and requirements of the ERP ESMF before the project effectiveness. For the on-going bilateral donors' projects, in addition to the due diligence above, MARD will also conduct a due diligence to assess if the donor's safeguards are properly applied. If the due diligence concludes that the bilateral donors' safeguards are consistent with the Bank Safeguards policies and that they apply their safeguards policies properly, ER benefit from these interventions can be included in the BSP. For other projects financed by the government budget and located within the ERP area and contributing to the achievement of the ERP objectives, they need to adopt and implement safeguards of the program.

For the similar projects that are financed by the Bank they need to follow their own safeguards requirements which are relevant to the ERP.

## Social

Resettlement Policy Framework:

A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared which lays down the principles and objectives, eligibility criteria of displaced persons, modes of compensation and



rehabilitation, participation features and grievances procedures that will guide the compensation and potential resettlement of program affected persons. The RPF will guide the preparation of site-specific Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). The RAPs for the sub-projects/ intervention activities will be prepared based on the guidance given in this RPF and the Investment report of each local/sub-project intervention. In the period of program implementation, the updated RAP of each sub-project will be prepared when the detailed engineering design has been finished to allow both an Inventory of Loss (IOL) and Detailed Measurement Survey (DMS) of losses and damages and precise identification of affected persons to be conducted. This updated RAP requires clearance from PPC review before payment release. Where impacts on the entire affected population are minor, or fewer than 200 people are affected, an abbreviated resettlement plan will be applied. Where impacts on the entire affected population are significant, or equal to or higher than 200 people are affected, a full resettlement plan will be applied.

#### Process Framework:

There is potential for an involuntary restriction of access (for example, NTFPs/ fuelwood collection) to legally designated production and protection forest areas and protected areas (special use forests) resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of affected persons. A Process Framework (PF) has been prepared to guide procedures to identify, assess, minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts on local livelihoods by restriction of access. The PF is to ensure adequate consultations with specific communities in specific locations for proposed interventions through the preparation of process plans when working with the management board entities and with a benefit sharing agreement mechanism for the natural resources use. The forest sector already has experiences of this type of process and agreement. The purpose of the Process Framework is to establish a process by which communities potentially affected by restricted natural resource access to the protection forest which are under the management authority of an FME engage in a process of informed and meaningful consultations and negotiations to identify and implement means of reducing or mitigating the impact of restricted resource access. The PF provides guidelines for the development of Action Plans during project implementation that:

- ? Define the restrictions of access to natural resources in protected areas;
- ? Identify and quantify the impacts that those restrictions may have on different segments of the local communities;
- ? Propose, implement and monitor remedial measures to compensate for the loss of those assets and the income associated with them;
- ? Provide grievance redress mechanisms in order to resolve any issues that may arise due to restrictions of access to resources over the course of the program.

#### Ethnic Minority Planning Framework:

An Ethnic Minority Planning Framework (EMPF) has been prepared in compliance. The proposed mechanisms will help address the underlying problems identified above. The EMPF takes into consideration emission reduction interventions that could impact on EM peoples' lands and livelihoods. The EMPF will guide for screening and preparation of site-specific Ethnic Minority Development Plans (EMDPs) during the implementation of the ER Program under the principle of free, prior and informed consultation. Site-specific EMDPs will be developed based on the result of the SESA and free, prior and informed consultations (FPIC), and disclosed locally before Program interventions which the EMDP supports start implementation.

A Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for the ER Program area is in place to address potential conflict relating to land/ boundary disputes and any such issues relating to the implementation of the ER activities. The FGRM is developed consistent with Vietnam's laws and that it fully encompasses the need for free, prior and informed consultation of not just affected EM peoples but also the majority Kinh people. The FGRM is introducing a Grassroots Mediation Group which is supported by Technical Support Group (TSG).

#### Benefit Sharing Plan:

The BSP ensures that these carbon benefits are allocated among various beneficiaries at different levels in a transparent, inclusive and fair manner with effectiveness, efficiency, democracy, flexibility and comprehensiveness through proper consultation process with all relevant stakeholders and local communities. The key potential beneficiaries are: i) forest dependent local communities and poor households who are considered to be the most important forest users and are often the most vulnerable to food insecurity; ii) managers of special-use forests, protection forests and production forests (Forest Management Boards and State Forest Companies); iii) private sector companies and cooperatives participating as service providers or project developers and implementing agents; iv) Forest Management Councils (FMCs), Adaptive Collaborative Management Boards (ACM boards) and other relevant parties at local level to support Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), and Feedback Grievance and Redress Mechanism (FGRM); v) Provincial, District and Commune People Committees; and vi) Mass organizations.

