

TERMS OF REFERENCE

For the preparation of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and Environmental and Social Mitigation Framework (ESMF) for the Lobeke (Cameroon) and Dzanga Sangha (Central African Republic) Landscapes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE LANDSCAPES

Lobéké

The Lobéké conservation complex is located in the South Eastern part of Cameroon and consists of the Lobéké National Park (LNP), covering a surface of 217,854 ha, and a peripheral area of 451,500 ha, which comprises six Forest Management Units, four Areas of Synergetic Interest (ZIC), three Areas of Synergetic Interest in Community Management, and one Agro-forestry zone.

The conservation complex spans the districts of Moloundou and Salapoumbé in the Boumba-and-Ngoko Division, East Region Cameroon where are located 21 villages, with an estimated population of more than 23,245 individuals (including circa 26% Baka, 52% Bantu and 22% immigrants).

Historically, the process that led to the establishment of the Lobéké National Park (LNP) started in 1995 when the area was declared by the Government of Cameroon an "essential zone of protection" (i.e. hunting and forest exploitation were prohibited). In the same year, WWF created the Jengi Southeast Forests Programme to promote the sustainable management of natural resources for the improvement of the living conditions of Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples (IPLC).

In 1999 the area was integrated into the South East Technical Operational Unit (UTO / SE) and in 2000 declared a zone of public utility by the Government. That same year the Lobéké area was integrated into the Tri-National Sangha (TNS) landscape following the cooperation agreement signed by the Governments of the Republic of Cameroon, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo.

In 2001 the essential zone of protection was classified as Lobéké National Park (LNP), with the participation of all stakeholders, including local communities and indigenous peoples.

In July 2012 the TNS was eventually registered on the World Heritage List at the 36th session of the PMO in St. Petersburg, Russia under Reference No.1380rev.

For several years now, the natural resources of the area have been undergoing systematic depletion linked to poaching, unsustainable logging, mining, poor governance and socio-economic transformation caused by industrial activities and immigration, and WWF has been supporting the LNP and its peripheral areas in the domain of wildlife conservation, promotion of the well-being of local populations and sustainable management of natural resources, through a landscape approach.

In more details WWF activities have been focussing on:

- Participation in the development of integrated land-use plans;
- Promotion of Lobéké National Park management effectiveness;
- Implementation of bio-monitoring programme to assess progress towards achievements of expected impacts;
- Improvement of IPLC access to forest and wildlife resources in and around national parks and their participation in related decision-making;
- Direct support for improving the living conditions of IPLC;
- Promotion of an appropriate innovative strategy for the education of Baka youth through the formal education system in Cameroon;
- Promotion of human rights consideration in conservation projects, and particularly in the



- surveillance and control operations to fight against poaching;
- Promotion of organisational and technical capacity of IPLC for sustainability of their livelihood activities.

Dzanga Sangha

The Dzanga Sangha Protected Areas complex (DSPA) is a 4,450 km² multi use zone, comprising the Dzanga Sangha Dense Forest Special Reserve with its various community uses, including a community hunting zone, and the Dzanga Ndoki National Park.

Situated in the far south-west corner of the Central African Republic (CAR), DSPA is home to large mammals such as forest elephants, lowland gorillas and chimpanzees, bongo, buffalo, sitatunga, giant forest hogs as well as a large variety of monkeys and duikers. The DSPA together with Lobéké NP (Cameroon), Nouabale Ndoki NP (Republic of Congo) and their buffer zones make up the Sangha Tri-National complex (TNS) inscribed a World Heritage Site since July, 2012. The protected area managers and their key partners work together to tackle the main threat to the integrity of this World Heritage Site, which is poaching, as well as other issues.

For 30 years WWF, with other partners, has been supporting the Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing (MEFCP) in CAR to manage the DSPA, both to conserve its exceptional biodiversity and to promote the sustainable management of natural resources for the well-being of nearby human populations.

In 2016 a five-year management plan for the DSPA was endorsed, setting objectives on protected area management, surveillance, sustainable development, ecotourism and research/monitoring for the period 2016-2020. Five conservation targets (forest elephants, great apes, consumable species, forests and rivers) and four human wellbeing targets (materials needed for a good life, health, equitable society and security) were identified for the DSPA. These will be met through the following strategic approaches: 1) anti-poaching (aimed at elephant poaching), 2) participatory management (aimed at reducing over-exploitation of natural resources), 3) sustainable development, 4) ecotourism (aimed at job creation, fundraising and including prevention of spread of diseases) and 5) sustainable forestry (aimed at improving forestry practices).

From a formal point of view, WWF has been working in the landscape through a de-facto co-management arrangement initiated with the CAR government in 1989. In February 2019, a new co-management agreement was then signed with the government outlining the role of each partner in the management of DSPA. Two bodies were created to manage DSPA: a Board of 6 members acting as the governing and decision-making body and a Management Unit composed of 5 departments acting as the executive body. The management unit is headed by a WWF-employed Director and assisted by a Government-employed Deputy Director.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The consultant will be asked to focus on two landscapes (hereafter collectively referred to as the “project”) that - although covering two separate countries – are geographically adjacent. The two landscapes are Lobéké (Cameroon) and Dzanga Sangha (Central African Republic).

The consultancy will look at the two landscapes separately and task 1-4 listed in the remainder of the ToR will be done separately for the two sites. The Consultant shall thus develop two Environmental and Social Management Frameworks (ESMF), one for each of the two landscapes, where WWF has been operating for several years – and still is.

OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Overall, the landscape interventions are expected to yield positive environmental and social benefits. However, the implementation of some landscape activities may result in adverse impacts on the



environment and the communities. A special focus should also lie on transborder activities across different countries within the Sangha Tri-National complex (TNS) landscape and their impacts.

In order to align the interventions within the landscape with the WWF Social and Environmental Safeguards Framework (ESSF) and ensure that any negative environmental and social risks and related impacts potentially stemming from the Project are minimized and mitigated as much as feasible, while striving to enhance benefits for local communities and the environment, the objective of the Assignment is the preparation of both an **Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for each landscape.**

It is expected that the assignment will be focused on reviewing all WWF interventions and activities and not specific projects within the landscape.

SCOPE OF WORK

The ToR aims to outline the tasks in as much detail as possible. Nevertheless, the Consultant shall critically verify the scope of services indicated and may extend, reduce or amend those services wherever such is deemed necessary according to his/her own professional judgement and knowledge. Any suggested amendments to the ToR should be clearly documented within the Consultant's submission, including accompanying justification for the proposed amendments, and must be approved by the contracting party at WWF.

COVID-19

It is recognized that the current COVID-19 pandemic limits the ability to undertake any field-based tasks until travel/health restrictions are lifted or other permissions secured. The Consultant and WWF will regularly review the COVID-19 situation and will jointly agree when it is safe for any field-based work to take place. This decision will be based on adequate assurance that the risk of COVID-19 transmission has been minimized for any communities or other stakeholders, the Consultant team and WWF staff.

Since Task 1 is heavily desk-based, it can be started immediately. It is also expected that preparatory work for Task 2 could be carried out remotely.

NDA/Confidentiality

In order for the Consultant to fulfil this ToR, confidential documents will be made available for review. The Consultant will therefore be required to sign and abide by a non-disclosure agreement (NDA) that will be included with the formal contract.

On WWF's E&S safeguards, and for avoidance of doubt, the [Framework](#) document has been publicly disclosed, but the ten Standards remain confidential, pending a consultation and subsequent disclosure.

It is anticipated that the Assignment will be undertaken through the following tasks conducted separately in the two landscapes:

- Task 1: Review of available documents and virtual kick-off meeting.
- Task 2: Development of the stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement plan
- Task 3: Field visit(s) and engagement with stakeholders.
- Task 4: Development of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)
- Task 5: Development of the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF)

Further details of the required tasks, the scope and guidance on content and proposed methodologies are provided in the sub-sections below.

Task 1: Review of available documents, identification of any potential gaps, and virtual kick-off meeting

WWF will provide any available background documentation regarding the environmental and social aspects of the landscape, including its initial ESSF risk screening and categorization performed by WWF staff, any previous impact assessments and any baseline studies developed for the project, and any mitigation measures already being adopted and under implementation.

The Consultant shall get familiar with the available documents and with the relevant WWF ESSF Standards. In addition to the documentation provided by WWF, the Consultant is also expected to explore any relevant external research/literature to inform the gap analysis.

Based on the preparatory information analysis, the Consultant shall identify any gaps in the existing documentation, highlight the need for any additional assessments and set up a work plan for the Assignment. The work plan shall refer to the tasks as described in these ToR and shall include any additional tasks as identified by the Consultant during the preparation phase. This work plan, with accompanying detailed budget, will form the basis of the detailed terms of the assignment and shall be approved by WWF prior to starting the work.

Prior to commencing the Assignment, the Consultant shall participate in a virtual kick-off meeting with relevant WWF staff members for the development of the work plan. This meeting will also enable WWF to provide the Consultant with additional context information for the tasks and the list of WWF documentation to be reviewed.

Task 2: Carry out a stakeholder analysis and a stakeholder engagement plan

Based on the information provided by WWF during the first task, the Consultant will carry out stakeholder analysis and develop subsequent stakeholder engagement plans for each of the landscapes.

For Lobeke, there has already been multiple efforts by WWF and other partners towards stakeholder analysis within the landscape. The Consultant is then expected to update the previous stakeholder analysis and also assess where applicable the form and processes of the consent obtained from communities under past FPIC processes.

Given there have been limited efforts regarding stakeholder analysis in Dzanga Sangha, the Consultant is then expected to draw a stakeholder analysis that identifies the key stakeholder groups that are likely to be directly or indirectly affected by WWF activities in the landscape, as well as those who have an interest in the activities and/or the ability to influence its outcome, either positively or negative. The stakeholder analysis will serve as a baseline to develop a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan. This plan is meant to provide a better understanding of the mechanisms and nature of engagement with the different rightsholder groups, including their participation and representation in decision-making.

Further technical guidance about the development of the stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement plan is outlined into the annex.

Task 3: Carry out field visit(s) and consult with stakeholders, based on the stakeholder engagement plan

Data collection and consultation processes in the framework of this Assignment will include one or more field visits to the landscape program sites (to be agreed in consultation with WWF) that are representative for informing the development of the ESMF. The field trips will be scheduled depending on the evolution related to travel restrictions in both countries. The selection of field visit sites/communities will be evaluated and jointly established by the Consultant and the WWF project team, based on the following criteria:

- Area of influence: the specific areas within the Lobéké and Dzanga-Sangha landscapes where WWF has activities or exerts influence.
- Accessibility: Access the impacted villages by road and possible mobility of impacted villagers to travel to the location where the consultation will take place. ;



- Ethnicity: Differences in culture and ethnic identity;
- Livelihoods: Differences in the main livelihood strategies – agriculture, NTFP collection, fishing, etc.;
- Dependency: Dependency of household livelihoods on forest products or more generally on the areas impacted by WWF's work;
- Impact: Difference in types of project-related positive and negative impacts and their spatial distribution.

- Historical conflicts: Areas where conflicts resulting from WWF work have happened in the past with local communities and indigenous peoples.

A particular attention will be paid to different sub-groups inside communities, e.g. women, elders, and different ethnicities (if a community is multi-ethnic).

The Consultant will detail in the proposal the methodology and any other criteria adopted for the identification of the stakeholders to engage. Site visits and field work shall be carried out in cooperation with the WWF Project staff, and any other relevant authorities as appropriate.

Especially in the social context, information shall be obtained from local communities, using to the extent possible in the scope of the mission, participatory rural appraisal methods based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques, including focus group discussions. Institutional stakeholders relevant in the context of the environmental and social aspects of the Project (as applicable), including but not limited to environmental agencies/administrations, institutions related to water resources management, institutions related to forestry and agriculture, protected area management as appropriate as well as relevant social institutions shall be consulted during the mission, for example through key informant interviews and multi-stakeholder workshops.

Task 3: Development of the ESIA

The process of developing the ESIA will help to fill the gaps in information identified in the inception report and integrate the views and feedback provided by stakeholders in relation to the potential negative social and environmental impacts, as well as the preliminary mitigation measures. See additional technical guidance about the ESIA in the Annex.

The impact assessment shall be undertaken by the Consultant in a structured manner, along the relevant national legislation and the requirements of the relevant WWF E&S Safeguard Standards (ESSS), with a special focus on, but not limited to:

- o ESSS 2 on Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms
- o ESSS 3 on Disclosure
- o ESSS 4 on Stakeholder Engagement
- o ESSS 5 on Involuntary Resettlement and Restriction of Access
- o ESSS 6 on Indigenous Peoples
- o ESSS 7 on Community Health, Safety and Security
- o ESSS 8 on Protection of Natural Habitats
- o ESSS 10 on Physical and Cultural Resources

Currently, known risks and/or issues in both the Lobéké and Dzanga-Sangha landscapes include:

- Social risks related to anticipated impacts from restriction of access to and use of natural resources, social exclusion, distributional justice, human-wildlife conflicts, any conflicts over resources between different groups of the population etc;
- Vulnerable groups, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, as well as indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, or other persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation;



- Law Enforcement (LE) activities - aimed at reducing poaching particularly in and around protected areas (PAs) – in connection to issues on government ranger performance; the rights of community and indigenous peoples; the quality, accountability and oversight of law enforcement activities and within that, WWF's support to governmental management authorities and ranger forces; community health, safety and security.
- The current governance arrangements within both landscapes
- Lessons learned from similar projects/programs in both countries.

During the site visits particular attention should be paid to the local public views on environmental, cultural heritage and social effects that could be imposed by the project or shall be considered as they are already observable on the ground.

Task 4: Development of the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF)

The ESMF serves as a framework for managing and mitigating the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with implementing the Project. Its content will depend on the extent to which issues have been identified during the documentation review, the field visit and the engagement with stakeholders.

To prepare the ESMF, the Consultant will:

- (a) propose a set of mitigating actions to address potential adverse impacts highlighted by the earlier steps;
- (b) assess the potential for locally sourced and managed mitigation actions including the required support for their sustainability
- (c) determine requirements (e.g. in terms of capacity, partners, resources, etc. that need to be in place) for ensuring that those responses are made effectively and in a timely manner; and
- (d) describe the means for meeting those requirements (including an indicative budget and timeline).
- (e) an estimate of the time period required for the mitigating action to become effective and a recommendation for the frequency of status monitoring and review

The ESMF shall be developed in close cooperation with the WWF Project staff.

More information on the components of the ESMF can be found in the Annex.

DELIVERABLES

Task 1 will be desk based and result in the following outcomes:

- Brief inception report (1) identifying and detailing gaps resulting from the review of the available documents (including the screening tool, project categorization information, previous impact assessments and mitigation measures already being adopted) and (2) specifying a) any gaps to mitigate environmental and social risks, identified in the screening tool or uncovered through this document analysis, that need to be addressed and b) any additional assessments required to develop the ESMF;
- Detailed work plan with accompanying budget;
- Preparation, participation and documentation of a virtual kick-off meeting, including any changes to the work outlined in these ToR.

Task 2 and 3 will result in the following outcomes :

- Draft stakeholder analysis and list of stakeholders to be met and consulted during site visit (including checklists, questionnaires/interview guides/guiding questions for assessing potential risks and impacts and identifying preliminary mitigation measures)



- Final stakeholder analysis and engagement plan for each landscape
- Summary report of stakeholder engagement activities and how their views influenced the ESIA and ESMF (included as an annex to the ESMF)

Task 4 will result in the following outcomes :

- Draft and final ESIA for each landscape with annexes in both French and English (including a non-technical summary)

Task 5 will result in the following outcomes :

- Draft and final ESMF for each landscape with annexes in both French and English (including a non-technical summary)

Further details of the required tasks, the scope and guidance on content and proposed methodologies are provided in the Annex below. Non-technical summary of the findings from both the ESIA and ESMF will be disclosed to key local stakeholders including communities. Since both landscapes are home to Baka indigenous peoples, a summary of the ESMF (in the relevant form and language) will be disclosed for at least 45 days to communities prior for the ESMF to be finalized. All draft versions of the developed documents will also be reviewed by the safeguards team at WWF. Based on the provided feedback and review from the local stakeholders and WWF, the final versions will be developed. Requested changes shall be duly considered by the Consultant. After approval of final documents, the Consultant shall submit the final versions in PDF and Word format.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Consultant shall manage the Assignment to ensure that the tasks are delivered to the agreed schedule and that these meet the standards set out for the Assignment.

Core project management include:

- a) Management of the Consultant's team;
- b) Communication activities with the WWF key contacts, and other parties as required;
- c) Regular reporting on schedule, budget and progress of the Assignment;
- d) Health and Safety (H&S) and logistical planning for the Assignment.

STAFF AND QUALIFICATIONS

The project team proposed by the Consultant or firm and their qualifications have to reflect the scope of services and show excellent technical and professional qualifications. The Consultant shall provide a description of tasks to be performed by each team member as well as details on the selection and experience of the proposed members with regard to their tasks. WWF anticipates that proposed team members will include local experts partners who are Cameroon and CAR nationals with (1) sound expertise of the country legal context and (2), personal knowledge of the Lobéké and Dzanga-Sangha landscapes and the communities that reside within it.

The Consultant shall provide updated curricula vitae (CV) of the proposed international and local / regional staff. Key staff should have adequate education, professional experience, language skills and experience in the region. Please note that key staff presented in the Consultant's proposal may not be replaced without the prior approval of WWF.

BUDGET

The Consultant shall estimate the human and other resources that will be required to complete Tasks 1-4. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 situation, the budget estimate for Tasks 1-2 can be assessed and



WWF *for a living planet*[®]

submitted as a distinct sub-budget (for desk-based work). The financial offer(s) shall include all costs for elaboration of works, as described above, including travel costs.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

On the basis of these ToRs, the Consultant should prepare a proposal that covers:

- Proposed tasks and outputs (methodology);
- Team composition, including summary of expertise and experience
- Tentative work schedule (activities and milestones);
- Estimated level of effort;
- Estimated travel cost estimate (Flights + per diem).
- The availability to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

The proposal will have to be submitted by 18.00 CEST, Friday November 13th to:

Paolo Revellino

Senior Advisor, Environmental & Social Safeguards

WWF International

M +41 79 537 8361

prevellino@wwfint.org

Eric Parfait Essomba

Regional Head, E&S Safeguards, Central and West Africa

WWF International

Tel: +242065162864

eessomba@wwfint.org

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The proposal will be evaluated by WWF against the following criteria:

- Level of expertise and experience in implementing safeguards systems (e.g. GEF, IUCN, WB, IFC, others), including carrying out ESIA/SIAs and developing ESMFs/ESMPs.
- Level of expertise and experience in the countries and in the given landscapes.
- Any other relevant expertise and experience (e.g. FPIC, law enforcement, livelihoods, stakeholder engagement, participatory approaches, etc.).
- Language skills (including local languages)
- Overall quality of the proposal (incl. quality of the proposed methodology for stakeholder engagement).
- Cost - i.e. value for money.
- Availability.

ANNEX

INTRODUCTION TO THE WWF Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework

WWF's [Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework \(ESSF\)](#) provides an institutional mechanism to manage the environmental and social risks of WWF's work, helps deliver better conservation outcomes, and aims to enhance the social well-being of local communities in the places where WWF operates. The ESSF is designed to shape project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to secure better conservation by identifying and addressing environmental and social risks, mindful of the different challenges and needs in different parts of the world. It supports the systematisation of good governance practices to achieve respect of human rights, transparency, non-discrimination, public participation, and accountability, in the context of conservation work implemented or supported by WWF, among other goals. WWF's ESSF has been designed to meet the specific needs of WWF, which is a global network of independent NGOs that operate under a common licensing agreement and brand, and that pool funds to advance common conservation objectives.

The ESSF was adopted by the Board of WWF International and the WWF Network Executive Team (NET) in June 2019, to ensure consistent, comprehensive application of safeguards across the entire WWF Network.

SCOPE OF APPLICATION OF THE WWF ESSF

Safeguards play a vital role in achieving [WWF's vision](#). They guide how we engage local communities to plan and manage our work to improve and protect their lives, rights and livelihoods while conserving nature and wildlife. WWF interventions in the landscape/seascape are expected to yield positive environmental and social outcomes. The implementation of some conservation activities have the potential to result in unintended negative impacts, which makes it crucial to effectively apply safeguards to identify, avoid and mitigate these impacts. Assessment of environmental and social impacts and the subsequent preparation of appropriate mitigation plans in a participatory manner, is an essential part of this. WWF uses the Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF) to identify, avoid and mitigate these risks, uphold human rights, and ensure conservation projects deliver better outcomes for communities and nature. We apply safeguards in the design, implementation, and monitoring of all of our activities.

STRUCTURE OF THE WWF ESSF

The ESSF is composed of 4 Process Standards and 6 Substantive Standards.

The Process Standards are applied in all mitigation planning. They are:

- Environmental and Social Risk Management
- Accountability and Grievance Mechanism
- Disclosure
- Stakeholder engagement

The Substantive Standards include:

- Involuntary resettlement and restriction of access
- Indigenous Peoples
- Community health and security



- Protection of natural habitats
- Cultural resources
- Pest management

In practical terms, each ESSF is built by following **several structured processes** that, implemented together **ensure compliance** with the ESSF Substantive Standards. This means:

- A process is implemented to identify and manage negative environmental and social impacts (the objective of the present consultancy)
- A process is implemented to engage stakeholders on a continuous basis, document and integrate their feedback into project design and implementation
- A process is implemented to set up an accountability and grievance redress mechanism
- A process is implemented to ensure regular disclosure of information to stakeholders

STEPS OF THE ESSF



The first step in the development of an ESSF is the Risk Screening and categorisation. These are carried out by the WWF teams prior to the Impact Assessment process, usually at the design stage. Its aim is to screen all relevant WWF activities in the landscape/seascape for potential negative social or environmental impacts and to categorise the landscape/seascape according to level of risk.¹

For **High Risk Category A** or **Special Consideration** activities, independent specialist(s) must be hired to carry out an impact assessment (e.g. Social and Environmental Impact Assessment or Social Impact Assessment) and develop an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). **This is where the present consultancy fits within the project cycle.**

¹ The risk categorisation is and can result in the following labels: **High Risk (Category A)** - Likely to have significant and irreversible adverse social or environmental impacts at a large scale (such as the construction of major infrastructure). It is unlikely that WWF would implement such projects. **High Risk (Special Consideration)** - If proposed/implemented in a Fragile, Conflict-, Violence-affected State, or if there is potential for human rights abuses in addition to potential adverse social and/or environmental impacts which can be mitigated through WWF activities. **Medium risk (Category B)** - Potential adverse social and/or environmental impacts which can be mitigated through WWF activities. **Low risk (Category C)** - Likely to have minimal to no adverse social and environmental impacts, or outside of the scope of application of the Environmental & Social Safeguards Framework, the activities cannot be implemented, and the Landscape/Seascape team may be asked to stop (in the case of activities under implementation) or redesign the proposed activities.



In terms of process, the development of the ESIA/SIA will likely generate valuable material for the subsequent ESMF, particularly in terms of mitigation measures as stakeholder feedback should be gathered not just on the potential negative impacts, but also mitigation measures.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS FOR THE ESIA and ESMF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

As part of the documentary/desk review, building as much as possible on information provided by WWF (risk screenings, situation analysis, records of past stakeholder analysis and engagement, socio-economic assessments etc.) and complementing with additional research (academic studies of the area, work carried out by development institutions/NGOs etc.) a stakeholder analysis document provides the baseline for developing a stakeholder engagement plan.

The stakeholder analysis should identify the key stakeholder groups in the project area that are likely to be directly or indirectly affected by a project, as well as those who have an interest in a project and/or the ability to influence its outcome, either positively or negatively. This is likely to include potentially affected communities, including Indigenous Peoples, civil society groups, the national government's relevant agencies, the private sector if locally active (ex: logging companies). The consultants should distinguish between potentially affected stakeholders and others, and make use of any stakeholder analysis and engagement done previously by the WWF team to avoid duplication of efforts.

The stakeholder analysis should include:

- At a minimum
 - the number and location of relevant communities/villages settlements (identified on landscape/seascape map) potentially affected by the project
 - Indigenous Peoples and/or other vulnerable groups (such as ethnic minorities not self-identifying as IPs) should be identified
 - Where an ethnic or religious group/minority has history been or is currently being discriminated against by a dominant ethnic or religious group, this information should be considered as it is relevant to the development of the stakeholder engagement plan (to be consulted separately) and to the development of appropriate mitigation measures
 - the relevant governmental stakeholders (relevant ministry/agency(ies), local government
 - major private sector stakeholders (this could include logging/mining companies, agricultural producers or other representative bodies, cooperatives etc.)
 - Local NGOs active in the area or thematic issue

- To the extent possible
 - Demographic information on relevant stakeholders (gender, age, ethnicity).
 - Relevant stakeholder decision-making, conflict resolution mechanisms and other local institutions (customary and other).
 - Relevant religious and cultural elements as they are likely to affect and be affected by the proposed interventions (cultural resources/sites)
 - Unless prior studies have been carried out, this information may need to be gathered during the stakeholder engagement process itself and a degree of flexibility will be required to adapt the stakeholder engagement activities so as to include the views of a diverse range of stakeholders.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ESIA and ESMF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

As a result of the stakeholder analysis, a stakeholder engagement plan for the consultancy must be developed (both should be included in the Annex to the ESMF). Implementing the stakeholder engagement plan will ensure a better understanding of stakeholders' concerns and needs and is the primary means to identify measures to mitigate negative impacts in a participatory manner. The



Consultants should draw from programme/project stakeholder engagement plans already developed by the WWF team to avoid duplication of efforts.

General guidance/considerations for the stakeholder engagement plans:

- At minimum 1-2 field visits should be carried out, the first, to:
 - Fill any gaps in stakeholder information identified during the stakeholder analysis stage
 - Gather feedback and discuss perceived/anticipated impacts of the project and potential ways to mitigate these impacts
 - A second round of field consultations should take place to share results of the ESIA and further discuss mitigation measures, institutional arrangements for implementation of the ESMF (including grievance mechanism), capacity building needs and possible M&E (community feedback on project implementation, which includes implementation of mitigation measures specified in the ESMF). As stated above, this could be led by WWF staff.
- To the extent possible, stakeholder engagement should be tailored to individual groups (non-discriminatory and gender inclusive), taking into account potential barriers to participation and preferred/most appropriate ways of communication
- Communication materials should be accessible and culturally appropriate, and delivered by persons who can effectively engage with the respective group(s) (i.e. by working with WWF field staff)
- The stakeholder engagement plan should also include the planned provisions on information disclosure (what information provided, frequency, format etc.)

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Safeguard Screening Tool (SST) describes the risk category of the landscape/seascape and identifies the main/most significant potential negative social and/or environmental impacts that could arise as a result of implementation of the planned activities. **The SST will be the starting point for the consultant team** tasked with the ESIA (and subsequent ESMF) and can help determine whether an ESIA is required or a SIA.

The level of detail of the assessments will need to be discussed with the WWF contracting office. In order to effectively use resources, the consultants should build on information gathered and studies already completed by WWF teams (socio-economic assessments, biodiversity monitoring reports, situation analysis) complementing these with field work as needed.

Structure of the ESIA

At minimum, the ESIA/SIA should contain:

1. **A non-technical summary**, which summarises significant issues in a way that can be easily understood by a non-technical audience, in particular local stakeholders.
2. **Landscape/seascape context**
 - This section will be developed using documentation provided by WWF
 - Include map(s) (sub-region, country, landscape)
3. **Methodology**

While the consultants are required to propose a methodology for the ESIA, as a matter of guidance:



- The ESIA should be developed through a combination of desk-based study and stakeholder consultation (identification of impacts and mitigation measures). See section on references/resources to refer to.
- The availability of existing information will determine the additional assessments that need to be carried out by the consultants, in discussion with WWF.

4. WWF landscape governance structure

Depending on the gaps identified in the SST. This section should explain in detail the governance/institutional arrangements in the landscape relevant to WWF's activities. This includes:

- To the extent possible, explain the overarching programmatic structure (or lack thereof). This means explaining whether all activities are implemented as part of a coordinated programme or several uncoordinated projects (multiple donors)
- Roles and responsibilities of the various partners WWF is working with in the landscape (provide details of contractual agreements that may exist)
- Financial organisation of the programme(s) in the landscape (if not 100% done by WWF, who has the authority to hire and fire staff, validate budgets and expenditure)

5. Socio-cultural, economic, historical and political context

While some broader contextual information is necessary, the main analysis should focus on the immediate context of the landscape/seascape and be relevant to decisions about project design, operation, or mitigation measures. To the extent possible consultants should rely on secondary data and existing analyses carried out by the WWF team as a project design step. This contextual information should ideally include:

- **Historical context** relevant to the landscape and potential impacts, including:
 - evolution of natural resource management regime in the country/landscape
 - property rights/tenure regime and degree of recognition of customary/communal rights
 - traditional organisational and decision-making structures
- **Main economic activities and livelihood patterns** such as:
 - subsistence and commercial agriculture/hunting/fishing,
 - degree of isolation from or integration in the market economy,
 - degree of dependence on natural resources or on illegal activities such as poaching or illegal trade.
 - Where possible this should be detailed to the village level and be gender disaggregated, as well as distinguished between ethnic groups
- **An overview of the social issues and risks faced by social groups**, including
 - issues related to access to infrastructure and social services as well as to capabilities and development opportunities.
 - This doesn't have to be detailed to the household or village level, but should enable the identification of the key socio-economic challenges faced by the local population and different social groups within (lacking health clinics, lack of schools, no access to markets for agricultural goods they produce etc.).
 - Where one ethnic group has historically been discriminated against by the dominant group, describe this situation here.
- **Interests and developmental aspirations** of the different identified stakeholder groups and their attitudes toward sustainable natural resource management (can help with defining mitigation measures and could be discussed during stakeholder engagement);
- **Description of existing physical cultural resources** or sites where they may be present;
- **Existing or potential emerging conflicts** between or among social (ethnic) groups or other stakeholders that are relevant to the project, including:



- Between different ethnic/religious groups
- Between the government and local communities
- Between local communities and the private sector (i.e. concession holders)

6. **Legal/institutional context**, including:

- Relevant environmental legislation that applies to the landscape/seascape and planned interventions (national, sub-national and international, if applicable). This can include
 - those regulating natural resource management and conservation
 - procedures for obtaining management rights to protected areas,
 - rules regulating the activities in the relevant sector (forestry, fisheries, commercial hunting, REDD+ etc.)
 - national legislation regulating ESIA
- Relevant laws and regulations that pertain to social matters, including:
 - land ownership and tenure (access and use)
 - Indigenous Peoples' (degree of recognition and rights),
 - Consultation, participation and/or Free, Prior and Informed Consent (primary and secondary legislation)
 - gender
- Administrative distribution within the landscape/seascape (relevant government institutions with jurisdiction over the landscape/seascape or activities in question) including:
 - ministries,
 - their agencies and local offices,
 - relevant local/municipal government institutions, if applicable
- Applicable social/environmental requirements/safeguards of any co-financing partners, especially where they go beyond the standards of national legislation.
- Capacities and capacity issues of institutions relevant to the project and to impacts, including:
 - land-use planning, availability of maps/data for policy-making and enforcement, in general and locally.
 - Issues and constraints within existing institutions and in their relationships with each other that might present barriers for the project (such as lack of inter-institutional coordination among government ministries)
 - This will help identify where some of the main governance gaps are and help determine mitigation measures.

7. **Summary of WWF activities (implemented and supported) in the landscape**

- Describe the activities that WWF supports and implements in the landscape (based on the information included in the SST and gaps identified during the review). For each activity describe:
 - Who is the main implementing actor (WWF staff, consultants, eco-guards, sub-contracted NGO etc.)
 - the nature of the activity (law enforcement, biomonitoring, drafting land-use plans etc.)

8. **Potential negative social and environmental impacts**

This section of the ESIA should provide a clear explanation of each identified potential negative social and (where relevant) environmental impacts that may arise as a result of implementation of the planned interventions. The impacts **should be organised by activity** (which should be spelled out) according to the relevant triggered ESSF Substantive Standards (listed above).



This section should also specify who and/or what would be negatively impacted (stakeholder group, species, habitat etc.) by the proposed intervention, as well as the severity of impact and likelihood of occurrence. The potential impacts should also be ranked according to the severity of impact and likelihood of occurrence (this can be done through a traffic light approach with definitions of how each level has been defined).

