

## CI-GEF PROJECT AGENCY SCREENING RESULTS AND SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS

(To be completed by CI-GEF Coordination Team)

**Date Prepared/Updated:**

### I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data	
<b>Country:</b> Madagascar	<b>GEF Project ID:</b> 5784
<b>Project Title:</b> Integrated adaptive management to protect ecological integrity in the Socio-Ecological Production Landscape (SEPL) of the south-east watershed of Makira Natural Park	
<b>Executing Entity:</b> Wildlife Conservation Society Madagascar	
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b> Biodiversity	
<b>GEF Project Amount:</b> US\$88,987	
<b>Reviewer(s):</b> Ian Kissoon	
<b>Date of Review:</b> June 17, 2016	
<b>Comments:</b> Analysis completed and approved	

### B. Project Objective:

To improve the ecological integrity of the Makira forests and the well-being of local natural resource dependent communities in and around the SEPL in the southeast of Makira Natural Park that suffers from a high level of anthropogenic threats. The three specific components that will contribute to the achievement of the project objective include the securing of ecological function and enabling of adaptive management of natural resources within the landscape; the empowerment of local communities and enhancement of their livelihoods based on a sustainable use of natural resources of the SEPL in partnership with private sector partners; and the promotion of good governance practices amongst all stakeholders.

### C. Project Description:

This project will focus activities in the SEPL of the southeast watershed of Makira and will aim to protect the conservation importance of the landscape in a participatory manner with local communities, while simultaneously optimizing communities' abilities to improve natural resource based livelihoods through increased diversification and resilience building. Livelihoods activities will involve private sector partners to build local capacity to implement improved agro-ecological techniques, thus decreasing land degradation and erosion, creating links to new markets for sustainable cash-crops through FairTrade clove production, a traditional crop in this zone – and promoting improved subsistence rice production techniques as an alternative to tavy. The project will also set the groundwork for future sustainability by building capacity of stakeholders on good governance of natural resources and also by involving youth and women in environmental actions and decision-making.

Strong and effective involvement of communities in conservation activities coupled with interventions to support improved livelihoods will facilitate behavior shifts by ensuring that the opportunity costs of continued destructive land use activities are outweighed by improved livelihood incentives. This will also reinforce community ownership and attitudes towards conservation actions and thus contribute to long-term sustainability of the project.

The project will implement activities under the following components:

- Component 1: Reinforcing the ecological integrity of the south-east watershed SEPL of Makira Natural Park
- Component 2: Enhancing livelihoods and food security of local communities
- Component 3: Improving local governance through community capacity building

**D. Project location and biophysical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis:**

The project is located in the Makira Natural Park which represents the largest remaining contiguous tract of low and mid-altitude rainforest in eastern Madagascar. It constitutes an important genetic corridor between other protected forests across the north of Madagascar, and ensures the ecological integrity of one of the most diverse and intact areas of Madagascar. The Makira forests also support the terrestrial and marine livelihoods of thousands of households and protect their means of subsistence by protecting the watersheds, by preventing flooding of plains, and in reducing the sedimentation of the downstream Antongil bay.

Human demands from the 90,000 people living in the Makira landscape threaten the integrity of the forests, which in turn affect the livelihoods of people that depend on them. Makira faces a number of challenges including growing demands for agricultural land, bushmeat hunting, collection of non-timber forest products, illegal logging and mining. However, the biggest threat to Makira forest is slash and burn agriculture (tavy) that is used to cultivate rain-fed rice rather than irrigated rice. Used principally for subsistence needs, tavy is typically practiced in upland forested areas and limited land availability and increasing human population growth (around 3%/year) exacerbate clearing rates for this practice.

One area of particular ecological and social fragility within Makira is the southeast watershed of Makira that encompasses two forest corridors – the Vohitaly and Lokaitra corridors that link two important forest parcels to the main forest block, and the surrounding community managed forests. This watershed is a classic example of a SEPL due to the combination of ecological importance and fragility, the poverty and natural resource dependence of local communities, the resulting high level of threats posed by the proximity to villages, and the high – yet largely untapped - potential for productivity through natural resource based livelihoods activities.

**E. Executing Entity’s Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies:**

Not assessed

**II. SAFEGUARD AND POLICIES**

**Environmental and Social Safeguards:**

Safeguard Triggered	Yes	No	TBD	Date Completed
---------------------	-----	----	-----	----------------

<b>1. Environmental &amp; Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: No significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented is anticipated</i>				
<b>2. Natural Habitats</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: The project is not proposing to alter natural habitats</i>				
<b>3. Involuntary Resettlement</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: The project does not propose any involuntary resettlement</i>				
<b>4. Indigenous Peoples</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: The project does not plan to work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples</i>				
<b>5. Pest Management</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: The project does not plan to implement activities related to agricultural extension services including the use of approved pesticides or alien invasive species management.</i>				
<b>6. Physical &amp; Cultural Resources</b>		<b>X</b>		
<i>Justification: There are no proposed activities related to physical and cultural resources.</i>				
<b>7. Stakeholder Engagement</b>	<b>X</b>			
<i>Justification: The project will involve local communities and effective participation of these key stakeholders must be facilitated by the project.</i>				
<b>8. Gender mainstreaming</b>	<b>X</b>			
<i>Justification: The project activities will target both men and women.</i>				
<b>9. Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms</b>	<b>X</b>			
<i>Justification: As a publicly funded GEF project, participants need to be able submit complaints or raise grievances with the Executing Agency and the Project Agency.</i>				

### III. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

*From information provided in the Safeguard Screening Form, this project has triggered three safeguard policies. These are:*

- I. Stakeholder Engagement,*
- II. Gender Mainstreaming, and*
- III. Grievance Mechanism.*

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

*No indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities are foreseen at this time.*

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

*The proposed approach of the project is expected to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. As such, no better alternative can be conceived at this time.*

4. Describe measures to be taken by the Executing Entity to address safeguard policy issues.

I. Stakeholder Engagement

*Given the small size of the project grant, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is not being requested. However, the project is **required** ensure active stakeholder participation and to reflect stakeholder engagement activities in the annual workplan. Please document the date, location and participants (gender disaggregated) along with meeting notes of all stakeholder engagement activities. The documentation of these activities can be supported (not required) with photographs, video and audio recordings.*

*Also agree with stakeholders on where, when and how information will be disseminated back to them following a meeting/consultation.*

II. Gender

*Given the small size of the project grant, a Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP) is not being requested. However, the project is **required** to reflect gender disaggregated activities in the annual workplan. The design of activities and consultations should consider the needs and schedules of both men and women. Please document how many men and women were consulted, participated in project activities, and benefitted/affected by the project. Also ensure that men and women are not adversely impacted and receive equal opportunities in planning, decision-making and implementation in a way that is culturally appropriate and acceptable.*

III. Grievance Mechanism

*An Accountability and Grievance Mechanism is **required** to ensure people affected by the project are able to bring their grievances to the Executing Entity for consideration and redress. The mechanism must be in place before the start of project activities, and also disclosed to all stakeholders in a manner/means that best suits the local context.*

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

*The key stakeholders are the government (The Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Oceans and Forests), private sector (LaFaza Trading Company) and the local communities. The mechanisms for consultation and disclosure should be culturally appropriate, gender sensitive, effective, and in keeping with local customs. Engagement can take the form of village meetings, group meetings, workshops, interviews/surveys, etc. and done using local languages and methods. The Executing Entity should take these contexts into consideration when designing engagement activities.*

#### IV. PROJECT CATEGORIZATION

PROJECT CATEGORY	Category A	Category B	Category C

*Justification: The proposed project activities are likely to have minimal or no adverse environmental and social impacts.*

#### V. EXPECTED DISCLOSURE DATES

Safeguard Plan	CI Disclosure Date	In-Country Disclosure Date
Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)	NA	NA
Environmental Management Plan (EMP)	NA	NA
Voluntary Resettlement Action Plan (V- RAP)	NA	NA
Process Framework for Restriction of Access to Natural Resources	NA	NA
Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP)	NA	NA
Pest Management Plan (PMP)	NA	NA
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	SEP not required. SE activities to be included in the annual workplan	SEP not required. SE activities to be included in the annual workplan
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	GMP not required. GM activities to be included in the annual workplan	GMP not required. GM activities to be included in the annual workplan
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	Within 15 days of CI-GEF approval	No later than inception workshop/kick-off meeting

#### VI. APPROVALS

<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>		
Vice President: 	Name: Miguel Morales	Date:
<i>Approved by:</i>		
Safeguard Manager: 	Name: Ian Kissoon	Date: 2016-06-20
Project Manager:	Name: Orissa Samaroo	Date:

