

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

Appraisal Stage

Report No.: 147170

Date Prepared/Updated: February 12, 2020

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Fiji	Project ID:	P163484
		Parent Project ID:	
Project Name:	Fiji FCPF Carbon Fund Emission Reductions Program		
Region:	EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	Feb. 17, 2020	Estimated Board Date:	N/A
Practice Area (Lead):	Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy	Financing Instrument:	Carbon Finance
Borrower(s)			
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Forests		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower/Recipient			0.00
Carbon Fund - Forest Carbon Partnership Facility-			12.5
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			12.5
Environmental Category:	B-Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):			
Other Decision:			
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?	No		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		
Is this a Transferred project? (Will not be disclosed)	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Fiji is a small island nation in the South Pacific Ocean with a population of 870,000, and an area of 18,000 km² on 332 islands, among which 110 are inhabited. Most of the population lives on two large islands, Viti Levu and Vanua Levu. Just under half of the population live in rural areas and derive part of their livelihood from agriculture, which has been falling in recent years with a rural to urban shift. Fiji is a multi-ethnic society with approximately 800,000 inhabitants, composing of 56.8% of indigenous Fijian people (iTaukei), 37.5% Fijians of Indian descent and 5.7% other ethnic groups. It is the second largest and most industrially advanced economy in the Pacific with substantial services and manufacturing sectors. Its dependence on sugar and garments has declined over time, with tourism becoming the leading sector and currently accounting for about 38% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Centrally located in the region, Fiji also serves as a regional hub for transportation, business, and telecommunications, and houses several important regional institutions.

Fiji is a country that is prone to natural disasters such as cyclones, floods and earthquakes, incurring average annual losses of about 2% of GDP. These losses increase environmental pressures and affect productive investments and service delivery. Vulnerable groups including the poor suffer the most from these shocks. In response, the Government of Fiji (GoF) has identified ‘no-regrets’ options for key sectors, including forestry, that provide both climate mitigation and resilience benefits. The 2012 National Climate Change Policy identified climate change impacts and areas for adaptation and mitigation for a broad range of sectors including forestry, agriculture, marine and fisheries, tourism and infrastructure. For forestry, improving land use planning processes that lead to sustainable forest management and reforestation/afforestation was identified as a key intervention. In 2014 a “Green Growth Framework for Fiji” was formulated and endorsed by the Cabinet aiming to guide the design of a Five -Year Development Plan (2015-2020), recognizing the need to manage population growth and urbanization, unsustainable consumption and resource use and infrastructure deficiency, and impact of climate change and natural disasters. In line with previous policies, the new National Climate Change Policy 2018 - 2030 has the vision of “A resilient and prosperous Fiji, in which the wellbeing of current and future generations is supported and protected by an equitable, socially inclusive, low carbon, and environmentally sustainable economy”. The new Policy states that a sustainable forestry sector remains key priority for Fiji’s national climate change response.

The GoF is committed to mitigating the impacts of climate change and natural hazards. Since 2013 the government’s spending on investments to strengthen resilience has grown fourfold, from F\$ 89 million to F\$ 359 million in FY 2016-17. Fiji has also demonstrated international commitment. It is a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and has been playing an active role in the negotiations, chairing the AOSIS, G-77 groups and the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body of Implementation - SBI. It has also actively participated in reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) negotiations, as a member of the Coalition of Rainforest Nations. In November 2017 Fiji chaired Conference of Parties (COP) 23, becoming the first Small Island Developing State to preside over the conference of parties – the annual round of the ongoing United Nations climate negotiations, held in Bonn, Germany.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Fiji has large forest resources relative to its land area. More than half of the total land area, or about 1.1 million hectares, is covered with diverse types of forests. Native forest of mainly indigenous species constitutes the largest share of Fiji's forest resources, covering 47.5% of the total land area¹. More than 80% of the total land area is under communal ownership and about 90% of the total forest area is owned by indigenous landowners (iTaukei mataqali). With forests covering such a large proportion of Fiji's land area, forest sector governance is very important yet challenging as there are a large number of laws, policies and reform processes relevant to the forest sector and REDD+.

Deforestation and forest degradation are present in Fiji. Fiji has an annual deforestation rate of 1.1%, which is equivalent to losing about 10,000 hectares on average of forests per year². On forest degradation, closed forests areas are decreasing by 7,500 ha and an increase in the area of open forests by 13,790 ha between 1991 and 2010. Forecasts indicate that by 2025 the area of closed forests would stand at 524,476 ha with the open forest area increasing to 483,634 ha³.

Agriculture continues to be the backbone of Fiji's economy and the main driver of deforestation, while commercial logging on the other hand constitutes the main driver of forest degradation. Clearing of forest, particularly for subsistence, semi-commercial and commercial agriculture, predominantly for taro and kava cultivation constitute the main driver of deforestation. Other main drivers of deforestation include conversion of forest lands to pasture for animal grazing, unplanned infrastructure development including construction of roads and dams; urban development and tourism facilities. Conventional logging on the other hand, constitutes the main driver of forest degradation. In Fiji, commercial logging largely follows conventional practices which allows for the removal of all merchantable species. Logging (mainly planned but not always controlled), clearance for agriculture or timber extraction; collection of firewood, and the growth of invasive vine and tree species are the main drivers of forest degradation⁴. A more detailed list of the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation per island is presented in Annex 2 of the PAD.

Fiji REDD+ Readiness process started over a decade ago. In 2009 Fiji started developing its national REDD+ program, with the support of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) project "Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region". One of the first achievements of the national REDD+ process was the development of a national REDD+ Policy in 2010. Fiji continued its REDD+ Readiness process and in 2012 it began developing its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP). The R-PP included all activities necessary for Fiji to achieve REDD+ Readiness. As part of this process, US\$3.8 million were granted in 2015 to finance between 2015 and 2019 REDD+ Readiness activities outlined in the R-PP. An additional financing of US\$ 2 million was approved in February 2018 by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Participants Committee to strengthen and finalize the work underway to further advance Fiji's

¹ Mangroves make up approximately 5% of Fiji's forest. Continual large-scale tourism development and urban expansion along coastal areas have been identified as the main drivers of mangroves clearance. The Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources manages State land including mangroves. Coastal communities are known to harvest mangroves on State land for subsistence purposes (e.g. cremation and firewood) but are not allowed to sell wood collected from mangroves. For the effect of the ER Program, Mangroves are not considered forests and thus, were not included when calculating the FREL.

² University of Hamburg. 2018. Forest Reference Emission Level – Fiji: Reference Period 2006 — 2016. Consultant Report. Hamburg, Germany.

³ Global Forest Resources Assessment Country Reports: Republic of Fiji. 2015. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy.

⁴ Fiji Emissions Reductions Program ERPD. 2019. Government of Fiji.

REDD+ Readiness. As part of its REDD+ Readiness Preparation process, the GoF developed an Emissions Reductions (ER) Program “Reducing emissions and enhancing livelihoods”. The ER Program provides the platform to develop integrated and sustainable land use plans which would contribute to reducing pressure on forests, controlling conversion of natural forests for other land use purposes, and to supporting local livelihoods. Fiji’s Carbon Fund (CF) ER Program will be among the first such programs internationally and the first one in the Pacific region.

The Forestry Department (FD), under the Ministry of Forests (MOF), is the lead agency, national focal point for REDD+, and the implementing agency for the FCPF Readiness and Carbon Funds. The preparation of the ER Program and the REDD+ National Strategy is undertaken by the National REDD+ Unit (housed in the MOF) with support from the REDD+ Secretariat and the Technical Working Groups, as well as the REDD+ development partners, such as GIZ.

Fiji’s proposed ER Program is a part of the Carbon Fund pipeline of ER Programs. Fiji’s ER Program Idea Note (ER-PIN) was accepted in the CF pipeline in early 2016 and a Letter of Intent was signed in July 2016 between the World Bank and the GoF for the purchase of up to 3 million tons of ERs from the ER Program. In July 2019, the GoF presented its ER Program to the CF participants. Acknowledging the extensive efforts made by Fiji, and the high quality of the ER-PD the CF participants approved Fiji’s ERPD unconditionally, whereby Fiji was officially accepted into the portfolio of both Tranche A and Tranche B of the CF, and the World Bank, as trustee of the CF, is authorized to negotiate with Fiji the ER Program in accordance with the Emission Reductions Payment Agreement (ERPA) negotiations process and subject to completion of Bank due diligence and final Bank approval. The commercial terms (such as advance payments, retroactive financing, price etc.) included in the ER-PD are subject to subsequent negotiations of the ERPA.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

The proposed project development objective is to make payments to the Program Entity for measured, reported and verified Emissions Reductions (ERs) from reduced deforestation, forest degradation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) at the national level in Fiji and to ensure that paid amounts are distributed according to an agreed benefit sharing plan.

Key Results

The achievement of the PDO will be measured through the following indicators:

- i. Volume of ERs measured and reported by the Recipient, verified by an independent reviewer, and transferred to the FCPF Carbon Fund (ton CO₂eq)
- ii. Payments received by the Recipient from the FCPF Carbon Fund for ERs generated by the ER Program (USD)
- iii. ER payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan

The indicators are designed to reflect the main stages of providing incentives to beneficiaries through ER payments. Indicator (i) measures the aggregate result ERs achieved as results of the efforts made by the different stakeholders participating of the ER Program. Indicator (ii) (payments of ERs), is made on the basis of the ERPA commercial terms agreed between the GoF and the Bank. Indicator (iii) on the other hand indicates if payments received have been distributed following a previously agreed BSP that is designed to provide incentives to program beneficiaries to implement REDD+ activities. The combination of these steps – verification, payment and benefit distribution – form an incentive structure

to reduce emissions. All three steps have been consulted and pre-agreed with program stakeholders and beneficiaries (i.e. the conditions for verification, the terms of the payment and the allocation of benefits) during the design of the ER Program

D. Project Description

The instrument for the operation is carbon finance through an Emission Reduction Payment Agreement (ERPA). By design, ERPA financing is results-based and therefore *ex-post*. As the trustee and delivery partner of the FCPF Carbon Fund the World Bank will make payment for Green House Gases (GHG) emission reductions that are independently verified during implementation. The final price and ER volume will be determined through negotiation between the Government of Fiji and the Bank. As per the international framework for REDD+, Fiji will propose an emissions/removals baseline based on historical rates of change in forest cover and quality (Reference Emission Level) and intends to use their national forest monitoring system (NFMS) established using Readiness funds to measure, verify and report (MRV) future emission reduction during program implementation. Payments under the ERPA will be made upon the independent verification of the emission reductions (a combination of reduced emissions and enhanced carbon sequestration compared with the FRL), and confirmation that safeguard instruments and the Benefit Sharing Plan (BSP) have been properly implemented as per the ER Program monitoring report.

The net emission reductions available for transfer to the CF are estimated at 2.5 million tCO₂e. during the ERPA period. This estimate was calculated after deducting a series of buffers to the ex-ante emission reductions estimates to account for uncertainty and reversal risk. Per the buffer guidelines, a conservativeness factor of 8% deforestation and reforestation, a 15% uncertainty buffer for forest degradation (which relies on so called proxy methods) and a 26% reversal risk buffer were applied to the estimated total expected emissions of the country under the Program. Gross ex-ante emissions reductions for the implementation period were estimated at 3.5 tCO₂e which represents a 43% reduction in emission and enhances removals by sinks from the business as usual estimates of the forest reference level (FRL). As ERPA payments are results-based, the actual performance determined after ER reporting and verification may be higher or lower than estimated.

This operation has two components: a) measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and payment of ERs generated by the project; and b) distribution of the ER payments as per the Benefit Sharing Plan.

Component 1. Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and payment of the ERs generated by the project. The Forest Management Services Division (MSD) under the Ministry of Forests (MOF) is the unit responsible for the measurement and reporting of information relating to greenhouse emissions reductions generated from forest lands as well as safeguards and biodiversity. The MSD will measure annually activity data and report on ERs will take place every other year. The MOF will report to the Ministry of Economy's Climate Change and International Cooperation Division (CCICD). The CCICD will then report monitoring results to the FCPF Carbon Fund. Subject to ERPA negotiations between the GoF and the FCPF, the verification will take place twice during the ERPA period and will be carried out by a third party contracted by the FCPF FMT following the submission of the government monitoring report⁵.

Component 2. Distribution of ER payments as per the benefit sharing plan. The proceeds from verified ER payments will be shared according to an agreed BSP, which is currently being improved. A

⁵ According to the ERPA General Conditions the Monitoring Report means a report provided by the Program Entity setting out the following information on the previous Reporting Period: (i) the number of ERs generated by the ER Program; (ii) the occurrence of any Reversal Event(s); (iii) any inability, in full or in part, to transfer Title to ERs to the Trustee or any Title Contest by any Contesting Party; and (iv) all other data as may be required to be collected and recorded by the ER Monitoring Plan.

draft BSP prepared by the GoF following the Carbon Fund Guidelines has been reviewed by the Bank and FMT, which is being revised incorporating the comments received. A revised advanced version is expected to be ready by February 2020, which will be presented to the FCPF Carbon Fund once endorsed by FMT. Payments from FCPF Carbon Fund will be made to the Ministry of Economy which will then transfer the resources to the MoF, ITAUKI Land Trust Board (TLTB), or Land Bank according to their respective number of beneficiaries (REDD+ beneficiaries under each entity). Distribution of benefits will be made according to a BSP for use of carbon funds proposed by the MSD unit. The Forestry Board approves the plan for the use of carbon funds proposed by Management Services Division (MSD)/REDD+ Unit in consultation with REDD+ Steering Committee, based on the registered REDD+ beneficiaries, lease agreements, and results of MOF monitoring of conservation. The MoF will retain a maximum of 10% (currently a 3% is proposed for the ER Program) for government plus amount needed for incentives for tree planting by communities.

Final allocation arrangements of benefits between the beneficiary groups, as well as the allocation to the Government, will be decided during the elaboration of the BSP through a highly consultative process. An advanced draft of the BSP will be shared with the CF participants for their review and no objection prior to ERPA signature. More information on the type of benefits and beneficiaries, the guidelines and eligibility criteria to participate as a beneficiary in the ER Program, the distribution mechanism and institutional arrangements, among other relevant key aspects of the BSP is available in the draft BSP. An advanced draft of the BSP is expected to be disclosed publicly at the FCPF website and on the REDD+ government webpages in February 2020. While the BSP is expected to contain the general guidelines for benefit sharing the GoF will develop a Project Operation Manual (POM) that will include specific provisions on performance monitoring and verification of activities, and the operational procedures for benefit sharing.

It is expected that GoF will seek retroactive financing dating back to July 2019 and propose three Reporting Periods, with the first period starting in July 2019. The projected payments include interim payments, which may occur based on reported but yet to be verified ERs. The expected delivery of units and payments for the verified ERs is summarized in the following table. Projected payments could change based on the negotiation of the commercial terms of the ERPA.

Table 2. Expected ERs payments per reporting period over the project period. USD \$ million. (Subject to undergoing negotiation between the GoF and the FCPF)

Reporting Period	Payments	Number of ERs delivered (tCO₂e)	Expected disbursements after verification (USD \$)
Reporting period 1: July 2019 - Dec 2020	Payment period 1	300,000	1,500,000
Reporting period 2: Jan 2021 - Dec 2022	Interim payment: Jan 2021 - Dec 2021	NA	1,250,000
	Payment period 2: Jan 2021 - Dec 2022	1,000,000	3,750,000
Reporting period 3: Jan 2023 - Dec 2024	Interim payment: Jan 2023 - Dec 2023	NA	1,500,000
	Payment period 2: Jan 2023 - Dec 2024	1,200,000	4,500,000
Total		2,500,000	12,500,000

The beneficiaries are identified as actors who should receive benefits because of their rights and or contribution to impact delivery of emission removals and reductions (ERRs). In this sense, it understood

as project beneficiaries as those who will receive ER payments in exchange of their efforts to contribute to ERs. Beneficiaries identified across all ER Program activities can be summarized into three main categories including:

- **Owners of the land who consent to a REDD+ lease.** Potential beneficiaries under this category include: i) Private registered landowners (freehold); ii) Land Use Units (Land Bank) in terms of designated land (iTaukei) leased on behalf of the landowning units under provisions of the Land Bank regime; iii) the iTaukei landowning units that lease their land through TLTB (this may be indigenous land, state land or private owned land); and Ministry of Land on account of State Lands.
- **Community Holders of REDD+ Leases who register to adopt ER Program activities.** Potential beneficiaries under this category include: i) Registered iTaukei landowning unit members (as a single unit or in amalgamation with other units) leasing own lands through joint enterprise under TLTB process under lessors' representative trust; ii) Registered iTaukei landowning unit members leasing own land through a trust under TLTB for REDD+ lease provisions, and iii) Potential investors leasing iTaukei land through TLTB, Land Bank or Ministry of Land solely for the purpose of ER Program activities (Investors may be smallholder farmers or companies interested in taking part in ER Program activities on both iTaukei and State land).
- **Members of villages/communities with access rights to lands included in a REDD+ Lease who form a REDD+ Community Trust.** Potential beneficiaries under this category include: i) Other landowning units residing in the same village with no ownership rights to ER Program activities area but have access and user rights; ii) Other iTaukei people classified as "dependants" under section 2 of the iTaukei Land Act (Cap 133) who had separated from the tribe they belong to by descent in same social settings with landowning units; and iii) Other members of the general population in surrounding communities of the ER Program activity area with traditional customary access and/or access and use by arrangement such as tenancy at will or informal "vakavanua" arrangements.

E. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis

The proposed ER Program area for Fiji will comprise the islands of Viti Levu, Vanua Levu and Taveuni. With 1,045,309 ha of forest area on 1,685,742 ha of land, the program covers 90% of the total land mass and 94% of the forest cover in Fiji with critical terrestrial biodiversity. The ER-P accounting area has a population of approximately 734,307 people (86% of the total population). The islands are generally hilly, and the population is often concentrated on coastal plains and undulating rolling hills of peri-urban areas. ER program sites have been selected through stakeholder participatory process. The selected ER program area is facing high risk of forest loss and degradation. It is the area with large communities/settlements at the forest edge, combined with high poverty and known biodiversity hotspots. The uniqueness of the ER program area's biodiversity distinguishes Fiji from all other countries in the Pacific region. Much of Fiji's biodiversity is unique to Fiji. There are 1,769 recorded native vascular plant species in Fiji of which 50% are endemic. Current best estimates suggest that Fijian flora consists of 310 pteridophytes and at least 2,225 seed plants. Over 90% of some insect groups, such as cicadas and marine insects, are all endemic. Out of a total of 27 reptile species, 12 are endemic. Land disputes while not frequent in the ER-P area are becoming more common in some of the villages. The major dispute relates to illegal encroachment by Mataqali from one village on the land of Mataqali from another village that belong to a different clan, but the actual dispute is exacerbated by unclear

demarcation of traditional boundaries. Lack of cadastral surveys of forest land belonging to Mataqali by the TLTB has exacerbated this problem

Approximately 63% of the population of Fiji is indigenous, known as iTaukei. More than 80% of the total land area⁶ is owned by iTaukei under communal ownership arrangements through traditional landowning groups called Mataqali. iTaukei living in remote / rural areas are more dependent on forest resources for food security, and livelihoods such as small-scale agriculture, collection of fuel wood and non-timber forest products compared to lowland and urban dwelling communities. The rights of iTaukei customary landowners are protected under national law. iTaukei land is inalienable. However, iTaukei landowners can lease their customary lands with government support and a benefit sharing mechanism to distribute rental payments equally amongst Mataqali is in place. Although female and male Mataqali members share equal land rights and equal payment benefits, dialogue around land tenure tends to be male-dominated. It would be important to ensure that the role of women in decision-making about land use, resource management and benefit sharing arrangements is mainstreamed in ERPD implementation. Furthermore, mechanisms are needed to ensure all Fijians (including those of Indian descent) participate in and benefit from policy developments.

REDD+ activities will be implemented on sub-national scale across 20 priority Districts in the ER Program area, for example, District Level integrated land use planning, or community projects which are supported and administered by government and partners on a larger congregative level. The selection of priority project areas has been and continues to be based on REDD+ eligibility, carbon impact, biodiversity and livelihoods impact, and the interest of the owners and users in joining the program.

- **Component 1:** Strengthening Enabling Conditions for Emission Reductions
This component involves Integrated District Land Use Planning to promote integrated landscape management and strengthening forest governance and law enforcement. It also aims to invest in an improved forest information system to support forest sector planning and decision making.
- **Component 2:** Promoting integrated landscape management
This is the core component of the ER-P and will have the largest contribution to the reduction of emissions and enhancement of removals by sinks. It will focus on:
 - i. Sustainable natural forest management contributing to reduction of forest degradation;
 - ii. Afforestation and reforestation; and softwood and hardwood plantations contributing to the enhancement of forest carbon stocks;
 - iii. Afforestation and reforestation to restore ecosystem services
 - iv. Promotion of agroforestry and enhanced livelihoods contributing to the reduction of deforestation pressure and
 - v. Promotion of forest protection, to conserve and restore natural forests.
- **Component 3:** Program Management and Emissions Monitoring
This component includes the program administration and financial management of the ER-P. It also includes the monitoring and evaluation, safeguards compliance, MRV system, communication and awareness raising programs of the ER-P implementation.

The selection of priority REDD+ activities is based on carbon impact, biodiversity and livelihoods enhancement, and the interest of the owners and users in joining the Program. Activities identified to have a high carbon emission reduction potential include afforestation/reforestation (mainly on unutilized and degraded grasslands), enrichment planting of poorly stocked and/or degraded commercial

⁶ Estimates range from 83 to 88%.

plantations, implementation of Fiji Forest Harvesting Code of Practice - FFHCOP with reduced impact logging in active logging sites, agroforestry and alternative livelihood and protection of indigenous forests under present or potential threat from logging and infrastructure development. The Program will focus on improving sustainable approaches to logging, improving forest governance, introducing climate smart crops and agroforestry – and aim to reduce impact of some of the crops currently driving deforestation and forest degradation in the country such as kava and taro.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Ms. Penelope Ferguson, Sr. Environmental Specialist

Ms. Haddy Sey, Sr. Social Specialist

II. IMPLEMENTATION

Given its diverse geography⁷, Fiji has developed a solid REDD+ governance that includes different structures at the national, regional and site level to ensure effective coordination for the implementation of the Program activities.

Coordination at the national level

45. The Forestry Department (FD), under the MOF, is the lead agency, national focal point for REDD+, and the implementing agency for the FCPF Readiness Fund. The preparation of the national REDD+ program and the REDD+ National Strategy is undertaken by the National REDD+ Unit with support from the REDD+ Secretariat, Technical Working Groups, and international and national consultants mobilized

46. The REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC)'s responsibility is to “coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the Fiji REDD+ program”. The RSC, a multi-stakeholder committee comprised of representatives of the key stakeholder groups identified as being relevant for REDD+, serves to ensure that (i) the multi-sector REDD+ agenda is implemented and (ii) the safeguards identified under Fiji's REDD+ Policy are complied with. The RSC plays both governing and advisory functions as it provides the administrative oversight for REDD+ activities, including the ER Program. The Deputy Conservator of Forests serves as the chairperson of the RSC.

47. Members of the RSC at national level include: the Ministry of Economy (MoE), which acts as the national focal point for UNFCCC and coordinates with the MoF in representing Fiji's REDD+ agenda at international meetings; the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs (responsible for developing and promoting policies to ensure good governance and welfare of the iTaukei); the iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB) (the custodian of iTaukei land in the country); the Ministry of Environment (the national focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)); the Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources (looks after State land including mangroves); the Ministry of Agriculture (the lead agency for the agricultural sector and the national focal point for UNCCD); the Ministry of Provincial Development (responsible for administering government activities at the provincial level). Representatives of non-governmental organizations carrying out REDD+ activities contribute to the development of national-scale Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), provide inputs to guidelines on safeguards, and ensure compliance of national procedures. Private forestry sector (timber industry) plays an important role in reducing forest degradation. Fiji Pine Limited and Fiji Hardwood Corporation Limited support and identify opportunities

⁷ Fiji is administratively divided into 3 divisions, i.e. Northern, Western and Central-Eastern. Under the native hierarchical system, the areas are divided into 3 traditional confederacies, which are further subdivided into 14 provinces. There are 11 townships and 2 cities. The ER-P accounting area hosts 11 of the 14 Provinces.

for REDD+ activities pertaining to plantations. REDD+ iTaukei resource owner representatives ensure that landowners' rights and interests are addressed as most of Fiji's forests are owned by indigenous communities. The Department of Women and The Ministry of Youth and Sports are also part of the RSC.

Coordination at the regional level

The MOF has overseen the REDD+ Readiness program through the REDD+ Unit, which sits within the Management Services Division of the Ministry. At sub-regional level REDD+ activities are supported by REDD+ Divisional Working Groups. Members of the REDD+ Divisional Working Group consist of the Chair Person (designated commissioners), senior administrators of all government agencies involved, private entities, and NGO under REDD+ SC, Conservation Officers at Provincial Council Offices, Forest Wardens, representatives of land care groups (e.g. commodity clusters such as kava and taro), and representatives of forest watch groups.

Coordination at the site level implementation

At the site level, the Forestry Beat Officer will be assisted by the Forest Warden (FW) to lead site-level implementation of activities and will be supported by the Agriculture Extension Officers. Community monitoring will be led by the Provincial Council Chief Executive Officer or Roko Tui and/or Conservation. The FW will be the point of contact for the villages. The FW will work closely with the *Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST)* as well as other voluntary community groups such as the Land Care Groups, the Commodity Cluster Groups.

The FW will be required to report on (a) the progress of implementation of ER Program activities at site level, (b) landowner grievances and issues that require immediate intervention and redress; (c) on opportunities that may arise that strengthens ER Program national position, and (d) advice on most plausible options for efficient implementation and delivery of ER program products and services with the greatest impact. Reports are submitted monthly to the District Divisional Forest Officer who will them to the REDD+ Divisional Working Group.

Safeguards will be coordinated at the National level in the REDD+ Unit of MoF and locally at the Divisional level. Safeguards staff (supported by technical consultants where necessary) will be responsible for screening, scoping and preparing safeguards plans for ERP activities and for training and awareness raising with all stakeholders, consultations, implementation of plans, implementation of the FGRM and monitoring of progress and outputs. An independent third party agency will be recruited to provide monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of safeguards instruments and to prepare reports for the MoF and World Bank.

III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Overall, the project should have positive environmental benefits and the recommended Category is B. Activities associated with the operation aim to promote and encourage improvements in forest cover and composition, which will help to sequester carbon and decrease GHG emissions, protect habitats for biodiversity and improve

	<p>environmental services. 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. Key social risks include: 1) restriction of people's access to forest resources, 2) the inequity of impacts on poorer or vulnerable people (including women) who may have restrictions on access to resources and may not have the ability or means to engage in the process and take advantage of the benefits. The process framework will be used to mitigate such impacts; 3) changes in livelihoods and levels of incomes from the introduction of land use planning, climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods, forest conservation and formalized protection of forest areas; 4) land boundary conflicts; 5) women and vulnerable not being part of decision making; and 6) inaccurate expectations of the monetary and non-monetary benefits from the ER Program. Environment risks include: 1) potential conversion of high value forests and other habitats from climate smart agriculture and plantation forestry; 2) loss or decline of soil fertility from intensive agriculture; 3) further invasion of pest species where areas are left fallow or forest disturbances occur; 4) contamination from pesticide use for controlling agricultural pests and invasive species; 5) degradation of other habitats following restrictions on forest use and / or forest conservation</p> <p>A Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) has been prepared along with an Environmental and Social Management Framework and Gender Action Plan. The ESMF has processes and implementation arrangements to ensure that adverse environmental, social, and gender impacts are identified early, avoided or appropriately mitigated and/or compensated for. The specific approaches include (i) procedures and methodologies for the environmental and social assessment, review, approval and implementation of ERP interventions including</p>
--	---

		the benefit sharing plan; (ii) specific roles and responsibilities, and outline the necessary reporting procedures, for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to program interventions; and (iii) the training, capacity building and technical assistance needed to successfully implement the provisions of the ESMF. The safeguards instruments have all been finalized and cleared.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>This policy is triggered given that the ER Program will work within a variety of terrestrial habitats.</p> <p>The Program intends to protect and enhance conservation of biodiversity and has integrated the priorities of the national biodiversity strategy into the Program (such as formalizing a number of conservation areas). The ER Program will not involve the conversion of critical natural habitats. The ESMF contains provisions to screen and assess possible impacts prior to any actions being undertaken on the ground following OP4.01 This policy will ensure that the interventions in the ER-P area considers 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 provinces 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	This policy is triggered because most actions and specific activities under the ER-Program will be implemented in areas characterized by forest ecosystems. The overall program objective includes reduction of deforestation and forest degradation and interventions are expected to have significant positive impacts

		<p>on the health and quality of forests. This policy is triggered also due to the potential changes in the management, protection, or utilization of natural forests or plantations that could arise from the program. The proposed 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 are included in the ESMF.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>This policy is triggered since it is conceivable that some forestry, agricultural and livelihood activities supported by the ER-Program might involve the use of pesticides. Impacts and risks of any potential use of chemicals in forest management and other activities, if needed, will be mitigated through actions in the ESMF.</p> <p>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 chemical pesticides.</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	<p>This policy is triggered since some village and forest areas where ER-Program activities will be implemented might be considered important cultural, spiritual, archaeological and historical places. Many activities will be carried out by communities on their own custom land, where they are also custodians of their own heritage and cultural resources. However, in cases where there may be risks of damaging or destruction of Physical Cultural Resources, the ESMF contains measures to ensure the appropriate measures are adopted in order to screen, avoid and protect them.</p>
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The Emission Reductions Program is likely to generate significant social benefits to include benefits for Indigenous Peoples where the ERP program implementation will occur predominately on the customary lands of Indigenous Peoples (referred to as iTaukei). The application of this policy will ensure that</p>