The BSP is a framework designed to set key principles while at the same time allowing for some flexibility to meet the national, provincial and local circumstances, and respect the traditional knowledge and culture of local communities in natural resource management. The BSP encompasses a mix of modalities for allocation of benefits, including fixed and variable allocations, either direct or resulting from competitive process. The main modality consists in allocating benefits on a performance basis to the local level through ACMA, which represents 75% of net benefits allocation in a full performance scenario. ACMA is a process which supports a collaborative process approach that is managed by a Forest Management Council (FMC). The FMC is tasked to develop sustainable forest management involving the different Forest Management Entities (FME) and communities that live within and around the boundaries of the FME (these include Special Use Forests - protected areas in Vietnam, Protection Forest Management Boards and State Forest Companies). The ACMA is set up to specifically involve poor forest dependent communities, baselines and information on the status of the communities is collected through: A REDD Needs Assessment (RNA), A Social Screening Report (SSR), and an updated management plan. ACMA is described in the ER-PD and ESMF. ACMA manual of operations is being developed and will allow for regular revisions to meet changing circumstances and progress on the ground. This will ensure the progressive and continuous inclusion of results and lessons learnt into the implementation of the BSP, and ensure that its functioning remains relevant and efficient.

The BSP encourages active participation of all relevant stakeholders at different levels to contribute to ER targets. The BSP design is based on best practices such as: linking with other ongoing initiatives, best use of existing institutional arrangement and capacity building. The BSP describes both the stakeholder functions and the conditions for accessing benefits. The direct allocation is applied to central and provincial level stakeholders dealing with policy development, law enforcement scheme and ACMA functioning, while the performance-based

allocation is applied to local level stakeholders

Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach process:

The ER Program will work through the ACMA process and the FMC which is also a key mechanism in the approach to mitigations as it is based around the interactions of both the communities and the FME which should jointly ensure that plantation establishment follows SFM practices and does not replace natural forests. The ACMA will include a place for dialogues and support for mapping of remaining forest areas, awareness raising and capacity building, linking plantation development to FSC certification, and tying benefit sharing to the protection of natural forests. Furthermore, simple codes-of-practice will contribute towards ensuring viable, sustainable and environmentally compatible plantation management among plantation owners.

Safeguard Implementation, Monitoring, and Training. As the Program Entity, MARD, through its CPMU supported by the PPMUs and the forest management boards (SUFMB and PFMBs) and the SFCs, will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the program environmental and social safeguard instruments (ESMF, RPF, EMPF, RP). At Program level, at least two Program safeguard staff of CPMU will review the safeguard implementation progress, take actions as necessary, and report the results as part of the Program safeguard monitoring report to be submitted to WB on a 6 months and yearly basis. The Program Steering Committee (PSC) and/or the Provincial People Committee (PPC) will be responsible respectively for taking policy actions related to safeguard issues at Program level and subproject levels. Close consultation with WB on specific issues will be maintained. At the field level the ACMA will work with the forest management councils and communities and will be instrumental in coordinating and contributing to implementing collaborative approaches to forest land management, forest protection and biodiversity conservation and reporting. At subproject/activity level, at least two safeguard staff of the subproject/activity owner (PPMUs) will be responsible for monitoring and monthly reporting. Third-party monitoring consultant, which includes environmental and social specialists, will be mobilized by MARD and will be retained until the end of the program. During implementation, appropriate trainings will be provided to CPMU, PPMUs, consultants, local community representatives, and other program stakeholders on the safeguard instruments to be applied to the Program.

World Bank oversight:

During the implementation period of an ERPA Operation, the World Bank has the responsibility for monitoring and ensuring effective implementation and compliance of the Program Entity with agreed management measures. The Bank's primary responsibility for oversight would be to assess whether the environmental and social management systems established by the Program Entity address and respect all aspects of the Safeguard Plans that apply to the ERPA Operation. World Bank's review, approval, and oversight of specific program activities are provided below:

- For the Bank-financed projects contributing to the ER Program, the Bank will retain full responsibility for safeguards compliance and oversight as it would for any other Bank financed activity;
- For the ER Program activities financed by others, the MARD as the Program Entity, together with financiers, would be responsible for ensuring that requirements of applicable safeguards frameworks and plans are addressed and respected. The World Bank would not be responsible for any prior review, clearance, or supervision of such activities. The World

Bank's role would be to undertake periodic assessments to determine whether the agreed safeguards systems are being implemented in accordance with agreements and that these systems are effective in addressing safeguards risks and impacts. This includes confirming aspects such as, adequacy of budgets and staffing to support the implementation of the Safeguards Plans; that the PE can demonstrate credibly that environmental and social assessments and management plans are prepared in accordance with the safeguard frameworks; mechanisms for self-reporting and Third Party monitoring are in place and functional; grievance redress and dispute resolution mechanisms are established and functional; the implementing entities have demonstrated ability to solve issues of non-compliance and so on. The Bank will establish a clear time-table for supervision and implementation support missions. In the early years of an ERPA Operation, oversight would typically need to be robust and conducted regularly to verify that systems are functioning as agreed.

