



ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report Uganda

This template has been designed for field projects. Another template using a simplified version of the ESMS Questionnaire is available for non-field projects such as projects which support policy making, strategy development or upstream planning processes or provide knowledge through capacity building or knowledge products. Very small projects such as organizing workshops, meeting or conferences, position papers, scientific paper, reports, preparation of scientific materials for subsequent use in conferences or communication are outside the scope of the ESMS and don't require the completion of the ESMS Questionnaire.

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	Building Drought Resilience Programme (BDRP)		
Project proponent:	IUCN ESARO		
Executing agency:	IUCN-UCO		
Funding agency:	Austrian Development Agency (ADA)		
Estimated start date and duration:	January 2019-December 2021 (3 years)	Contract value (add currency):	CHF 450,000 TBC (as part of an overall 1.xx grant)
Country:	Uganda	Amount in CHF:	CHF 450,000
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	Provide details, if yes:	

Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the questionnaire is presented in Annex A

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Egaru Moses (Senior Programme Officer Water and Biodiversity) Coordinator of Project in Uganda	21 st September 2018
ESMS Screening is <i>(tick one of the three options)</i>	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is \geq CHF 500,000</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risk issues when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because project budget is < CHF 500,000 <u>and</u> no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire (or only low risks that are fully addressed by the project activities); this is confirmed below by naming the staff member who carried out the self-screening.</p>	

The fields below are only applicable when option 3 is ticked above

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Risk category
Self-screening of ESMS risks completed by:		<input type="checkbox"/> low risk

Step 2: ESMS Screening

To be completed by IUCN ESMS reviewer(s); only needed when the options 1 or 2 above (marked in red) are ticked

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Francis Musau	Regional Monitoring & Evaluation Officer Eastern & Southern Africa Region (ESARO)	October 4, 2018

	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator	13.10.2018
	Title		Date
Documents submitted at Screening stage:	BDR2 project evaluation report		
	Annex IV- Stakeholder Consultations for New BDR Programme		
	Project_Document_BDRP		11.10.2018

ESMS Screening Report ¹	
Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk
<p>Rationale: Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization</p> <p><i>See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:</i></p> <p>Section A for findings about the stakeholder engagement process, Section B on the 4 Standards, Section C on other E&S impacts and Section D on risk issues related to Climate change</p>	<p>The project aims to strengthen the resilience of communities to the impacts of climate disasters through improving governance for climate resilience and restoration, measures of ecosystem restoration and management, by providing financing for livelihood enhancement and as incentive for ecosystem restoration and by promoting climate resilient value chains.</p> <p>The project is expected to lead to outcomes that are highly beneficial both socially and environmentally. The envisioned types of project activities are small-scale and considered low impact and would therefore generally suggest a classification as low risk project. However, the fact that the sites and concrete restoration, resilience and value chain activities will only be decided during the project implies a level of uncertainty that requires continuation of risk assessment during project implementation. This is also relevant for the financing component (CECF). An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) needs to be devised to establish the rules and procedures for assessing impacts, once activities and sites are known, determines suitable risk management strategies as well as required resources and roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>The Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restriction is not triggered because changes of the natural resources management systems (e.g. limitation of the use of natural resources such as fuel wood, grazing so as to restore the ecosystem) are based on communities' or users' own and voluntary decisions. However, the project needs to ensure that the decision making process is transparent/inclusive and reflect informed decision of the community and that potential adverse impacts on vulnerable members of the community are identified, avoided and/or appropriately addressed. Using the CECF appear a suitable mitigation mechanism. Further details see section B1.</p> <p>The project area does not overlap with territory of groups that are considered or consider themselves as indigenous peoples – hence the Standard is not triggered. This being said, the project will be implemented in remote areas with predominantly traditional and marginalized societies and explicitly targets vulnerable groups in its livelihood and financing component. It also promotes the integration of marginalized groups like women, youth, elderly and minorities in decision-making on land use at the community level. Hence the social impacts are considered overly positive. Nevertheless, Section C1 (other social risks) identified a few risks that need to be looked at once the detail activities and sites are known.</p> <p>With regards to the Standard on Cultural Heritage, the information available at this stage are not sufficient to decide about the trigger. This will be reviewed once sites and activities are known (section B3).</p> <p>While the project outcomes on biodiversity conservation and natural resources are expected to be highly positive, a number of potential risk issues have been identified which need to be assessed upon availability of details on the livelihood</p>

¹ For projects below CHF 500,000 where no risks have been identified the screening report is completed by the project proponent - only the section on the rationale but the sections below that as low risk projects don't require assessments. The columns in the ESMS Questionnaire reserved for the IUCN ESMS reviewer will remain blank.