		<p>consultations regarding ERP interventions are culturally appropriate and inclusive, and provide evidence of broad community support for REDD+ activities on their lands. The REDD+ Unit will continue to consult with iTaukei and non- IPs (mainly Fijians of Indian descent) to ensure that they participate in, and benefit from REDD+ activities in a culturally appropriate way and that adverse impacts on them are avoided, or where not feasible, minimized or mitigated. As a key process to ensure this policy requirement, Free, Prior and Informed Consent consultation will be conducted with affected iTaukei and their broad community support to the project would be ascertained.</p> <p>An Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework has not been prepared as the majority of beneficiaries will be Indigenous Peoples. Elements of an Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework have been incorporated into the ERP, ESMF, RPF and PF. The ESMF includes provisions for ensuring that the design of ERP activities would integrate the elements of project-specific Indigenous Peoples Plan.</p> <p>A Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for the ER Program area has been developed, to receive, identify and resolve concerns and grievances. The FGRM is developed in compliance with Fiji's laws and fully encompasses the need for free, prior and informed consent of not only affected indigenous iTaukei peoples but also the Indo-Fijians. The FGRM will built on the local customary grievances used</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>With the proposed interventions in the ER Program, potential impacts, including scale and scope of potential land acquisition, economic or physical displacement or restriction of access to natural resources, remains unidentified at this stage. 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.</p>

		A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared which spells out 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). There is higher potential for an involuntary restriction of access (for example, NTFPs/ fuelwood collection) to designated production and protected areas 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 and a benefit sharing agreement mechanism for natural resources use.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The ER Program activities will not involve the construction of, nor will be affected by, new or existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Project will not affect international waters.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Project will not involve disputed areas.

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:

The purpose of the ER Program is to promote a reduction in the rates of deforestation and degradation as well as measures to protect and conserve forests. Therefore, the impacts are expected to be mostly positive. As forest cover improves so will the associated benefits associated with forests, including healthier natural habitats, not only as a sink for carbon but also for the many environmental/social 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.

Environment:

The environmental risks identified in the SESA are: 1) potential conversion of high value forests and other habitats from climate smart agriculture and plantation forestry; 2) loss or decline of soil fertility from intensive agriculture; 3) further invasion of pest species where areas are left fallow or forest disturbances occur; 4) contamination from pesticide use for controlling agricultural pests and invasive species; 5) degradation of other habitats following restrictions on forest use and / or forest conservation. The careful design of the project activities would avoid any project activities to the extent possible that could potentially lead to any further degradation or conversion of the high value forests or other habitats. Risks will be mitigated by detailed screening and scoping of environmental risks during the development of the ER Program activities and the benefit sharing plan and site-specific / risk-specific management plans implemented and monitored throughout the implementation period.

Social:

The key social risks identified in the SESA and Gender Action Plan are: 1) the restriction of people's access to forest resources, 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; 2) the inequity of impacts on poorer or vulnerable people (including women) who may have restrictions on access to resources and may not have the ability or means to engage in the process and take advantage of benefits. The process framework will be used to mitigate such impacts; 3) changes in livelihoods and levels of incomes from the introduction of land use planning, climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods, forest conservation and formalized protection of forest areas; 4) land boundary conflicts; 5) women and vulnerable not being part of decision making; and 6) inaccurate expectations of the monetary and non-monetary benefits from the ER Program. Risks will be mitigated through the use of the ESMF Process framework as well as extensive and ongoing consultations and engagement activities to raise awareness and allow the full engagement and contribution of beneficiaries and potentially affected people in the ER Program activities and Benefit Sharing Plan (BSP).

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

There is anticipated to be an increase in the forest cover in Fiji and a reduction of CO₂e emissions as a result of the project. Land use may be more sustainable in the long term due to the integrated land use planning process and the 20 Land Use Plans proposed as outputs of the project.

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

No project alternatives were considered relevant. Avoidance and minimization of impacts has been incorporated into project design.

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. A

BSP has been prepared. These measures are designed to ensure indigenous iTaukei and non iTaukei Indo-Fijians have the same opportunities to derive benefits from the ER Program. 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 – SESA: Given the types and locations of the proposed activities and the nature of the environmental and social issues in 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, environmental and gender concerns into the decision-making process REDD+; and to enhance the country's safeguards institutions 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 Environmental and Social Management Framework – ESMF: 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 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.

Environment:

The ESMF provides guidance for some key mitigation measures including: Mitigation of pest and disease; soil erosion and loss of soil fertility; loss of biodiversity, invasive species; Implementation of landscape level land use planning and compliance to the landscape plantation plan; and 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) would be applied with primary reliance on prevention, early detection, damage thresholds, and design, mechanical and biological control methods rather than chemical pesticides. The program would not allow the use of pesticides that are unlawful under national and/or international laws; would not allow the procurement or use of pesticides and other chemicals specified as persistent organic pollutants under the Stockholm convention.

Mitigation of loss of biodiversity and habitat fragmentation: Strict implementation of regulations on monitoring possible conversion of forests and actions to be taken to ensure the non-conversion of natural forests for other land use purposes, including degraded natural forests to plantations; Ensure effective implementation of the BSP.

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.