The findings of this section will be a result of desk-based research by the consultants COMBINED WITH inputs from stakeholder engagement. The ESIA report should document the results of the consultations carried out with stakeholders and provide an explanation of how these results have been taken into account in identification and prioritisation of impacts. The description should specify how women and vulnerable minorities, including Indigenous Peoples have been included in the consultation.

This section should address the questions and gaps identified in the SST in relation to potential impacts.

9. Possible mitigation measures

In addition to the identification of potential negative impacts, the consultants should identify preliminary mitigation measures. As with the impacts, these suggestions should be the result of desk-based research by the consultants COMBINED WITH inputs from stakeholder engagement. These will be further developed in the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMF) as well as implementing arrangements (cost, timeline, capacity building, institutional arrangements etc.)

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK (ESMF)

For each significant impact identified in the ESIA an appropriate mitigation strategy must be developed. First, all available options should be sought to avoid impacts (e.g., through adjustment of project design, modification of protected area boundaries). If avoidance is not possible, appropriate measures to minimise the impact should be identified.

At minimum, the ESMF should contain:

1. **A non-technical summary**, which summarises significant issues in a way that can be easily understood by a non-technical audience, in particular local stakeholders.
2. **Methodology**
3. **Analysis of the potential environmental and social impacts**

This section should summarise the conclusions of the ESIA, identifying the main negative impacts that need to be mitigated. The Consultants should aim to identify the ESSF Standards that relate to the identified impacts (Indigenous Peoples, Involuntary Resettlement/access Restriction etc.)

4. **Proposed avoidance/mitigation measures (including procedures) for each identified impact**

Mitigation measures should be technically and operationally feasible and culturally adequate and specify the type of impact(s) it will address.

5. **Implementation arrangements (roles and responsibilities)**

The ESMF should provide a specific description of institutional arrangements and who is responsible for carrying out mitigation and monitoring measures.

6. **Accountability and grievance mechanism**



Each WWF office is responsible for developing and maintaining procedures to enable individuals or groups impacted by WWF supported activities to raise and seek resolution to concerns and grievances about activities supported by WWF in that country.

In accordance with the WWF Standard on Grievance Mechanisms, high and medium risk landscapes/seascapes require the establishment of landscape/seascape-level grievance mechanisms. Complaints received at this level must be escalated to the Country level grievance mechanism.

In general, the grievance mechanism should ensure the following principles:

- Accessible: Mechanism is fully accessible to all parties that might be affected by the office's activities.
- Practical: Mechanism is cost-effective and practical in its implementation and doesn't create a burden for project implementation
- Effective: The provisions and steps for responding to complaints and seeking solution are effective and timely
- Transparent: Decisions are taken in a transparent way, and complainants are kept abreast of progress with cases brought forward
- Independent: Oversight body and designated investigator is independent from project management
- Maintenance of records: Diligent documentation of negotiations and agreements and good maintenance of records on all cases and issues brought forward for review

Resolution of complaints should be resolved at the lowest possible level: The first approach involves project management and the affected party reviewing the conflict and deciding together on a way forward that advances their mutual interests. If a localized resolution is unsuccessful, then resolution should be sought with the office management.

The WWF **Guidance and Procedures on Accountability and Grievance Mechanism** provides more details on the above and will be shared with the consultants. See references/resources section below for further resources on designing accountability and grievance mechanisms

7. Capacity building needs/measures

To support timely and effective implementation of project components, the ESMF should identify gaps in this capacity, and outline actions for appropriate training/capacity-building of staff, to allow implementation of the recommendations.

8. Disclosure, monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management provisions

The monitoring section of the ESMF should provide a description of monitoring measures including:

- the parameters to be measured (implementation of mitigation measures, linkages to identified negative impacts)
- institutional arrangements (who monitors and to whom the reports are sent)
- methods to be used
- frequency of measurements

9. Expected timeline and costs for implementation

For all four aspects (avoidance/mitigation, monitoring, and capacity development), the ESMF should provide:

- (a) an implementation schedule for measures that must be carried out; and
- (b) estimated costs (capital and recurrent cost) and, in collaboration with the WWF team identify potential sources of funds for implementing the ESMF.



WWF *for a living planet*[®]

- (c) Where feasible, the ESMF should try to assess whether proposed measures will continue to be effective after project funding ceases.

10. Annexes (stakeholder consultation plan, summary of consultations etc.)

References/resources

IAIA

<https://www.iaia.org/best-practice.php>

IFC

https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/Topics_Ext_Content/IFC_External_Corporate_Site/Sustainability-At-IFC/Policies-Standards/Performance-Standards

<http://www.cao-ombudsman.org/>

IUCN

<https://www.iucn.org/resources/project-management-tools/environmental-and-social-management-system>

UNDP

https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/SitePages/Guidance%20and%20Templates.aspx

World Bank

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/environmental-and-social-framework>

http://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SIA_Guidance_Document_IAIA.pdf