- For activities in the ERPA accounting area which may in some way contribute to emissions reductions but are not part of the ER Program, the World Bank would bear no responsibility for review or oversight either at the transaction or program level.

Grievance and Redress Mechanism (GRM): The ESMF includes a GRM to provide the framework within which complaints about safeguards compliance can be handled, grievances can be addressed, and disputes can be settled quickly. Within the Vietnamese legal framework citizen rights to complain are protected. As part of overall implementation of the subproject, the GRM will be established by Environmental and Social Unit of the PPMU. It will be readily accessible, handle grievances and resolve them at the lowest level as quickly as possible. The key process and elements of the GRM include, procedures for submission of complaints and grievance resolution, responsible person, and contact information. The complaints can be received in verbal or writing forms, by telephone, fax, or email. They can be sent to the local authorities, contractor, construction supervision engineer, PPMU, or the independent environmental monitoring consultants and will be logged in the record system and sent to responsible person for taking action. To facilitate complain process, subproject information leaflets will be prepared and distributed at the subproject sites to provide practical information about grievances to local residents including contacts and addresses.

The GRM also refers to the WB's Grievance Redress Service (GRS) and clearly indicates that program affected communities and individuals may submit their complaints to the WB's independent Inspection Panel which determines whether harms occurred, or could occur, as a result of WB non-compliance with its safeguards policies and procedures. The website address to provide information on how to submit complaints to the World Bank's GRS is also provided.

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

Public Consultation and Information Disclosure.

During preparation of the program document, SESA, ESMF, RPF, EMPF, PF, relevant stakeholders (VNFOREST staff, agriculture, forestry, environment, ethnic minority staff at provincial, district and commune levels, staff in special use forest management boards (SUFMBs) and protection forest management boards (PFMBs), heads of villages and local people of different ethnic groups, NGOs, mass organizations) have been consulted. The ESMF, RPF, EMPF, and PF were prepared based on the results of the ER-PD and the

consultations involved in that process and the SESA process which included extensive qualitative and quantitative consultations. Stakeholders from the household level to the national and international level have been consulted on the SESA. These consultations commenced in October 2015 although for the past three years there have also been consultations of an iterative nature.

Consultation sessions on the ESMF at community level occurred in all six provinces up to and including mid-September 2018. Prior to the additional consultation held in 2018, detailed consultations were also undertaken during 2015 and 2016 and were specifically used in the development of the EMPF and the ESMF. Consultations with relevant stakeholders on the RPF were conducted from May to mid-June 2017. Additional local consultation sessions were conducted in August 2018 in Nghe An, Thanh Hoa and Thua Thien Hue provinces. Inputs from these consultations were used in updating of the EMPF and RPF. The feedbacks from the consultations have been incorporated into the program design and the final draft of the program safeguard instruments.

Draft version of environmental and social safeguards instruments has been disclosed both locally at the PPMUs and program areas, and at World Bank's websites on or before February 2019. The final environmental and social safeguards instruments will be disclosed locally and at the Bank Operation Portal. The Appraisal Stage Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet of the project will also be disclosed at the Bank's Operation Portal.

### ***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Jan-2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	31-Jan-2019
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Vietnam	28-Jan-2019
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Jan-2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	31-Jan-2019
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Vietnam	28-Jan-2019
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Jan-2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	31-Jan-2019
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	

Vietnam	28-Jan-2019
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<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 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 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 4.09 - Pest Management</b>						
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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" 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	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Pest Management Specialist?						
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>						
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"/>
<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 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"/>
<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 Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
500 Provide estimated number of people affected to date, or to be affected.						
<b>OP/BP 4.36 - Forests</b>						
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input 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"/>
<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"/>

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact:Lan Thi Thu Nguyen  
Title:Senior Environmental Economist

Contact:Alexander Lotsch  
Title:Senior Carbon Finance Specialist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:Socialist Republic of Vietnam  
Contact:  
Title:  
Email:

### Implementing Agencies

Name:Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

Contact: Van Ha Nguyen  
Title: Deputy Director General  
Email: ngvanha@yahoo.com

**VI. For more information contact:**

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-1000  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

**VII. Approval**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Lan Thi Thu Nguyen, Alexander Lotsch	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (SA)	Date: 17-Oct-2019
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Christophe Crepin (PMGR)	Date: 17-Oct-2019
Country Director:	Name:	Date: