CI-GEF Project Screening Form
03/02/2016

1. The CI-GEF Project Agency undertakes environmental and social safeguard screening of each proposed project to determine whether an ESIA is required and if so, the appropriate extent and type of ESIA (see Policy #1 and Appendix I for more details). The CI-GEF Project Agency classifies the proposed project into one of three categories, depending on the type, location, sensitivity and scale of the project and the nature and magnitude of its potential environmental and social impacts. The descriptions of the categories and lists of types of projects identified in Appendix I are meant to serve as guidance to proposal reviewers and are not meant to be exhaustive.
2. All proposed activities will undergo safeguard screening to determine eligibility under CI-GEF ESMF policies, the type of ESIA that they are subject to and if proposed project activities trigger any of the safeguards policies.
3. **The Executing Entity** is responsible for providing responses to each of the questions outlined in this form when submitting a PIF to the Project Agency for consideration.
4. **The Project Agency is responsible for conducting** all aspects of the safeguard screening process, from initiation to making the final decision on whether or not an ESIA is necessary and, if so, at what level along with whether a project-level plan is required if a safeguard is triggered.

I. PROJECT DATA SUMMARY		
Country: Suriname and Guyana (a regional North Brazil Shelf LME Project that also includes coordination actions with Brazil (Amapá) and French Guiana)	**GEF Project ID**: TBD	
Project Title: Setting the foundations for zero net loss of the mangroves that underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf LME.		
Name of the Executing Entity (ies): International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).		
Length of Project: 12 *months*	**Start date**: 1st Nov. 2017	**End date**: 31st Oct. 2018

Introduction: (location, main issues to be addressed by project)

The project works to enable a more integrated and transboundary treatment of coastal zone and integrated management influencing an estimated 250,000 – 300,000 ha of mangrove ecosystem within the North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (NBS-LME or NBS). Situated along the north eastern coast of South America the NBS-LME spans ~1.1 million km^2 over six countries, being bordered by the Caribbean Sea in Central America and extending south to the Atlantic Parnaiba River delta along the margin of Maranhão and Piauí States in Brazil (Ekau & Knoppers, 2003). It is a region that retains and supports great natural richness and cultural diversity, yet is also subject to increasing development pressures, potentially game-changing inchoate industries (such as offshore oil extraction) and subject to high flooding risk for the largely coastal population given IPCC climate scenarios.

It is a one year project that aims to generate necessary baseline knowledge and technical assessments as inputs towards a collaborative vision and coordinated well informed management of North Brazil Shelf (NBS) mangrove systems, with emphasis upon the information needs of countries Guyana and Suriname. Although the project collaborates with Brazil and French Guiana, the two countries of Guyana and Suriname were identified during the planning phase (as part of a participatory multi-government workshop held in Suriname March 2017) as being the most relevant beneficiaries for a one year investment to provide a balanced representation of information, organization and capacity necessary to further a shared transboundary ICZM agenda for the region.

Building on initial assessments initiated in the pre-project phase, this is to be achieved through

participatory knowledge gap analysis organized between project partners, targeted support to monitoring, mapping and research in the two countries, updated threat assessments (applying Ecosystem Red Listing expertise with IUCN) and knowledge sharing for decision making. This is in coordination with complementary actions underway and planned for November 2017 onwards as part of the GEF/ UNDP CLME+ sub-regional NBS project (that includes the NBS countries as part of the recently developed transboundary Strategic Action Program (SAP) ratified by CLME+ (including NBS) countries into 2017-2021).

Strengthening the knowledge base to achieve a more comparable level between NBS countries supports development of a transboundary coordination mechanism(s) between the countries of Guyana, Suriname, French Guiana and Brazil (Amapá). The overall expected outcome is an improved integrated coastal management of the extensive, ecologically connected yet vulnerable mangrove habitat of the North Brazil Shelf (NBS) region. This catalyst project over one year is intended to support the aforementioned CLME+ SAP implementation and actions within the NBS-LME region.

Project Background: (description of physical, biological and socioeconomic context, including Indigenous Peoples and reference to how gender may play a role)

The mangrove systems between the Amazon and Orinoco river outflows support a range of critical ecosystem services to coastal NBS societies yet were and are subjected to varying degrees of deforestation and incidental degradation given installation of precautionary concrete shore defenses, conversion of coastal land for agriculture, cattle grazing and urbanization in the last century. In the case of the NBS region coastal communities make up 80-90% of the total population: 12k in Amapá; 225k F. Guiana; 500k Suriname, 693k Guyana, and hence are living in the intervention geography of the project subject to the benefits that healthy mangroves directly and indirectly provide to people.

As low lying countries at high risk from coastal flooding and sea level rise impacts, mangroves represent a green belt buffer zone reducing wave energy and inland incursion of storm surge and the erosion from persistent increments in sea level. It is also an area with a fairly unique sedimentation and hydrology where the mangrove settlement dynamic follows the natural accretion and erosion of extensive mud-banks over decadal periods alongshore and between the NBS countries. Understanding such dynamics as well as the social, economic and cultural interdependencies with mangrove systems (as the dominant productive coastal habitat in the region) is a key factor for advising coastal management and habitat rehabilitation programs and is an issue that spans national borders.

NBS mangroves are also in an area which has to date limited denominations for marine protection and management to help ensure the persistence of the important goods and services they provide to local communities (including coastal defenses, nurseries and habitat for nearshore and offshore fisheries (largely data limited) and hence food security). The direct benefits of mangroves for coastal communities are complemented by their national value for sequestration of Blue Carbon, recognized globally as one of the world's most important sink ecosystems for below ground carbon storage. This makes mangroves very important (yet often underappreciated) contributors towards meeting Nationally Determined Contribution targets and international UNFCCC signatory contributions. As with other mangrove systems the act of deforestation not only reduces turnover and the remedial drawdown of atmospheric carbon, but liberates those accumulated stores as the net balance of sediments destabilize, requiring in the best of cases 20-50 years to recover the same functionality under reforestation and sediment restoration programs.

Important and positive movements in recent years by the two countries of Guyana and Suriname

recognize the importance of well managed natural and mangrove resources (e.g. the 2010 Guyana National Mangrove Management Action Plan and Suriname's 2012-2016 National Biodiversity Action Plan). This is especially relevant given that mangroves stabilize over 1600 km of silt enriched sediments against erosion for low elevation countries (Suriname and Guyana are ranked 2nd and 5th globally in terms of population living in low elevation coastal zones). This places an estimated 11% of the country's population and ~240 million US$ (11% of the annual GDP) in coastal infrastructure at risk in the next 30 years (CABI, 2006). There is interest in establishing a first Marine Protected Area network, furthering a community of practice for sustainable resource use and for improving the effectiveness of existing Reserves and protection of representative and ecologically functional tracts of mangrove habitat. Some local communities form part of these initiatives (such as the Victoria Guyana Village Mangrove Committee for example) as the principle resource users in the coastal zone.

The project recognizes the need for participatory, well informed and inclusive process between local communities, public institutions, multilateral investment, academia, NGOs, research and the private sector (fishers, tourism developers, upstream industry and land managers, offshore oil prospectors and investors etc.) in construction of an ICZM strategy for the NBS countries. The ICZM process is intended to be fully inclusive for men, women and age groups, to better understand, reflect and respect the diversity of uses and roles of different demographic groups in the NBS coastal zone. As a project that aims to scope and enable ICZM (without significant on the ground interventions at this stage), this also includes an appraisal of Indigenous Peoples (IP) community roles and uses in the coastal zone. In Guyana this involves 11 Amerindian communities that adjoin or are within the Shell Beach Protected Area and in the case of Suriname, the Indigenous Peoples community of Kalebaskreek in the estuary zone of the Coppename Monding Ramsar site and the community of Galibi in the Marowijne district, all of which reside adjacent to important mangrove areas.

Project Objectives:

To create the multi-disciplinary information base, regional coordination mechanism and multi-sectoral consensus required to implement elements of the CLME+ Strategic Action Plan pertaining to the mangroves that most directly underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf LME.

Project Components and Main Proposed Activities:

Component 1 (single component):

To help establish the multi-sectoral consensus and knowledge foundation necessary for the development of an Integrated Coastal Management (ICZM) Plan for Mangroves:

A) A coordinated effort between the countries of Guyana and Suriname to improve baseline knowledge of biophysical, social and economic information most relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves in Guyana and Suriname. This is to be obtained from synthesizing results of existing work and undertaking new research where gaps exist as the technical foundation for building an NBS Integrated Coastal Management Plan for mangroves.

B) A broad-based multi-sectoral consensus is reached regarding how to manage Guyana, Suriname and Brazil's mangrove in a coordinated fashion and with the goal of achieving progress on six Aichi Targets, UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and a zero net loss rate by 2030 and contributing to the achievement of the relevant SDGs and Aichi Targets**.**

Abbreviated activities are as follows (please refer to the Project Document for more details):

1.1.1. Updated mangrove cover and estimates from literature review and synthesis, use of remote sensing data and ground truthing scoped to the needs of each country.
1.1.2. Three linked mangrove Ecosystem Goods and Services Valuation studies examining mangrove economy and human well-being of local communities, national flood defenses and global carbon mitigation potential.
1.1.3. Biophysical characterization research, a conservation planning exercise, IUCN Ecosystem Red List assessment and a review of restoration methods and effectiveness in the NBS region.
1.1.4. A policy analysis linked to recommendations for decision makers.
1.1.5. An online knowledge sharing platform in coordination with the CLME+ sub-regional NBS project.

1.2.1. Set up and/ or reactivate mangrove regional coordination group(s) and develop a multi-sectoral coordination mechanism.
1.2.2. Engage and formalize French Guiana and Brazil participation in a shared ICZM opportunity.
1.2.3. Develop a three country work plan (Guyana, Suriname and Brazil) to establish the ICZM mangrove baseline.
1.2.4. Through scoping consultancy and a synthesis and planning workshop, establish a framework and road map for an NBS 2021 regional ICM plan.

Compliance with Environmental Conventions:
Explain how your project's objectives, outcomes and outcomes align with the main conventions that CI adheres to. These include UNCBD*,* UNFCCC*,* RAMSAR Convention*,* CITES*, and* UNCCD.

The project supports improving the knowledge base of key processes, state of mangrove related policy and national progress towards goals stated in the following international conventions:

UNCBD: Aichi Targets to which this project contributes include: Target #5: Rate of loss of natural habitats (mangroves) are halved; Target #6: Adoption of ecosystem based approaches and that all fisheries are harvested sustainably. Target #8: Pollution has been brought to levels not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity. Target #11: Ten per cent of coastal and marine areas are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of marine protected areas (MPAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures. Target #12: Extinction of threatened species prevented. Target #14: Ecosystems that provide essential services, contribute to livelihoods and well- being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.

UNFCCC: SDGs to which this project will contribute include: SDG #1 on poverty reduction as mangroves provide multiple valuable ecosystem services on which jobs/income are based and that reduce financial loss through coastal protection. SDG #2 on hunger reduction as mangroves underpin productive food fisheries. SDG #3 on health and wellbeing and SDG #6 on clean water and sanitation as mangroves naturally remediate polluted waters that cause sickness. SDG #11 on sustainable cities as mangroves provide natural green infrastructure to provide coastal defense in place of more expensive and less effective conventional gray infrastructure often used in efforts to protect urban areas. SDG #13 on climate action as mangroves are one of the ecosystems that naturally stores the greatest carbon stocks per unit area. SDG #14 on Oceans as mangrove health is central to healthy productive oceans given their role in pollution remediation, land stability and as nursery grounds for inshore and pelagic species.

RAMSAR: Suriname and Brazil are contracting parties (see entry year below) to the convention and therefore are committed to its implementation. Each country has established various numbers of Ramsar sites (Wetlands of International Importance) covering extensive mangrove areas. Guyana has taken preparatory steps to become a signatory (EPA 2002 - two sites suggested in recent workshops).

Suriname (1985): 1 site, Coppename Monding Nature Reserve (12,000 ha).

Brazil (1993): 19 Sites (as of July 2017 a combined area of 8,466,944 ha).
French Guiana (1986 as French territory): 2 established sites, (87,400 ha)

Compliance with Country Legal and Institutional Frameworks:

1. Explain how your project aligns/will align with national laws and/or frameworks related to the environment (this may include national ESIA or EIA laws, etc.)

Both national IUCN and CI national offices have over 20 years' experience and an existing peer network working in Suriname, Guyana and Brazil with government counterparts, communities and conservation partners in support of the development of sustainable resource policy and hence work within and in support of national laws and legal frameworks related to the environment . EIA law is still under development in both Guyana and Suriname.

In the case of Guyana the project coordinates with the former Guyana Mangrove Restoration Project (GMRP) which is now a Mangrove Unit based and financed in NAREI as the principal government technical wetlands agency. The work is framed within EPA guidelines Act (No. 11, 1996), its amendments and the Environmental Protection Regulations established in 2000 that look to ensure that measures for environmental protection are integrated into development activities. A summary of applicable policy is available at http://www.guyana.org/NDS/chap18.htm#2contents_B .

In the case of Suriname the project works with the Nature Conservation Division of the Suriname Forest Service (ROGB in Dutch) responsible for the Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management Program and resource management. There is currently no legal framework for EIA in Suriname (as of 2009) although a new Environmental Law under development supports existing commitments to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which both address EIA (with guidance from the National Institute for Environment and Development (NIMOS) who review EIA reports). A review of these developments is expected to form part of the diagnostic inputs for the project ICZM process.

In terms of transboundary initiatives and regional commitments, the NBS countries of Guyana, Suriname and Brazil are signatories to the CLME+ Strategic Action Program which frames an ICZM plan. Such a plan would be linked to interpretation of national policy provisions that are relevant for a wider NBS-LME regional initiative.

2. When national legal and institutional frameworks are inadequate, the proposal should include a statement explaining how this problem will be addressed, either as part of the project or by a third party.

Recognizing that countries are in an early planning stage for an Integrated Management of the Coastal Zone (ICZM) the project will work to initiate consultation and collaborative process in coordination with government NFPs. Hence in support of furthering an appropriate national and regional framework, a working group(s) will be established (depending on the situational context and expectations of each country). These will be the first steps necessary to help develop and/or establish an ICZM agenda (working towards 2021) which should include feasibility and potential for policy improvements. The process will canvas sector group expectations and facilitate participation of stakeholders in this regard.

3. When national legal and institutional frameworks do not apply to or impact the project and its objectives, the reason for that conclusion needs to be stated.

National legal and institutional frameworks are considered in this project (see above).

Project Justification *(e.g., Alignment with Country and CI Institutional Priorities, GEF Focal Area Strategies):*

The project works in the following complementary areas, objectives and core values of IUCN, CI, NBS country and GEF IW Focal Areas:

- Multi-state and multi-stakeholder transboundary planning and co-operation;

- Scaled benefits to achieve international biodiversity and sustainable development goals and conventions.
- Reducing negative environmental impacts (e.g. pollution loads, coastal infrastructure);
- Restored and sustained mangrove ecosystem goods and services supporting coastal community resilience and well-being.
- Improved resilience (reduced vulnerability) to climate variability through multi-state cooperation.

Both CI and IUCN are partners in a global mangrove partnership established 2016-2017 with TNC and WWF with the stated aims of reversing trends in mangrove loss and supporting the recovery of 20% of the world's degraded mangroves by 2030.

GEF Focal Area(s): International Waters (Objective 3, Program 6)

GEF Project Amount: USD$ 700,000

Other Financing Amounts by Source (USD$): 689,905 TOTAL
International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN): In-kind 60,000
Conservation International (CI): Cash and In-Kind 100,000 TBD (70k confirmed + final CI-AFD to confirm)
WWF-Guianas: In-kind 89,750
UNDP (GCCA+): In-kind 249,155
SBB (Suriname): In-kind 152,000
NAREI (Guyana): In-kind 39,000
Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC-Guyana): In-kind TBD
Government of Brazil: In-kind TBD

Safeguard Screening Form Prepared by: Stuart Banks

Date of preparation: 24th June 2017

Comments: For the purposes of this safeguard revision, it is worth mentioning the important distinction between conventional dams which are not supported in any way or form within this project, and the artificial breakwaters (sometimes referred to as permeable dams) constructed along the coast in pilot studies to help recover sediment accretion and eroded mangrove settlement habitat.

II. PROJECT ELEGIBILITY QUESTIONS

Answer the following questions to determine if the project is eligible for CI-GEF funding

Will the project:	**Yes**	**No**
1. Propose to create significant destruction or degradation of *critical natural habitats*[1] of any type or have significant negative socioeconomic and cultural impacts that cannot be cost-effectively avoided, minimized, mitigated and/or offset?	☐	☒
2. Propose to create or facilitate significant degradation and/or conversion of *natural habitats* of any type including those that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities?	☐	☒
3. Propose to carry out *unsustainable* harvesting of natural resources -animals, plants, timber and/or non-timber forest products (NTFPs)- or the establishment of forest plantations in *critical natural habitats*?	☐	☒

[1] Habitats considered essential for biodiversity conservation, provision of ecosystem services and the well-being of people at the local, national, regional o global levels. They include, among others, existing protected areas, areas officially proposed as protected areas, areas recognized as protected by traditional local communities, as well as areas identified as important for conservation, such as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) Sites, Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), Biodiversity Hotspot, Ramsar Sites, areas identified as important for ecosystem services such as carbon storage, freshwater provision and regulation, etc.

4. Propose the introduction of exotic species that can certainly become invasive and harmful to the environment, for which is not possible to implement a mitigation plan?	☐	☒
5. Contravene major international and regional conventions on environmental issues?	☐	☒
6. Involve *involuntary resettlement, land acquisition, and/or the taking of shelter and other assets* belonging to local communities or individuals?	☐	☒
7. Propose the use of pesticides that are unlawful under national or international laws?	☐	☒
8. Involve the removal, alteration or disturbance of any *physical cultural resources*?	☐	☒
9. Will the project include the construction and/or operation of dams?	☐	☒

III. PROJECT ELEGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

If you answer **YES** to any of the questions above, your project **IS NOT ELIGIBLE** for funding

If you answer **NO** to all of the questions above, please proceed to answer the safeguard questions below

IV. SAFEGUARD QUESTIONS

The sections below will help the CI-GEF Project Agency to determine whether your project triggers any of the CI-GEF safeguard policies. As a Project Agency implementing GEF funding, CI is required to assess all applications to determine if safeguards are triggered, and if so, whether or not appropriate mitigation measures are included in project design and implementation. For further information on CI application of safeguards please refer the Appendix section of this form.

SECTION 1: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

Has a full or limited ESIA that covers the proposed project already been completed?

☒ **NO** → Continue to Section 2 (*do not fill out Table 1.1 below*)

☐ **YES** → No further environmental and social assessment is required **if** the existing documentation meets the CI-GEF Project Agency "*Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)*" policies and standards, and environmental and social management recommendations and/or plans are integrated into the project. Therefore, you should undertake the following steps to complete this screening process:

1. Use Table 1.1 below to assess existing documentation. It is recommended that this assessment be undertaken jointly by the CI-GEF Project Agency and the Executing Entity;
2. Ensure that the development of the full Project Document incorporates the recommendations made in the existing ESIA; and
3. Submit this template, along with other relevant documentation to the Project Agency.

TABLE 1.1: CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSING QUALITY ASSURANCE OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

1. Is the assessment a: ☐ **A FULL ESIA** ☐ **A LIMITED ESIA**	**Yes**	**No**
2. Does the assessment meet its terms of reference, both procedurally and substantively?	☐	☐

3. Does the assessment provide a satisfactory assessment of the proposed project?	☐	☐
4. Does the assessment contain the information required for decision-making?	☐	☐
5. Does the assessment describe specific environmental and social management measures (e.g., avoidance, minimization, mitigation, compensation, monitoring, and capacity development measures)?	☐	☐
6. Does the assessment identify capacity needs of the institutions responsible for implementing environmental and social management issues?	☐	☐
7. Was the assessment developed through a consultative process with key stakeholder engagement, including issues related to gender mainstreaming and Indigenous Peoples?	☐	☐
8. Does the assessment assess the adequacy of the cost of and financing arrangements for environmental and social management issues?	☐	☐
9. For any "no" answers, describe below how the issue has been or will be resolved or addressed		

SECTION 2: PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS

Will the project cause or facilitate any significant loss or degradation to natural habitats, and their associated biodiversity and ecosystem functions/services?

☒ **NO** → Continue to Section 3

☐ **YES** → Continue to Table 2.1. below

TABLE 2.1: CHECKLIST FOR PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS	Yes	No
1. Is the project located or expected to be located near or in existing protected areas?	☐	☐
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information: a. Name, area, management category, governance arrangement, and current management activities of protected areas being affected by the project: b. Description of project activities that will affect existing protected areas:		
2. Is the project located within any other type of critical natural habitat?	☐	☐
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information: a. Description of the critical natural habitat to be affected by the project: b. Description of project activities that will affect critical natural habitats:		
3. Will the project affect species identified as threatened at the local and/or global levels?	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Name and conservation status of the species that will be affected by the project:

b. Description of project activities that will affect threatened/endangered species:

4. Will the project implement habitat restoration activities:	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Type and extent of habitats to be restored:

b. Description of project activities for habitat restoration:

c. Description of the contribution of the project in restoring or improving ecosystem composition, structure, and functions/services:

SECTION 3: VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AND/OR RESTRICTIONS TO ACCESS/USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the project involve the voluntary resettlement of people and/or direct or indirect restrictions of access to and use of natural resources?

☒ **NO** → Continue to Section 4

☐ **YES** → Continue to Table 3.1. below

TABLE 3.1: CHECKLIST FOR VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT	**Yes**	**No**
1. Will the project involve the voluntary resettlement of people?	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Name of communities, description of livelihood, ethnicity, and estimated number of people to be resettled:

b. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the resettlement, ensuring that vulnerable/marginal groups such as women are thoroughly consulted:

c. Description of the activities that will be carried out for the resettlement:

2. Will the project introduce measures to restrict people from accessing or using resources that they have been using prior to the implementation of the project?	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Name of resource, tenure status, type of use and extent (quantity) of the resources being used, and, if applicable, who tends to use the resources (men, women, youth, etc.):

b. Description of project activities that will affect access to natural resources and their potential positive and negative impacts on the environment and people, and how they will be gender-sensitive if necessary:

c. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the restriction to access and use resources:

d. Means by which the community (ies) or affected people will be compensated:

SECTION 4: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES [2]

Does the project plan to work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples?

☐ **NO** → Continue to Section 5

☒ **YES** → Continue to Table 4.1. below

TABLE 4.1: CHECKLIST FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	Yes	No
1. Will the project activities directly or indirectly affect indigenous peoples?	☒	☐

[2] According to CI Policy on Indigenous Peoples, "*CI identifies indigenous peoples in specific geographic areas by the presence, in varying degrees, of: a) Close attachment to ancestral and traditional or customary territories and the natural resources in them; b) Customary social and political institutions; c) Economic systems oriented to subsistence production; d) An indigenous language, often different from the predominant language; and f) Self-identification and identification by others as members of a distinct cultural group".*

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information when applicable:

a. Name of communities, description of livelihood, ethnicity, estimated number of people to be affected by the project:

In Guyana this involves 11 Amerindian communities that adjoin or are within the Shell Beach Protected Area. These include the Arawak, Akawaio, Arekuna, Carib, Makushi, Patamona, Wapichan, Warrau and Wai Wai who together number around 80,000 people dispersed in more than 160 communities and thousands of scattered homesteads in the interior of the country. In the case of Suriname, the Indigenous Peoples community of Kalebaskreek is located in the estuary zone of the Coppename Monding Ramsar site and the community of Galibi in the Marowijne district, all of which reside adjacent to important mangrove areas. Indigenous peoples nationally represent an estimated represent ~3.8% of Suriname's population (~21,000 people) and 9.16% of Guyana's population (~80,000 people) , of which ~90% are understood to live in the coastal fringe.

b. Description of the project activities and their impacts on indigenous peoples, including if the project is likely to impact particular subgroups of indigenous people such as women or youth:

The Project will help to consolidate information and planning steps for an ICZM process in the region and as such will have no direct actions upon IP communities – rather a strategy that includes their engagement, as for coastal communities in general is expected as part of that subsequent planning process formalized with NFPs. They are to be considered as stakeholders within the ecosystem goods and service evaluations and in the formative steps defining participation for the ICZM planning process with country NFPs. This also provides opportunity to mainstream gender and youth issues into the same process from the beginning.

c. Means by which the project will respect free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) with the affected communities, while ensuring that marginalized subgroups are included:

The Project will follow IUCN and CI established guidelines on FPIC for approach, consultation and processes in coordination taking into account any existing national guidelines in the project countries or as specific to particular communities. It is understood that the process regarding IP rights is a continuing development in the NBS countries and subject to recent and ongoing initiatives and reviews (e.g. the Forest Peoples Program based around responsible financing, a Guyana-Norway MoU for low carbon forest development that affects IP communities, establishment of the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples Affairs (Guyana) etc.). Hence ICZM steps should understand and complement that process.

d. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure that indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits that are negotiated and agreed upon with them:

Indigenous Peoples communities in important mangrove areas are stakeholders in any ICZM planning process (although in some instances such as those linked to RAMSAR site declarations there exist provisions and territorial rights). IP rights are an issue evolving in each country since the 1980's given developments in land use for industry. Part of the ICZM preparatory work should include a review of IP rights and relevance to coastal management good practice and hence advance joint planning that ensures that IP cultural integrity in each country is respected.

e. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure the fair participation of indigenous people in the design and implementation of the project:

CI national offices will assist country focal points to involve IP and coastal community leaders in the relevant engagement for ICZM planning steps, although it is likely that this will form part of the follow-up/ next actions beyond the planning phase (i.e. future implementation of the ICZM work-plan / roadmap developed during this project)

SECTION 5: PEST MANAGEMENT

Does the project plan to implement activities related to agricultural extension services including the use of approved pesticides (including insecticides and herbicides) or alien invasive species[3] management?

☒ **NO** → Continue to Section 6

☐ **YES** → Continue to Table 5.1. below

TABLE 5.1: CHECKLIST FOR PEST MANAGEMENT	Yes	No
1. Will the project include the use of approved pesticides and other chemicals?	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name, description and proposed use of approved pesticides/chemicals:

b. Description of how the Executing Entity will conduct the assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users:

c. Description of positive and negative impact on the environment, non-targets, and people:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly manage products, equipment, and containers to avoid harm to human health or broader environmental contamination:

e. Description of how the Executing Entity will avoid the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used:

f. Description of how the Executing Entity will ensure that pesticides used would be properly applied, stored, and disposed of, in accordance with practices acceptable to the CI-GEF Project Agency:

2. Will the project include the use of ecologically-based biological/environmental integrated pest management practices (IPM) and/or Integrated Vector Management (IVM)?	☐	☐

[3] *Invasive alien species* (IASs) are plants, animals, pathogens and other organisms that are non-native to an ecosystem, and which may cause economic or environmental harm or adversely affect human health. In particular, they impact adversely upon biodiversity, including decline or elimination of native species - through competition, predation, or transmission of pathogens - and the disruption of local ecosystems and ecosystem functions (*CBD, 2006*).

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Description of approach to be used:

b. Description of potential positive and negative impacts of the approach to be used in the project:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will assess the risk of the danger to non-target species:

e. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly implement these approaches:

SECTION 6: PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Does the project plan to remove, alter or disturb any physical cultural resources (PCRs) [4]?

☒ **NO** → Continue to Section 7

☐ **YES** → Continue to Table 6.1. below

TABLE 6.1: CHECKLIST FOR PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (PCR)	Yes	No
1. Will the project plan to work in areas that fall into categories under PCR, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, and sacred sites including graveyards, burial sites, and sites with unique natural values?	☐	☐

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:
a. Name, description of the known physical cultural resources to be affected by the project, and cultural importance to local community(ies):

b. Description of project activities to be implemented and their positive and negative impacts on PCRs:

c. Description of the mitigating measures to be implemented by the Executing Entity:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will handle issues related to consultations, siting, change-finds procedures, construction contracts and buffer zones:

[4] PCRs are defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, sacred sites or other cultural significance.

SECTION 7: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

1. Stakeholders Participation: Describe any stakeholders important to the project and how you have involved or plan to involve them in the planning and implementation of the project.

During the development of the project proposal each national CI office in Suriname and Guyana ran a series of consultations with government counterparts as part of the preparation and planning process, developing the results based framework with project partners IUCN and CI (Americas Field Division). This included a planning workshop held in Paramaribo, Suriname between government and local actors (please see Project Document Section 3 for a description of represented stakeholders which include government NFPs, ONGs, private foundations and mangrove user communities) during the pre-project phase and a preliminary review led by CI of current state of mangrove knowledge and conservation actions in Guyana and Suriname.

The project seeks to improve understanding of the goods, services, expectations and needs of local communities related to mangroves which involves coordination with local communities, national stakeholders, regional interests for sustainable development and emphasizes the relevance of mangrove conservation and ICZM for human well-being in the region. Those inputs, to be discussed in stakeholder participatory meetings are specifically to support the ICZM planning process, in developing agreements and a shared transboundary agenda.

In terms of project implementation the GEF-CLME+ project is a key collaborator to which this project extends support in developing aspects of the multi-government ratified SAP for the NBS region relating to mangrove, integrated water management and coastal habitat conservation.

SECTION 8: GENDER MAINSTREAMING

1. Describe how the Executing Entity will ensure that gender is mainstreamed throughout the project according to the CI-GEF Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines (see Appendix VIII of the ESMF for more information):

The support in collective research for NBS mangrove conservation aims to help reduce potential loss of benefits provided by mangroves for people through facilitating and enabling a mechanism with stakeholders to co-develop a subsequent ICZM planning process that manages diverse industries, expectations and the natural resource. The project hence expects to engage a broad audience with diverse interests, cultural and social backgrounds, including gender and age groups through capacity building, consultation and facilitated discussion in a series of planned in-person and on-line meetings.

As such the project management team on the ground in Suriname and Guyana is responsible for ensuring that within the situational and cultural context of each country there is no discrimination that influences the availability and receipt of culturally compatible social and economic benefits between men, women and different age groups and that their dignity and human rights are respected throughout the project. The M&E system will include disaggregated data to help with adaptive management regarding equitable participation during the project and there are planned activities that disaggregate community roles, expectations and engagement with mangrove resources (Activity 1.1.2 community level ecosystem good and services evaluations). Since it is a 1 year catalyst project these will serve as important inputs and considerations to promote gender mainstreaming in the subsequent planning steps towards a regional ICZM and within national mangrove action plans.

CI field teams will consult with the CI-HQ Gender and Conservation Specialist (CI-HQ Policy and Practice Unit) for guidance in inferring or further development of gender dimensions linked to research and ICZM planning results.

Conservation International implementing on-the-ground actions for the project is an Affirmative Action/ Equal Opportunity Employer of minorities, females, protected veterans, and individuals with disabilities. It is the policy of CI to afford equal employment opportunity to all employees and applicants for employment. In the context of the project, all contractual opportunities are be subject to the CI-GEF procurement process including a fair and non-discriminatory evaluation procedure.

2. Is there a risk that the project may infringe on men's or women's human rights[5]? Explain how these risks will be managed.

The project will not endorse any actions that may infringe men or women's human rights, although by its nature any changes in consensual use and access to resources in the coastal zone would involve societal adjustments that may influence also gender roles.

It is expected that there be no discrimination in in this process; in participation or in any of the learning, outreach and development opportunities afforded by the project. An ICZM plan should include elements of gender mainstreaming from the beginning of the process as well as looking to ensure representation of those involved and potentially affected by a future ICZM planning process.

3. Is the project likely to create, aggravate or perpetuate inequalities/conflicts between men and women within households and communities? Explain how this situation will be managed.

The project will work to avoid such situations and seeks an informed participation of men and women as stakeholders during ICZM planning. Those planning steps should take into consideration social diversity, differential use of resources and will consider and respect cultural or situational context. That may involve steps to better understand societal gender roles such as gender specific interview groups where moderators are men or women under advice of a gender issue specialist. If issues do arise indirectly as a result of the project (detected during the evaluation or through the M&E indicators) then the responsible office will assess and take any remedial steps, including appraisal of the work plan, a change in strategy to ensure equitable participation and modification of any activities instigating such problems.

4. Is the project likely to impact men or women (positively or negatively) in different ways? Explain how these differences will be managed:

The impact of an ICZM process is intended to be positive and adaptive to users' needs and expectations, including gender disaggregated impacts as evidenced in examples of spatial use ordination and rights based management in other regions (e.g. different gender roles in aspects of fisheries, commercialization, micro-tourism enterprises etc.). In this instance the project aims to help set up the guidelines/ roadmap for that process, providing an opportunity to mainstream gender issues into ICZM design where appropriate from the early planning stages.

Beyond the project the intention is that stakeholders implementing an ICZM process can find optimized use and access solutions that prioritize sustained mid-long term benefits over the often short term unsustainable gains. Planning in multiple use and user scenarios is usually a necessary mix of compromise and concessions towards

[5] See Universal Declaration of Human Rights http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/

agreed objectives for such managed areas and is reviewed over regular inter- annual periods. The adaptive management cycle provides opportunity for any needed adjustments that help ensure equitable gender benefits.

SECTION 9: ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM

1. Describe how the Executing Entity will ensure timely response/resolution of complaints from parties affected by the project

Stakeholders may raise a grievance at all times to the Executing Agency about any actions instigated by the project and the application of its safeguard frameworks. Affected stakeholders should be informed about this possibility and contact information of the respective organizations at relevant levels should be made available either on-line, during the project start-up workshop and/or in project affected sites where most relevant.

IUCN has put in place an Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) grievance mechanism to provide people or communities fearing or suffering adverse impacts from a project with an opportunity to raise their concerns. The mechanism covers complaints related to issues where IUCN projects have failed to respect ESMS principles, standards and procedures. The mechanism and complaint procedure are described in the guidance note available at https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_esms_sia_guidance_note.pdf and a template for submitting complaints available at https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_esms_complaint_form_template.docx .

For the grievance mechanism to be effective and accessible, the executing entity must inform all relevant project stakeholders of its existence and about the relevant provisions of the ESMS at the start of the project. In this case the project can be advertised on-line through the IUCN/CI local web presence displaying information about how to contact IUCN and CI if concerns or complaints arise. Guidance for this signage can be found at https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_esms_guidance_on_signage_template.docx .

SECTION 10: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. External Assumptions: Describe any important external factors (risks) that may affect your project during implementation and how you will mitigate these potential risks.

The main risks faced by the project are the willingness of scientists and technical agencies to collaborate in the regional assessments, the availability and access to existing information and the degree to which responsible agencies in each country, private organizations and NGOs can support the development of an ICZM initiative given the situational context of each country during its implementation. Stakeholder uptake is essential to project success.

These risks are mitigated by having already begun a collaborative process with researchers and information providers, and having the support of the NFPs in each country to help advance the knowledge gap analysis and in their review and validation of ICZM planning steps.

2. Long-term Sustainability/Replicability: Describe how project components or results will continue or be

replicated beyond the initial project. Note that this may include elements of project design, tools utilized during the project, or project results.

Given that lack of continuity and organization beyond the end of the project is a risk, an ICZM should involve a financing planning component. The challenge and opportunity is to help develop a road-map that is feasible, ratified and formalized leading to further investment by countries and supporting agencies with clearly stated roles, objectives and expected benefits that are well communicated from the outset.

4. **Social Context**: Describe the broad socio-economic context of, and local communities living in, the area of the proposed project, with emphasis on men's and women's different roles, responsibilities and needs of natural resources that the project seeks to focus on.

Populations in the NBS-LME are largely concentrated in the coastal zone (>80%). Continuous mangrove degradation (10-20%) is reported over the last four decades near developed peri-urban areas. Evidence of erosion dates from 1914 in coastal districts such as Paramaribo and Wanica, home to ~50% of the entire population of Suriname (Nijbroek 2014) where >80% of the populace live in the coastal fringe. Agriculture, particularly rice plantations (in Guyana) and horticulture (in Suriname), areas used for cattle grazing and urban encroachment has reduced kilometer thick mangrove forests in places to <10m wide belts.

Much development was before people were aware of the implications for the flood defenses, fisheries resources, carbon value and water quality services provided by mangroves to local communities. Extensive artificial dykes for flood protection have replaced the mangroves in many populated areas resulting in "polder" dried areas that have subsided to below sea level (particularly in Guyana). These solutions are typically costly, and unlike mangrove green belt cannot naturally adapt to changing conditions, providing limited services beyond physical protection and require ongoing maintenance. Recent awareness work in Guyana has motivated subsequent efforts to recover lost mangroves which have so far met with mixed (0-60%) success (Anthony 2015). There is however a psychological component to the green-grey coastal defense argument in that large concrete dykes have a reassuring effect upon the general population (pers. Comment Prof. Naipal) which also influences the willingness of authorities to commit to alternative or hybrid solutions.

Following World Bank statistics there is a bias towards men in the labor force and a tendency towards men as fishers/ farmers and women in supporting commercialization and processing roles (e.g. with honey production and sales etc. in the case of mangroves). This information cites women as having higher enrollment rates in education, yet as being less involved in decision making outside of the direct influence of the household.

5. Describe how the project will work in this context and with the local communities, if relevant.

The project supports the concepts of retention, recovery and longevity of mangrove goods and services to local communities, national and international communities and expects to engage local communities as part of the ecosystem goods and services evaluation and indirectly through the participation and awareness building steps implicit in a participatory ICZM development for the region. The argument for mangrove conservation is firmly rooted in the benefits they provide to people and the risk posed to coastal societies by their continued loss.

6. **Institutional Capacity**. Describe the institution's capacity to implement the safeguard policies.

IUCN as Executing Agency and CI as executing partner have the capacity to implement safeguard measures as described by the CI-GEF Agency ESMF guidelines. Both organizations have published protocols for developing and instigating Ecological and Social Impact Assessments which are underpinned and compliant with their GEF accredited Agencies guidance materials. Safeguard staff members are capable of advising field teams, providing targeted support and training. The project staff also have experience in developing and implementing safeguard

plans for GEF and analogous projects based upon World Bank Environmental and Social Framework and standards (also having experience in applying the same GMS and IP concepts for work with mangrove user communities the Eastern Tropical Pacific region).