Application of the safeguards of the ER Program:

Bank's safeguards policies apply to the entire ER Program 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 Ministry of Forests (MOF) as the Program Entity and the project owners. The MOU will cover background of the ER Program and the project, and, commitment to compliance with the safeguards of the program, implementation arrangement, and monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. Alternatively, if bilateral donor's safeguards are considered for use under the ER program, MOF 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 project effectiveness. Min. of Forests will also conduct a due diligence to assess if the donor's safeguards are properly applied. If the due diligence concludes that the bilateral donor's 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 ER Program area and contributing to the achievement of it objectives, they need to adopt and implement safeguards of the Program. For similar projects that are financed by the Bank they need to follow their own safeguards requirements which are relevant to the ER Program.

Social

Resettlement Policy Framework – RPF: An 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/subproject 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 before payments are released. 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 – PF: There is potential for an involuntary restriction of access (for example, NTFPs/ fuelwood collection) to legally designated production and protection forest areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of affected persons. A 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 and with a benefit sharing agreement mechanism for the natural resources use. The purpose of the PF is to establish a process by which communities potentially affected by restricted natural resource access 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.

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 Fiji's laws and that it fully encompasses the need for free, prior and informed consent of not just affected indigenous iTaukei peoples but also the non iTaukei Indo Fijian peoples. The ESMF includes an FGRM to provide the framework within which complaints about safeguards and benefit sharing compliance can be handled, grievances will be addressed, and disputes will be settled quickly. As part of overall implementation of the subproject, the FGRM will be established by Environmental and Social Unit of the ER Program Provincial level Program Management Units (PPMUs). 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 FGRM include, procedures for submission of complaints and grievance resolution, responsible person, and contact information. The complaints could be received in verbal or writing forms, by telephone, fax, or email. They could be sent to the local authorities, 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 FGRM also refers to the WB's Grievance Redress Service (GRS) and 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 noncompliance 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.

Benefit Sharing Plan – BSP: 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) iTaukei Land owners; who consent to a REDD+ lease; ii) Holders of REDD+ Leases who register to adopt ER-P activities and; iii) Members of villages/communities with access rights to lands included in a REDD+ Lease who form a REDD+ Community Trust. 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 encourages active participation of all relevant stakeholders at different levels to contribute to the ER targets. The BSP design is based on best practices such as: linking with other ongoing initiatives, best use of existing institutional arrangement such as TLTB and Land Bank and capacity building. The BSP describes both the stakeholder functions and the conditions for accessing benefits.

Safeguard Implementation, Monitoring, and Training: As the Program Entity, the MOF through its central level Program Management Unit (CPMU) supported by the Provincial level, Program Management Units (PPMU), will be responsible for implementing and monitoring the program environmental and social safeguard instruments (ESMF, RPF, 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. Close consultation with WB on specific issues will be maintained. At the field level the BSP will be included in PMU implementation of ER programs and communities

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 Min. of forests 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 the 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 MOF 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 timetable 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.

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 safeguards program document, SESA, ESMF, RPF, and PF, relevant stakeholders – sectors engaged in land use at national and provincial levels, NGOs, faith-based organizations, women's organizations etc have been consulted. The ESMF, RPF, 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 July 2017, although for the past two years there have also been consultations of an iterative nature. Consultation sessions on the ESMF at provincial level occurred in all three provinces up to and including mid-September 2019. Prior to the additional consultation held in 2019, detailed consultations were also undertaken during 2018 and 2019 and were specifically used in the development of the ESMF. Consultations with

relevant stakeholders on the RPF and PF were conducted from June/July 2019. Inputs from these consultations were used in updating of the ESMF, RPF and PF. The feedbacks from the various consultations have been incorporated into the program design and the final draft of the program safeguard instruments. The final environmental and social safeguards instruments recently cleared by RSA will be disclosed locally and at the Bank Operation Portal shortly. The Appraisal Stage Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet of the project will also be disclosed at the Bank's Operation Portal. During program implementation the consultation and participation plan developed by the Central REDD+ unit will be used together with the FPIC guidelines.

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	Nov. 29, 2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	Feb. 6, 2020
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	N.A.
"In country" Disclosure	
Fiji	Feb. 5, 2020
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	Nov. 29, 2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	Feb. 6, 2020
"In country" Disclosure	
Fiji	Feb. 5, 2020
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	Nov. 29, 2019
Date of submission to InfoShop	Feb. 6, 2020
"In country" Disclosure	
Fiji	Feb. 5, 2020
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:	
N/A	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats						
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP 4.09 - Pest Management						
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources						
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or 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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Anis Wan
Title: Senior Operations Officer
email: awan@worldbank.org

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Title: Director, FCPF National Focal Point, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Forestry
 Telephone: +679-3301-611
 Email: Semidranibaka@gmail.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):	Anis Wan	<i>Anis Wan</i>	<i>02/13/2020</i>
<i>Approved By:</i>			
Safeguards Advisor:	<i>Ekaterina Romanova on behalf of Peter Leonard</i>	<i>Peter Leonard</i>	<i>02/13/20</i>
Practice Manager:	Ann Jeannette Glauber	<i>Ann Jeannette Glauber</i>	Date: 17 Feb 2020
Country Director	Michel Kerf	<i>Michel Kerf</i>	Date: 25 Feb 2020