

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

**Appraisal Stage**

Report No.: 112734

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 7-Feb-2017

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Congo, Republic of	<b>Project ID:</b>	P158604
		<b>Parent Project ID :</b>	P124085
<b>Project Name:</b>	Congo: Additional Financing for Forest and Econ. Diversification Proj. (P158604)		
<b>Region:</b>	AFRICA		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	10-Feb-2017	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	27-Apr-2017
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Environment & Natural Resources	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>GEF Focal Area</b>	Multi-focal area		
<b>Borrower(s)</b>	Ministry of Finance, Budget, and Public Portfolio		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	Ministry of Forest Economy, Sustainable Development, and Environment (MEFDDE)		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			22.60
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			6.51
IDA			9.14
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			38.25
<b>Environmental Category</b>	B-Partial Assessment		
<b>Decision</b>			
<b>Other Decision (as needed)</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		
<b>Is this a Transferred project? (Will not be disclosed)</b>	No		

## **B. Introduction and Context**

### **Country Context**

The Republic of Congo (ROC) is classified as a low middle-income country, largely due to its large oil revenues and small population of 4.1 million, with a recorded GDP of US\$ 8.55 billion in 2015. Located in Central Africa, the country has a wealth of assets that have the potential to build a robust economy and improve the living standards of its population. In the last decade, economic growth rates were high, and on the back of rising oil production, the country posted the second fastest rate of economic growth in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Accelerated development during this time led to major infrastructure projects that opened up previously remote forest areas to economic activity. However, a recent dramatic drop in oil prices has lent urgency to the Government's drive to diversify its economy away from an overwhelming dependence on hydrocarbons. This represents a potential threat to the forest stock, as agriculture, forestry, and mining are among the key alternative sectors identified for development, which can have severe impacts on forests if not carried out responsibly.

### **Sectoral and Institutional Context**

ROC is home to 21.7 million hectares of the Congo Basin forest, the world's second-largest swath of tropical rainforest. With a low historical rate of deforestation (0.052% per annum between 2002 and 2013) and forests covering 64% of the land area, it is a typical example of a High Forest Cover and Low Deforestation (HFLD) country. Maintaining deforestation and forest degradation in such countries at low levels represents an important contribution to achieving the commitments made at the COP21 in Paris to limit the global temperature increase to well below 2°C in a cost-effective manner.

ROC's forests are a source of livelihoods for remote populations and an important reservoir of tropical forest biodiversity. In areas with few formal income sources aside from industrial logging, populations in forest areas conduct slash-and-burn agriculture, are engaged in artisanal timber extraction, collect non-timber forest products, and hunt both legally and illegally. These practices have negative impacts on the forest stock. At the same time, the country houses a diverse range of biomes, ecosystems and habitats, including evergreen forests, semi-deciduous forests, alluvial forests and mangroves. Plant diversity explains a rich fauna, including forest species such as forest elephants, mandrills, Western gorillas, chimpanzees, common duikers, bongos, and buffaloes. The coexistence of growing populations in forest areas with biodiversity while protecting the existing forest stock poses a challenge as poaching for ivory, trophies and bushmeat threatens much of the major fauna across the landscape.

Congo has been engaging in REDD+ since 2008 and is developing an Emissions Reductions (ER) Program for result-based payments in the departments of Sangha and Likouala to deliver significant climate impact and critical development benefits. It follows a multi-sectoral approach and is aligned with three strategic options of the draft National REDD+ Strategy, namely building governance capacities, sustainable forest management, and improvement of agricultural systems. The ER-Program yields an important opportunity to help set economic development activities on a green growth path by demonstrating the feasibility of innovative approaches to economic development that minimize impacts on forest carbon stocks, thus enabling the triggering of performance-based payments from the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility's Carbon Fund.

The rich biodiversity of the ER-Program has led the Government of Congo (GOC) to create four large protected areas: Nouabale-Ndoki (NNNP), Ntokou-Pikounda (NPNP) (both considered Key Biodiversity Areas by the KBA partnership), and Odzala-Kokoua (OKNP) National Parks, and the Lac Tele Community Reserve. The GOC has supported an approach of implementing partnerships for the conservation of its parks. Such partnerships are in place in NNNP and Odzala-Kokoua National Park

(OKNP). The GOC has invited the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) to form such a partnership for the administration of NPNP. In Northern Congo, WCS already serves as the management partner for NNNP (since 1991) and the Lac Tele Community Reserve, as well as a partner to forestry companies in for the sustainable management of wildlife in the adjacent concessions of Pokola, Kabo, and Loundougou-Toukoulaka (with CIB-OLAM) and Ngombe (with IFO-Danzer). WCS thus covers a contiguous landscape in the intervention area between Odzala-Kokoua National Park, NPNP, and NNNP, creating substantial operational synergies from its various projects. While NNNP and OKNP are well-managed owing to the involvement of management partners drawn from the international NGO community, NPNP has only very minimal management, where the GOC struggles to address poaching by organized criminal networks, leading to a rapid decline of key species.

### **C. Proposed Global Environment Objective(s)**

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to “increase the capacity of the forest administration, local communities, and indigenous peoples to co-manage forests.” The GEO/PDO does not change under the Additional Financing (AF).

#### **Key Results**

The proposed project would contribute to five key results, the fourth of which would be added through the AF:

- (i) 75% of agents of the decentralized forest administration have access to up-to-date information and data
- (ii) 15,000 ha of forest area have simplified management plans under implementation by end of IDA period
- (iii) Control and sensitization missions for purposes by the departmental forestry directorates, including by brigades, have increased by 3,000.
- (iv) 427,200 ha brought under enhanced biodiversity protection by end of AF period
- (v) 15,000 direct project beneficiaries reached, 40% of which are female beneficiaries

### **D. Project Description**

**Baseline, theory of change and project alternative:** The parent project has been supporting the forest administration, local communities, and indigenous peoples to build their capacity to co-manage forests. While deforestation and land degradation rates are still low, poaching of forest elephants and commercial bushmeat hunting are issues. The theory of change and project alternative rest on two key elements: (i) A program to maintain the low national rates of deforestation and land degradation by building on the parent project's activities to extend them to previously uncovered areas, more comprehensively enable sustainable management of community development zones, and widen the scope of the forest resources covered to include protected areas; and (ii) the incremental GEF support forms a child project under the Global Wildlife Program (GWP), which is designed to address wildlife crime across 19 countries in Africa and Asia by reducing poaching and the supply of key animal species to meet demand, , and to build awareness and capacity to address these issues. The World Bank leads this multi-country program globally in cooperation with other partners. Component 2 would support implementation of simplified management plans and agro-forestry approaches, benefiting households through increased incomes, while reducing deforestation and forest degradation. Component 4 would be newly created to protect high-conservation value forests in protected areas with a long-term view of gradually promoting ecotourism, and to support national-level anti-poaching

measures. These changes are expected to scale-up the project impact and align with the Emissions Reductions Program that Congo is developing with funding from the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) in Sangha and Likouala departments. The project end date would be extended by 3.5 years to May 31, 2021. The results framework would be updated to reflect added funds and activities. The Safeguard Category B would be maintained, the Environmental and Social Management Framework, Indigenous Peoples Plan and Integrated Pest Management Plan are being updated, and a Process Framework developed to supplement the parent project's suite of safeguard instruments.

The AF is aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (August 2015), and will support implementation of Objectives 5, 7, 11, 12, and 15. In addition, the Project is aligned with the achievement of the Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11, and 12 of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity. Congo is a party to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). On January 13, 2016 the Government confirmed that it will join the Elephant Protection Initiative, an African-led conservation program to eradicate the ivory trade and stop the continued slaughter of the continent's elephants by poachers.

The original project had three components; the fourth and fifth are added as a result of the AF.

**Component 1 - Capacity building of the forest administration** (Total US\$ 18.11 million, including US\$ 5.56 million original IDA and US\$ 12.55 million original government counterpart funds)

This component will not receive AF.

**Component 2 - Involvement of local communities and indigenous people in forest resource management** (Total US\$ 13.82, including US\$ 3.53 million original IDA, US\$ 7.96 million original government counterpart funds, and US\$ 2.33 million GEF AF)

The AF would build on the FEDP's development of simplified management plans for the community development areas in forest concession areas located in Sangha and Likouala, and its pilot microprojects in agroforestry. Based on the findings of a reference study, the AF would fund additional priority income-generating agroforestry and sustainable subsistence agriculture investment opportunities for previously uncovered areas on degraded forest land, thus enlarging the number of beneficiary households. To bolster and further these investments, the AF would support local governance bodies, including in administering revenues from forestry operations. It would also support agricultural value chains by organizing farmers into groups, supporting access to markets, and processing of outputs.

**Component 3 - Prospective work and communications** (Total US\$ 0.92 million original IDA and US\$ 2.08 original government counterpart funds)

This component will not receive AF.

**Component 4 - Habitat and biodiversity conservation** (Total US\$ 3.85 million GEF AF)

a. Development of National Parks: The AF would provide support to NPNP and NNNP in Sangha

and Likouala departments, aiming to increase forest and habitat protection with a triple goal of supporting REDD+ efforts, protecting biodiversity, and creating long-term opportunities for income generation by: (i) Establishing and equipping a management agency in NPNP, and commencing management activities based on a park management plan; and (ii) Supporting development of NNNP through targeted investments in basic infrastructure outside of the park, risk assessments, capacity building for guides, and equipment to support tourism operations.

b. As part of the GWP, implementation of the National Anti-Poaching Strategy: funding the implementation of priority recommendations resulting from the application of the International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime (ICCWC) analytical toolkit, including the establishment of a criminal records management system, training on conducting regional investigations into wildlife crime, conducting a legislative review, and the establishment of canine units in selected ecoguard units.

### **Component 5 - Project Management** (Total US\$ 0.33 million AF)

The AF would provide the Project Coordination Unit with the means to cover its incremental operational expenses.

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

Component 1 would take place at the MEFDDE in Brazzaville.

Component 2 would operate in the community development zones of the forest concessions of Ngombe, Pokola, Kabo, Loundoungo-Toukoulaka, and along the Ntokou to Pikounda corridor to the southeast of NPNP.

Sub-Component 4a would take place in NPNP and NNNP.

Sub-Component 4b would take place in Brazzaville and in selected locations in the project area in northern Congo.

Northern Congo is home to relatively intact equatorial lowland rainforest of the Congo Basin, with a mostly closed canopy. The project area spans Sangha and Likouala departments in Northern Congo. The forest cover of Sangha Department is estimated at 5,557,096 ha, which is made up of 49% primary forests, 4% degraded forests and 44% swamp forests. In Likouala, the forest cover is estimated at 6,172,876 ha, 33% of which are primary forests, 1% degraded forests and 65% swamp forests. The project area is home to nearly 300 species of birds, more than 60 species of mammals, including forest elephants, gorillas, chimpanzees, bongos, leopards and hippopotamuses, thousands of plant species and a rich variety of forests, including mahogany ones.

The project area includes two protected areas (NNNP and NPNP, both of which are KBAs) and four logging concessions: Kabo, Pokola, Loundoungou-Toukoulaka and Ngombe. The project area forms part of the large-scale jurisdictional Emissions Reduction (ER) Program that the GOC is preparing to help set economic development activities on a green growth path while reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.

NPNP was legally created in 2012. It covers 427,000 ha, but the GOC has to date only been able to finance extremely basic management and protection activities. As a result, the park is subject to poaching operations that mostly go uncontrolled. The heavily forested park, with its large swamp forests, is home to forest elephants, chimpanzees, hippopotamuses, and a large populations of lowland gorillas.

NNNP is under sound management through a public-private partnership between the GOC and the Wildlife Conservation Society, which acts as the park manager. The heavily forested park covers

423,870 ha, and is a relative safe haven for forest elephants and gorillas in particular. It is part of the Tri-National Sangha UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The population of Sangha department is 109,528, and that of Likouala 197,000. This population is divided into 25 ethnic groups. Population density is very low, at about 2.5 people per km<sup>2</sup>. Populations in the forest concessions are concentrated in the Community Development Areas (*Séries de développement communautaire*, SDC). In the project area, these are home to an estimated 59,670 people spread out over 162 villages. The communities have largely free reign over land use of the SDCs. In addition, there are populations in the limited so-called ‘zones banales’ – areas that are not designated as concessions, protected areas, or for similar formal land use. An estimated indigenous population of 21,361 people lives in Sangha and Likouala, who are mostly forest dwellers and depend heavily on hunting and gathering.

#### **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team**

Ruma Tavorath, Claude Lina Lobo ( GEN07 )

Grace Muhimpundu, Lucienne M. M'Baipor ( GSU01 )

### **II. IMPLEMENTATION**

The AF will continue to be managed by the MEFDDE through the existing project implementation unit (PIU) under the formal leadership of the Department of Studies and Planning. A steering committee composed of MEFDDE representatives performs oversight functions.

MEFDDE will carry out technical work for Component 2 in collaboration with Community Development Management Committees and Local Development Funds. Activities in Component 4a will involve the private partners responsible for national park management, who would be contracted through delegated management contracts. Component 4b will involve agencies relevant to anti-poaching, which will include, among others, the national police, the Gendarmerie, and the Ministry of Justice.

### **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 AF is enhancing the scope of some existing activities while also supporting new activities which will have potential environmental impacts. Under Component 2, the scope of income-generating agroforestry and sustainable subsistence agriculture investment opportunities are to be increased to previously uncovered areas on degraded forest land. Component 4 will support civil works and establishing basic infrastructure outside of the Nouabale-Ndoki National Park. No works are foreseen within park boundaries, and only minor works in the vicinity outside the park boundaries. The potential environmental impacts of these activities include 1) pollution of water and soil from rehabilitation of administrative buildings, 2)

		generation of rubble, waste, dust and noise, 3) worker and community safety issues, 4) risk of deforestation and loss of vegetation which could affect ecosystems, 5) social impacts resulting from presence of external construction workers in proximity to local communities. An Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared to include mitigation measures to address these potential risks and also includes processes and procedures for screening of subprojects, preparation and disclosure of site-specific Environment Management Plans and monitoring.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The application of this policy seeks to ensure that all project activities take into account the conservation of biodiversity, as well as the numerous environmental services and products that natural habitats provide. Overall, agroforestry activities in combination with simplified management plans are expected to have positive impacts on natural habitats as degraded land is reforested, new habitats are created on afforested land, and pressure on natural forests is reduced. The ESMF includes mitigation measures to address any potential risks to natural habitats
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Overall, project activities are expected to have positive impacts on forests. Potential impacts of project activities on natural forests and their mitigation measures are detailed in the revised ESMF.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The expansion of agroforestry activities for local communities focuses on cocoa production triggers OP 4.09, even though the project does not foresee supplying pesticides. The potential risks and mitigation strategies are reflected in the ESMF and Pest Management Plan.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy has been triggered since microprojects and habitat preservation activities could promote actions in areas containing sites deemed physical cultural resources by local populations (e.g. holy/secret sites such as sacred groves, sacred forests, etc.). Though it is not anticipated that the project will have negative impacts on any such sites given the participatory management approaches employed, the ESMF nevertheless

		includes a chapter to provide guidance in case physical cultural resources were to be discovered.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Limited economic dislocation is possible in NPNP, as local indigenous and non-indigenous groups have traditionally used the park for various purposes (habitation, wood, medicine, hunting, etc.), however any such decisions would be made based on broad community support to ensure that any dislocation remains voluntary. No physical resettlement of the IPs will be carried out. To ensure due diligence is exercised, the IPP was updated, setting out principles and procedures for timely and effective mitigation of indigenous communities' concerns. This requires the government to identify indigenous peoples, consult with them properly, and ensure that they participate in and benefit from project activities.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The original project avoided land acquisition in an effort to any avoid negative impacts with respect to OP 4.12. The project's infrastructure investments will remain on Government-owned forest concession lands. The project is in possession of legal documents/titles for the lands. In the AF phase, the project will continue to eschew land acquisition. No physical resettlement will be carried out. Where the project operates on community or indigenous land, the baseline study under Component 2 is expected to clarify land rights and ensure broad community support before enabling any activities to proceed. In Component 4, the park management plan will be developed based on broad community support to ensure that no involuntary resettlement takes place. The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been updated and a Process Framework (PF) developed. The documents identify the risks and propose mitigation measures in view of the impact the activities may have on the local communities and indigenous peoples (LCIPs).
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance dams nor rely on dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project is not expected to affect international waterways.

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project will not be located in a disputed area.
---------------------------------------	----	---

#### 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:**

Safeguards performance of the parent project has been satisfactory to date. Negative environmental impacts of AF project activities are expected to be site-specific, limited to minor work, and not significant or with long-term consequences. Social impacts are expected to be managed by ensuring broad community support for all project activities. The expected social and environmental benefits of the proposed AF at the local level comprise enhanced management of forest resources in the forest concession areas located in Sangha and Likouala; strengthened biodiversity management in protected areas; strengthened participation of local communities in decision-making processes; and creation of new income-generating activities (IGAs) in the project area.