	<p>and values chain activities and the respective sites - in particular the infrastructure activities (water points, boreholes, sub-surface or sand dams, roof water harvesting). For further details, see section B4.</p> <p>Likewise, there are few potential other environmental risks (see section C2) that require further analysis once more details are known.</p>	
Required assessments or tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Required actions for gender mainstreaming		
ESMS Standards	Trigger	Required tools or plans
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions <i>(see section B1 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples <i>(see section B2 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Process Framework
Cultural Heritage <i>(see section B3 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources <i>(see section B4 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

The Building Drought Resilience Programme (BDRP) is a scale up of the Building Drought Resilience (BDR) project and a foundational project of a larger multi-year regional BDRP programme. The project builds on a detailed situational analysis of the regional climate change vulnerability assessments that depict an increased exposure to climate-induced drought risks for communities, ecosystems and economies in the dryland areas.

The BDRP projects aims at strengthening the resilience of communities, to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent climate disasters within well-managed river catchment ecosystems in Kenya and Uganda. In Uganda, the project will be implemented in the Aswa catchment in northern part of the country, influencing the lives of 1.3 million people living within the catchment, while directly benefitting 131,000 people.

The overall objective of the Project is *“the resilience of communities, to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent climate disasters within well-managed and functioning river catchments and ecosystems is strengthened”*.

The project will be located in *East Africa, with emphasis on Kenya and Uganda*.

The project purpose is: *“Sustainable restoration and management implemented in priority catchments for improved adaptive capacities of communities over a 3-year period (2019-2021)”*. The project objectives are:

- 1. Output 1: Institutional governance strengthened for climate resilience.** Consolidation of the climate-responsive mitigation and adaptation plans developed to support institutional strengthening, capacity building and learning at national and sub-national levels.
- 2. Output 2: Sustainable catchment restoration and management:** Integrity, functioning and productivity of catchments and ecosystems is enhanced by appropriate techniques for restoration, and sustainable management
- 3. Output 3 Climate adaptive livelihoods systems supported:** *Climate resilient value chains that promote enterprise development are strengthened and are underpinned by innovative inclusive finance models including the CECF.*

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization

1. **Stakeholder Analysis:** Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only stakeholders’ interests in the project and their influence but also whether they might be affected by the project? Does the stakeholder analysis differentiate between women and men, where relevant and feasible? It is recommended to add the stakeholder analysis to the documents submitted at screening stage.

To be completed by project proponent

Yes: Stakeholder consultation and analysis has been carried out with special considerations for gender and vulnerable groups such as women, elderly, and the youth. Stakeholder engagement has been done from the community level, village level, parish level, sub county level, district level, and national level to ensure that the concerns, interests, and input from all level of stakeholders are incorporated into the programme. In the field, consultations have particularly been undertaken for the shea butter value chain groups (6 groups) in Otuke and the 127 CECF villages in the 5 implementation districts of the programme

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

Stakeholder mapping needs to be fine-tuned once the sites are known in order to use this as a tool to ensure that all relevant groups are involved when planning the detailed activities and that their interest and power in restoration of catchment ecosystems and livelihood Improvement are appropriately taken into account.

2. **Stakeholder Consultation:** Has information about the project – objectives, activities, sites and potential risks – been shared with stakeholders? Have consultations been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept and risks? Provide details about the groups involved. Were women involved or consulted separately? Did the consultations involve stakeholders that might be negatively affected by the project? Were consultations conducted in a culturally appropriate way? Have results of the consultations been documented? Were results used to inform project design?

To be completed by project proponent

Development of this project has been informed by a number of actors ranging from the lowest community level represented by the Community structures that have been established to manage their water resources, as well as the community environment fund. In addition to the communities, meetings have been held with key Government agencies including central and sub-national level to identify the best entry points for effective alignment and strengthening of government programmes. The private sector has also been consulted due to the focus on value chains as a major project component. The consultations with the various groups of stakeholders included presenting the programme objectives, areas, and potential risks and issues that could arise in implementing the programme. The consultations also involved special interest groups such as women and youth. The programme incorporated interests of most of the stakeholders, for example supporting value chain development of the shea butter which is predominantly managed by women, and supporting linkages to markets of agriculture based enterprises which take care of youth interests. The stakeholders did not identify any critical risks associated with the programme that needed to be integrated into the programme development.

IUCN ESMS Reviewer

Stakeholder consultation as part of the evaluation of the BDR Phase 2 has been well documented. Community meetings were held with approximately 1000 beneficiaries from different locations of the project area, both in Uganda and Kenya, (through 30 groups of about 30-40 people) divided into smaller Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) for women, youth, men and sometimes mixed groups across the two countries. Participatory PRA-type tools were used in the discussions to analyse the benefits and challenges from BDR Phase 2 and recommendations for the future. However, it seems that the consultations did not discuss potential risks caused by project activities or concerns or potential conflict of interest related to the next phase.

B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards			
B1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions			
	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Will the project involve resettling peoples or communities? if yes, answer a-b below	No		
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement?			
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?			
2. Does the project include activities that might restrict peoples' access to land or natural resources? Please consider the following activities: establishing new protected areas (PA) or extending the area of an existing PA, improving enforcement of PA regulations (e.g. training guards, providing monitoring and/or enforcement equipment, providing training/tools for improving management effectiveness), constructing physical barriers that prevent people accessing certain places; changing how specific natural resources are managed to a management system that is more restrictive ² ; if yes, answer a-h below	Yes		
Answer only if you answered yes to item 2			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions and the respective resources to be restricted.	Yes	The project has a component on developing bylaws on the management of natural resources which will govern how the natural resources such as land, water, fodder, wetlands and pasture are shared by the communities. The bylaws may in a way prohibit unsustainable utilisation of these specific natural resources as currently is the case, however, the bylaws will also provide a clear framework of how these resources can be accessed and utilised by the communities, especially those living adjacent to the resources. It also helps to note that the bylaws are developed by the communities themselves and are, therefore, self-determined and will therefore incorporate their practices, cultures, and aspirations in the process. The bylaws are linked and operationalise the management plans developed by the same communities, and also embedded within the sub county, district, and national legislative laws.	The project will promote the development of bylaws that aim at increasing the sustainability of land use which will be operationalized by natural resources land use plans – which are likely to involve use and access restrictions. Further restriction might be needed as part of the restoration of degraded sites (in order to allow regeneration of the sites) and While restrictions that are decided by the communities themselves, do not trigger the Standard, potential impact issues still need to be addressed by the project as these are considered social impacts. As such the project needs to ensure that the decision process is transparent/inclusive and reflect informed decision (e.g. based on prior analysis of potential risks) and that negative impacts on vulnerable members of the society are avoided.
b. Has the legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource been analysed, broken down by different groups including women and	Yes	During an evaluation that informed the design of the programme, various communities were consulted and the consultations also included vulnerable groups including over	It would be useful that the project proposal summarizes the main findings of the analysis of the legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource. It is

² Note that the Standard is not triggered if changes of natural resources management systems and respective restrictions are based on communities' or users' own and voluntary decisions – e.g. in order to ensure long-term use of these resources.

<p>ethnic/indigenous groups? Are customary rights for land and natural resources recognized? Are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not legally recognized?</p>		<p>400 women, youth, elderly, disabled, and the landless consulted. This process enabled the interests of these groups to be incorporated in the project design. Additionally, a review of the necessary legal framework regulating management, use and access of natural resources has been done and it is clear that it caters for the interests of all groups including the vulnerable groups. Emphasis has also been put in the project design to ensure that the rights of these vulnerable groups are addressed.</p>	<p>stated that the framework caters for the interest of all groups. Does this mean that there are no issues with regards to tenure security, even of poor or vulnerable groups? Does the State recognize customary tenure rights for land and natural resources? Can it be excluded that there are groups in the project site whose rights are not recognized? These issues need to be well understood when promoting the developing community-by-laws and land use plans. And unrelated to access restriction issues, it will also be important the credit component to understand and address issues on tenure insecurity.</p>
<p>c. Have the implications of access restrictions on people's livelihoods been analysed? Explain who might be affected and describe impacts. Distinguish social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples) and men and women.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Much of the analysis on resource restrictions has been done under the 6 years of the Building Drought Resilience Project. Some of these restrictions ensure compliance with national laws, e.g. limiting cultivation in riverine areas and wetlands. Others are based on the self-determined community planning. E.g. community decisions to stop making charcoal from shea trees which restricts outside charcoal makers but protects the long-term benefits for resident women shea butter producers.</p> <p>Overall the programme aims at facilitating access and sustainable use of the available natural resources in the landscape such as water, grass, firewood, fruits, and land. Women are mainly concerned with access to water for domestic use, land for small holder agriculture (producing most of the food consumed at home and some for sale), and fruits for nutrition of especially children and for sale in the local markets.</p>	<p>As explained under a) also a community's voluntary decision can lead to restrictions and the associated livelihood need to be well understood by the project; in particular, the impact on vulnerable and marginalized communities/groups. Such assessment should also clarify the magnitude of such livelihood restrictions (minimal/low, moderate or high impact).</p>
<p>d. Have strategies been considered to avoid restrictions by making changes to project design?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The envisioned access restrictions will be temporal/seasonal. The project is designed to maintain long-term productivity and prevent degradation. The aim is to promote access to natural resources by all, especially the vulnerable communities, on a sustained basis. The bylaws that will govern the access and utilisation pattern of some of the natural resources such as wetlands, fodder, pasture are designed in a consultative, inclusive and self-determined manner (within the legal framework), to ensure that the interests of all groups are met.</p> <p>The programme has identified and will support critical value chains such as shea butter production which almost exclusively done by women to improve their incomes and diversify livelihood options. The programme will also support better management of the shea tree which supports this livelihood value chain. In addition, the programme will support women and the youth to engage in viable crop value chains to improve their incomes.</p>	<p>The project is already designed in a way that restrictions are minimized – however, it seems inevitable that some impacts cannot be avoided to secure the conservation objectives and sustainability of wetland, pasture etc. resources. The project already foresees a range of activities (e.g. developing income opportunities through value chain development or access to credit/ CECF); and while the decisions are considered voluntary (hence the Standard not triggered), the project should ensure that measures are provided by the project or through the community itself (or those who benefit most from improved resources) to avoid impacts on vulnerable groups affected by the restrictions.</p>

		Men mostly engage in agriculture (for production of crops for sale and supporting households), livestock production, The project will support them by providing linkages to improved seed and farming systems for crops, while supporting better management of grazing lands and fodder management as well as market linkages for the livestock. In this regard, the project will support diversification of livelihoods, while supporting the communities to improve access and management of their natural resources	
e. If it is not possible to avoid restrictions, will the project include measures to minimize or compensate for impacts from loss/ restrictions of access? Please describe the measures.	Yes	The project will provide a platform where community members meet to discuss matters on natural resource use, management, and governance on a monthly basis at village level and quarterly at parish level. These forums provide a platform where emerging issues and challenges can be discussed and solutions sought by the communities at the lowest appropriate level. This process will solve any matters arising on restriction in access and use of natural resources in case they arise. The objective of any restriction is to improve the overall productivity and value of community lands. The programme will ensure that the most vulnerable are not negatively impacted by any community-determined restrictions. In addition, the project will implement the Community Environment Conservation Fund (CECF), which provides an incentive as well as livelihood/income generating activities that provide an alternative source of cash to ecosystem degrading activities..	
f. Are eligibility criteria established that define who is entitled to benefits or compensation? Are they transparent and fair (e.g. in proportion to their losses and to their needs if they are poor and vulnerable)?	No	The programme will not undertake any involuntary restriction on access and use of natural resources. As such, there is no envisaged compensation that will arise from programme implementation. The criteria for accessing the CECF grant gives opportunity to the most vulnerable members of the community and it is non-discriminatory, managed by the local structures which have been established by the communities themselves.	Resources and benefits provided by the project (e.g. access to production inputs for restoration or value chain activities) should generally be allocated in a fair way with transparent eligibility criteria and without unjustified preferential treatment - even if the standard is not triggered. It is well received that the criteria for CECF take into account needs of vulnerable members of the community.
g. Are measures culturally appropriate and gender inclusive? Does the geographical scale of the measures match the scale of the restrictions (e.g. will measures be accessible to all groups affected by the restrictions)?	Yes	The restoration, catchment management, natural resource improvement and management measures are in the interest of the cultural practices and norms of the people within the Aswa catchment. Over 85% of the communities in the programme area practice agro-pastoralism. The programme is designed to specifically support and enhance the community livelihoods, while strengthening cultural aspects such as better management of grazing lands, strengthening cultural laws and norms and practices. In addition, the specific roles of the men, women and children are clearly defined to guide planning and implementation.	
h. Has a process been implemented or started to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups that are likely to be negatively affected by	Yes	The programme is not envisaged to have negative consequences on use and access of natural resources. The programme is instead designed to enhance benefits for the	As the standard is not triggered, there is no formal need to obtain FPIC. It is understood that the process of deciding land use and potential restrictions is taken by the

restrictions? Please describe the process (who has been consulted and how).		most vulnerable groups within the communities and strengthen governance arrangements that give them an opportunity to effectively engage. Participation by communities is voluntary and by demand. The project is explained at a village assembly and the community takes a vote on whether to participate.	communities. The project should ensure that this is an inclusive process involving all relevant groups.
3. Will/might the project require the acquisition of land for project purposes (e.g. infrastructure development)? If yes, describe the current legal status of the land (private/ public, occupied/unoccupied).	No		Under Output 2, the project will support infrastructure initiatives. It needs to be ensured that the ownership status of the land on which the infrastructure will be developed is clarified and agreement with the rights holder obtained.

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer³ on the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD What are the main risk issues? If possible indicate their probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major).	NO	The Standard is not triggered because changes of natural resources management systems (e.g. limitation of the use of natural resources such as fuel wood, grazing so as to restore the ecosystem) are based on communities' or users' own and voluntary decisions. However, potential social impacts from restrictions need to be identified by the project and appropriately addressed (see comment d and e above). As such the project needs to ensure that the decision making process is transparent/inclusive and reflect informed decision of the community (e.g. based on prior analysis of potential risks on all groups); and that negative impacts on vulnerable members of the society are avoided or mitigated. Using the CECF grant appear a suitable mechanism if eligibility criteria are defined and linked to the livelihood loss experienced from restrictions.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	n/a	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	n/a	

B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples⁴			
	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project site in an area inhabited by or important to indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples? If yes, answer questions a-j	No	None of the communities in the proposed project area of the Aswa Catchment includes indigenous people (source: https://www.iwgia.org/en/uganda). Should components of the programme be added which include areas where indigenous people live then screening will be carried out. For example should funding be included under the programme for Mount Elgon a screening would be carried out for the Benet Community.	The project sites are inhabited mostly by Acholi, Langi, and Iteso tribal groups who are not considered or don't consider themselves as indigenous. Would there be any Iteso and Kakwa tribal groups?
2. Even if indigenous groups are not found at the project sites, is there still a risk that the project could affect the	No		

³ If the project budget is < CHF 500,000 this field (and the equivalent fields below) needs to be completed by the project proponent (instead of the IUCN ESMS Reviewer).

⁴The coverage of indigenous peoples includes: (i) peoples who identify themselves as "indigenous" in strict sense; (ii) tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and (iii) traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services

rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples? If yes, answer questions a-j			
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.			
a. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project's area of influence.			
b. What are the key characteristics that qualify the identified groups as indigenous groups? Do these groups identify themselves as indigenous?			
c. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?			
d. Is there a risk that the project affects their livelihood through access restrictions ? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.			
e. Is there a risk that the project affects their livelihood in some other means? E.g. by affecting their self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices, social cohesion, or by providing inequitable benefits?			
f. Does the project intend to promote the use of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge?			
g. Are any indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how does the project respect their rights and avoid any negative impacts?			
h. Explain whether and how legitimate representatives of indigenous groups have been consulted to discuss the project and better understand potential impacts upon them?			
i. Has a process been started or implemented to achieve their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) to activities that might affect them (positively or negatively)?			
j. Explain whether opportunities are considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a way agreed with them and culturally appropriate and gender inclusive?			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Indigenous Peoples

<p>Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD</p> <p>What are the main risk issues? If possible indicate their probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major).</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>The current project area of influence does not overlap with territory of ethnic groups considered indigenous or who consider themselves as indigenous; thus the standard on indigenous people is not triggered. In case of extension, the presence of other tribes (e.g. Benet or Sebei who live primarily on the slopes of Mount Elgon) would need to be assessed.</p> <p>Uganda is a country of high ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity rooted in a complex history of overlapping migrations and interactions. There is a legacy of human rights abuses with ethnic dimensions from the past. Hence, awareness on ethnic diversity, power relations and levels of integration into the mainstream society as well as potential marginalization are important topics to assess and monitor throughout the project. Issues around discrimination of marginalized tribal groups and risks of aggravating this by the project will be discussed in section C1.</p>
--	-----------	--

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		n/a	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a	
B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage⁵			
	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<small>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</small>	<i>Answer question, provide further detail where relevant</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection? if yes, answer a-c below	No		
2. Does the project site include important cultural resources such as burial sites, buildings or monuments of archaeological, historical, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value? if yes, answer a-c below	No		The answer needs to be backed-up by local knowledge; it does not seem unlikely that the project area of influence includes sites of cultural or spiritual value.
3. Does the project area site include any natural features or resources that are of cultural, spiritual, or symbolic significance (such as sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas, or sacred species)? if yes, answer a-c below	No		This should also be investigated (e.g. sacred groves etc.)
a. Will the project involve development of infrastructure (e.g. roads, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation) or construction of buildings (e.g. visitor centre, watch tower)?			The answer should be yes as the project includes infrastructure development, though details are not known at this stage.
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?			It is assumed that planned infrastructure investments are small-scale and excavation might be rather limited.
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items a. and b. might affect known or unknown (buried) cultural resources?			This will depend on the sites which are not known at this stage
4. Will the project restrict local users' access to cultural resources or natural features/sites with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	No		While grassland restoration might require temporary restrictions, but this would be very site-specific and temporary.
5. Is there a risk that project activities might affect cultural values, norms or practices of local communities?	No		Ecotourism activities might lead to risks in case cultural norms or values are not respected; however, the project's

⁵ Cultural heritage is defined as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resource or site with paleontological, archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community, or natural feature or resource with cultural, religious, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature.

			engagement with ecotourism is not clearly spelled out yet, therefore difficult to assess the probability of such impacts.
6. Will the project promote the use of (or development of economic benefits) from cultural resources or natural features/sites with cultural significance?	No		

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Cultural Heritage

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD What are the main risk issues? If possible indicate their probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major).	TBD	The information available at this stage are not sufficient to decide about the trigger. This will be reviewed once sites and activities are known.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		n/a at this stage
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a at this stage

B4: Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	<small>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</small> Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? If yes, provide details on the protection status and answer questions a-c	No	Should the programme add sites that involve protected areas the screening would be carried out at that time.
2. Is the project located in or near to areas recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-c	No	
3. Is the project located in/near to areas which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value ⁶ ? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-c	No	
Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.		

⁶ Areas important to threatened species according to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, important to endemic or restricted-range species or to migratory and congregatory species; areas representing key evolutionary processes, providing connectivity with other critical habitats or key ecosystem services; highly threatened and/or unique ecosystems (e.g. to be determined in future by the evolving IUCN Red List of Ecosystems); areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and subsets such as important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), important Plant Areas (IPAs), important Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity or Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites.

a. If the project aims to establish or expand a protected area (PA) or to change its management regime, is there a risk of negative impacts on natural resources in areas outside the PA?			
b. If the project plans any infrastructure in a PA or an area of high biodiversity value (e.g., watch tower, tourism facilities, access roads, small scale water infrastructure), is there a risk of negative impacts on biodiversity (e.g. on threatened species) during its construction and use?			
c. If the project promotes ecotourism, is there a risk of negative impacts on biodiversity (e.g., due to waste disposal, disturbance, slope erosion etc.)?			
4. If the project involves civil works or infrastructure development outside of PA or other areas of high biodiversity value, is there a risk of significant impact on biodiversity?			
5. If the project includes plantation development, is there a risk of affecting natural forest areas or other areas of high biodiversity value?			
6. Will the project include introduction or translocation of species (e.g. for erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation) or include production of living natural resources? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b			The answer should be yes as the project includes restoration activities
a. Does this project involve non-native species or risk introducing non-native species by accident?			The project plans to use high value indigenous grasses and fodder trees for the fodder banks and high value flora species for restoring rangelands. Hence generally there seems to be no intention to use non-native species. However, as precautionary measure it is recommended to produce a guidance note or protocol that will guide partners on species selections.
b. If a.is yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?			
7. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?			
8. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water flows through extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or through other activities?			Water infrastructure is mentioned but no further details. To be assessed at implementation stage.
9. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g., by affecting water infiltration, aquifer recharge or sedimentation)? Also consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.			Increase in tourist activities and infrastructure might result in a significant increase of water consumption. However, the engagement in tourism is too vague at this stage to be able to draw conclusions.

10. Is there a risk that the project affects water quality of surface or groundwater (e.g., contamination, increase of salinity) through irrigation/ agricultural run-off, water extraction practices, influence of livestock or other activities?			Some activities such as value chain processing and ecotourism may lead to impacts on water quality. TBD later stage.
11. If the project promotes the use of resources from natural habitats (such as timber or non-timber forest products), is there a risk that this might lead to unsustainable use? How will this be prevented?			The project promotes harvesting and processing of shea butter kernels and gums/resins as well as other dryland products. The project needs to ensure that improving processing and /or market access does not trigger unsustainable harvest rates, especially as part of these activities are carried out by partners.
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? If yes, provide details and answer questions a-b			
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?			
b. Has a pest management plan been established?			
13. Is there a risk that the project unintentionally causes adverse knock-on effects on biodiversity in a wider area of influence (landscape/ watershed, regional or global levels) including transboundary impacts?			
14. Is there a risk that consequential developments triggered by the project will have adverse impacts on biodiversity? Is there a risk of adverse cumulative impacts generated together with other known or planned projects in the sites?			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Standard on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

Standard triggered? Yes / No / TBD What are the main risk issues? If possible indicate their probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major).	TBD	While the project outcomes on biodiversity conservation and natural resources are expected to be highly positive, a number of issues have been identified above- However, these can only be assessed once more details on the livelihood and values chain activities and the respective sites are known.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		n/a at this stage
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		n/a at this stage

C. Other social or environmental impacts

C1: Other social impacts

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than issues related to indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the respective standard? Differentiate between women and men, where applicable.	No		On the contrary, the project recognizes that traditional means of managing natural resources are increasingly eroded and that due to weaknesses in governance conflict arise that can be problematic as resource competition and climate disruption become more frequent. The project addresses these threats by promoting local governance structures and inclusive decision making on natural resource use.
2. Will the project influence land tenure arrangements or community-based property rights to land or resources and is there a risk that this might adversely affect peoples' rights and livelihoods? Consider in particular impacts on transhumant pastoralist, vulnerable groups, different gender etc.?	No		On the contrary, the project works precisely on improving the resilience and livelihood conditions on socially marginalized or vulnerable groups in the sites, including pastoralist groups, ethnic minorities and social and economically disadvantaged groups.
3. Is there a risk that the project creates or aggravates inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the situation or livelihood conditions of women or girls?	No		
4. Explain whether the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?		At least 35% of the project beneficiaries are envisaged to be women. The project will support livelihoods that are preferred/dominated by women for example the shea value chain and supporting production of fruits and vegetables. The project will also support improvement in management and use of catchment areas like rivers, wetlands, agricultural landscapes to enhance their productivity and support their provision of ecosystem services and benefits such as food, water, medicine, fuelwood, etc in a sustainable manner. These are culturally considered women's responsibilities, and therefore enhancing them enhances the adaptive capacity of women.	
5. Explain whether the project provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?		The project has a strong component of supporting particularly women and other vulnerable groups undertake sustainable economic initiatives and value chains. In addition, the project will support development of bylaws and land-use plans that are all inclusive and give women a platform to access and utilise resources in an equal footing as other resource users.	
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups ⁷ in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?	No	Instead the project targets to support the marginalised groups through income enhancement, livelihood diversification and capacity building initiatives to sustain their gains.	

⁷ Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals (e.g. by increasing resource competition when promoting economic opportunities, strengthening rights of or providing projects benefits to selected individuals/groups? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration and issues / needs of displaced people.	No	The programme will adopt an all-inclusive approach where it will support entire communities to achieve their aspirations in natural resource management, economic and livelihood diversification, governance, and utilisation of resources.	There is a risk of unjustified preferential treatment if access to benefits and services is not well defined and transparent.
8. Is the project likely to induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?	No		
9. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. risks of spreading diseases, human-wildlife conflicts, unlawful or abusive acts of security personal/PA guards)?	No		
10. Is there a risk that changes in water infrastructure or water resource management may attract disease vectors (e.g. standing water) or inadvertently affect quality of drinking water?	No	The project experience thus far indicates that project interventions improve both the supply and quality of water.	The projects plans to build boreholes, wells etc. which might involve risks, if not well executed or maintained, to harbour disease vectors. Monitoring of water quality of those structures created by the project should be provided.
11. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	No		
12. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects the livelihoods of local communities in indirect ways or through cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts?	No		
13. Is there a risk that the project negatively affects the operation of dams or other built water infrastructure (reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals), e.g., by changing flows into those structures, and as such impairing local communities' livelihood or income?	No		
14. Are there any statutory requirements for social impact assessments in the host country (including provisions for disclosure and consultation) the project needs to adhere to?	No		
15. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	No		

C2: Other environmental impacts

	Project proponent	IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant
		Comments, additional considerations
1. Will the project lead to increased waste production, in particular hazardous waste?	No	Value chain processing as well as ecotourism activities might result in an increase of solid or liquid waste; magnitude of impact is considered low, but needs to be assed once details are available.
2. Is the project likely to cause pollution or degradation of soil, soil erosion or siltation?	No	

3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	No		
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions or to the reduction of carbon pools (e.g. through changes in vegetation cover and loss of below and above ground carbon stocks).	No		
5. Is there a risk that the project triggers consequential development activities which could lead to adverse environmental impacts, cumulative impacts due to interaction with other projects (current or planned) or to transboundary impacts (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	No		
6. Are there any statutory requirements for environmental impact assessments in the host country (including provisions for disclosure and consultation) the project needs to adhere to?		No	
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations?			

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on other Social or Environmental Impacts

Have negative environmental or social impacts been identified? If possible indicate probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major) of risks.	TBD	While social and environmental impacts of the project are expected to be overall highly positive, some risks have been identified above that will need to be revisited upon availability of more detailed information about the restoration, livelihood and value chain activities.
Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	n/a at this stage	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?	n/a at this stage	

D. Climate change risks (Risks caused by a failure to adequately take the effects of climate change on people and ecosystem into consideration)

	Project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	Answer question, provide further detail where relevant	Comments, additional considerations
1. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	Yes	The project area is particularly prone to floods especially between the months of August-November. The area also experiences short dry spells between December and March.	
2. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more susceptible than others (e.g., women or vulnerable groups)?	Yes	The harshest impacts of climate change in the region are felt during the dry spells when no crop activity can take place (agriculture), at the same time livestock is hard hit due to lack of water and pasture. This increases the vulnerability of	

		communities and households to famine and hunger. This mostly affect children	
3. Is there a risk that climate variability and changes might affect the effectiveness of project activities or the sustainability of intended changes?	Yes	Some of the project activities that are rainfall/agriculture based can be affected by the dry spells which may cause loss or poor performance of for example crops and trees. The project, however, aims to mitigate this through capacity building for good crop and tree planting practices and overall improvements in ecosystem water balance (soil organic content for water retention, catchment management, riverine protection etc,)	While the intention is evident, the project should make use of up to date hydromet data when planning the activities in detail (e.g. choice of species, siting of water infrastructure etc.).
4. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities to current or future climate variability and changes?	No	Instead the project activities intend to provide avenues for decreasing vulnerability to climate change effects	It is recommended to monitoring the effectiveness of activities to ascertain that no unforeseen impacts or unintended side-effects occur
5. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of the local ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes?	No	By supporting communities to plan, sustainable utilise and manage natural resource, the programme will instead reduce impacts of climate change to project.	Same as above
6. Explain whether the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	Yes	The project has already identified potential opportunities through supporting sustainable and climate smart agricultural value chains and practices, through developing and implementing sustainable land use plans, identifying and engaging is economically viable value chains to bolster livelihoods, and support catchment/landscape restoration efforts as a means of increasing productivity and functionality of landscapes and ecosystems.	

Conclusion of ESMS Reviewer on the Climate Change Risks

<i>Have negative impacts been identified? If possible indicate probability (unlikely, likely, almost certain) and impact (minor, moderate, major) of risks.</i>	NO	
<i>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed</i>	n/a	
<i>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</i>	n/a	