The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) identifies potential risks related to project activities and details mitigation measures to minimize and manage those risks. Improved management of NPNP is expected to increase the integrity of the national park, and no works are foreseen within the boundaries of the park. Limited economic dislocation is possible in NPNP, as local indigenous and non-indigenous groups have traditionally used the park for various purposes (habitation, wood, medicine, hunting, etc). However, management planning for the park will integrate environmental and social considerations, including integrating pre-existing land use, into community use areas in the park so as to minimize or avoid altogether any economic dislocation. Management planning will be highly participatory to ensure community support. No land acquisition or physical resettlement is expected. Since the project triggers OP 4.10, an Indigenous Peoples Plan has been updated from the parent project to ensure the inclusion and participation of Indigenous Peoples in the project activities. The project also triggers OP/BP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement, therefore the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been updated to manage any potential involuntary resettlement or economic displacement as a result of project-related activities. A Process Framework (PF) has been developed to manage potential increased access restrictions for NPNP under Component 4a. Broad community support will be the basis of all management planning to avoid involuntary economic dislocation. Should negative livelihood impacts result, compensation would be provided to project-affected people. Since the specific site and project intervention areas are not known, only framework safeguards instruments have been produced. These framework documents provide guidance for the development of site-specific management plans and procedures for consultation, disclosure and monitoring.

All documents have been consulted with key stakeholders and disclosed in-country and by the Bank. All management plans will be integrated into contractor documents prior to commencement of civil works. A Project Implementation Manual has been developed which includes detailed sections on safeguards, including positive environmental and social impacts,

potential negative impacts, mitigation of potential negative environmental impacts, and mitigation of potential resource access restriction and implementation responsibilities. An independent Environmental Audit will be undertaken at the end of year 2 of the AF to ensure satisfactory compliance with the ESMF requirements.

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

This project would enhance forest, protected area, and wildlife management. The new infrastructural works are expected to be small-scale, while other works are rehabilitation of existing small infrastructure. No adverse long term or indirect environmental or social impacts are expected.

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

The project is expected have significant positive impacts in terms of improved park management, anti-poaching measures and better forest management through capacity building of the local communities. No alternatives were therefore considered to avoid impacts.

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

The original project was classified as a Category “B”. At the time, the project prepared, consulted upon, and disclosed a full suite of safeguard documents: an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), which included an ESMF, an RPF, an Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF) and corresponding Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPP). With restructuring in 2015, the project revised its safeguards instruments and added an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) to account for the agricultural microprojects that were added at that stage. Safeguards performance has been satisfactory to date. For the AF, the framework documents have been updated to address the impacts of the new activities. A Process Framework has been added to manage any social impacts resulting from activities in NPNP.

The current approach of embedding expert consultants in the Project Coordination Unit of the MEFDDE’s Department of Studies and Planning (DSP) to work together with government officials to transfer capacity through on-the-job training will be continued under the AF. An expert consultant would continue to support social safeguards functions for the duration of the project on a full-time basis. An environmental expert seconded by the MEFDDE would ensure environmental safeguards responsibilities.

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

Key stakeholders outside of government structures are local communities, indigenous peoples, and conservation NGOs. The design of the AF has been participatory at various levels. In April 2016, a consultation process was carried out with the different actors involved on the implementation of IGAs within the departments of Sangha and Likouala, including LCIPs. This was complemented with additional consultations as part of the review of safeguards instruments. Representatives of the national government formulated the design of the project, while regional governments, local authorities, and conservation actors provided inputs. The project would be implemented with the participation of local stakeholders.

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

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	December 1, 2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	February 8, 2017
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	February 7, 2017
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	December 1, 2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	February 8, 2017
"In country" Disclosure	February 7, 2017
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	December 1, 2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	February 8, 2017
"In country" Disclosure	February 7, 2017
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	
Date of receipt by the Bank	December 1, 2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	February 8, 2017
"In country" Disclosure	February 7, 2017
<b>Process Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	December 1, 2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	February 8, 2017
"In country" Disclosure	February 7, 2017
<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 (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)**

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or 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"/>
Provide estimated number of people 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 type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" 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: Julian Lee  
Title: Environmental Specialist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance, Budget, and Public Portfolio

### Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Forest Economy, Sustainable Development, and Environment

Contact: Joachim Kondi  
Title: Project Coordinator  
Email: Joachim.kondi@gmail.com

**VI. For more information contact:**

The InfoShop  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 458-4500  
Fax: (202) 522-1500  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

**VII. Approval**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Julian Lee	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Maman Sani Issa	Date: January 26, 2017
Practice Manager:	Name: Benoit Bosquet	Date: February 3, 2017
Country Director (acting):	Name: Laurent Debroux	Date: February 7, 2017