



Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 19-Dec-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA30730

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Congo, Republic of	Project ID P163361	Project Name CONGO - Emission Reductions Program in Sangha and Likouala	Parent Project ID (if any)
Region AFRICA WEST	Estimated Appraisal Date 09-Nov-2020	Estimated Board Date 29-Jan-2021	Practice Area (Lead) Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy
Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Calixte Nganongo, Minister of Finance, Budget and Public Portfolio	Implementing Agency Ministry of Forest Economy	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

To make payments to the Program Entity for measured, reported, and verified greenhouse gas emission reductions from reduced deforestation, forest degradation and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in Sangha and Likouala of the Republic of Congo, and to distribute these payments in accordance with an agreed Benefit Sharing Plan

Components

Payments of Emission Reductions generated in Sangha and Likouala following Measurement, Reporting, and Verification
Distribution of the financial benefits from the Emission Reductions sale in accordance with a Benefit Sharing Plan
Program management, Monitoring and Evaluation

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)**SUMMARY**

Total Project Cost	41.80
Total Financing	41.80
of which IBRD/IDA	0.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS



Non-World Bank Group Financing

Trust Funds	41.80
The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility – Carbon Fund	41.80

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

The Republic of Congo (ROC) is a lower-middle-income country (LMIC) in Central Africa with a gross domestic product (GDP) per capita of US\$2,011 (2019). Located in the Congo River basin, it is neighbored by Gabon (to the west), Cameroon (northwest), Central African Republic (northeast), the Democratic Republic of Congo (southeast), and Angola (enclave of Cabinda, to the south). Congo's population of 5.4 million inhabitants is growing rapidly, at around 2.5 percent per annum. Although it has a total surface area of 342,000 km², two-thirds of its people are concentrated in urban areas, giving Congo one of the world's lowest population densities (15.8 people per km²).

The country possesses a wealth of natural assets that have the potential to lay the groundwork for a robust economy capable of improving the living standards of its people. In 2017, Congo was Sub-Saharan Africa's third largest producer of petroleum, and the 34th largest in the world. Congo's hydrographic network is highly developed, its climate and lands conducive to agriculture (nearly one-third of its land area (10 million hectares) is arable, 90 percent of which is unexploited) and it has abundant mineral resources (iron, gold, diamonds, phosphate, potash). Congo's forests constitute a globally important carbon stock and home to biodiversity of global importance.

Although Congo rejoined the ranks of LMICs in 2005 on the back of strong oil revenues, the country has yet to fully leverage its natural resource endowments in the pursuit of inclusive and sustainable development outcomes. While the country enjoyed over 5 percent annual growth from 2004-2014, it failed to reach the 8.5 percent growth target set by the 2012-2016 National Development Plan to achieve the country's ambition to become upper-middle-income by 2025. Congo's outsized dependence on an oil economy (70 percent of 2018 exports were crude and refined petroleum and related products) and the global slump in the price of that commodity has mired the country in recession since 2014. This has triggered a profound economic crisis, leading to deep output losses, large fiscal and current account deficits, and a steep increase in public debt levels. The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has complicated this already muddled picture and the country's economic outlook for 2020 remains challenging.



Congo's growth problems are especially glaring in terms of poverty reduction and sharing prosperity. Though the share of the extreme poor declined from 50 percent in 2005 to 31 percent in 2015, it rose again to 35.4 percent in 2016 and the level of poverty in Congo remains much higher than in comparable middle-income countries (World Bank, 2019). Inequality levels too remain high by global comparison: non-inclusive growth has contributed to high inequality as seen in Congo's Gini coefficient of 0.489 (World Development Indicators, last updated 2011).

Income inequality is borne out spatially in the starkly different living standards experienced in Congo's urban and rural areas. During the period of growth from the mid-2000s to the mid-2010s, the poorest segments of the population experienced a deterioration in their standard of living, whereas the wealthiest and those in the middle of the distribution experienced a substantial welfare increase. The poverty reduction experienced between 2005 and 2011 was concentrated in urban areas, primarily the country's two largest cities of Brazzaville and Pointe-Noire. Meanwhile, the depth and severity of poverty was increasing in rural areas. Although the overall number of poor people in the country decreased from 1.8 million in 2005 to 1.6 million in 2011, it rose in rural areas from 795,000 to 951,000, moving the rural poverty headcount from 64.8 percent to 69.4 percent (World Bank, 2019).

The COVID-19 pandemic and measures taken to mitigate further spread of the disease are likely to intensify the stresses on the local economy, with poor and vulnerable populations affected most. High urbanization rates, for example, enhance the risk that the smaller share of the population living in rural areas may receive less attention in the context of COVID-19 crisis, amplifying pre-existing inequalities between urban and rural areas. In addition, inflationary pressures on food resulting from trade disruptions and restricted markets could impose an additional burden on many poor households, due to the relatively higher share of their resources spent on food. In the absence of public mitigation measures, the proportion of people living below the international poverty line (US\$1.90 a day in 2011 purchasing power parity) is expected to increase to 43 percent by 2022. Marginalized groups, such as youth, women, and the elderly, are likely to be acutely affected by the socio-economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic with longer-term implications for human capital accumulation and fragility.

Congo is one of the most vulnerable countries to climate change, and agriculture and forests are among the most vulnerable sectors within the country. The country ranks 163rd out of 181 (2018 rankings) in the Notre Dame GAIN Country Index. Temperatures in the region are expected to increase in line with global averages. The annual number of hot days and nights is expected to increase, while the number of cold days and nights is expected to decrease. Mean annual precipitation has decreased between the 1950s and 1980s, and greater fluctuations in intra-seasonal precipitation patterns have been observed in recent years. By the middle to end of the 21st century, mean annual precipitation is expected to increase. These climatic changes are projected to heavily impact the agriculture sector: projected impacts include already elevated flood risks, increased vulnerability of rain-fed agriculture due to more erratic rainfall, as well as changes in pest and diseases vectors due to rising temperatures.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Forests play an important role in the national and household economies of Congo. Making up 12 percent of the Congo Basin forest complex, Congo's natural forests are the third largest expanse of tropical rainforest in Africa, covering 23.5 million hectares (69 percent of land area), 80 percent of which are exploitable. Rents from forestry have contributed to around 3.5 percent of GDP over the past decade. Wood products are the third-most important source of export revenues, accounting for 3.4 percent of total exports (US\$344 million) in 2018. It is estimated that 575,000 Congolese live in forest areas. 85 percent of Congolese depend on wood products for their energy needs.



A historically low rate of deforestation (0.052 percent per annum between 2000 and 2012) and forests covering 69 percent of the land area make Congo a typical example of a High Forest Cover, Low Deforestation (HFLD) country (CNIAT, 2015). Keeping deforestation rates low in HFLD countries is one of the main strategies in the forest and land use sector to deliver on the Paris Agreement's goals to limit temperature increase to well below 2 degrees C and to pursue efforts to limit increase to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial levels. Since the 2000s, Congo has had an ambitious policy on sustainable forest management; the country has 2.5 million hectares of forest area certified by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), comprising the largest certified area on the continent. In 2011, the Government also signed a Voluntary Partnership Agreement with the European Union to ensure the legality of timber, the preparations of which are ongoing.

Congo has demonstrated its commitment to a low-carbon development agenda including the land use sector by pursuing REDD+ since 2008. It submitted its Emission Reductions Program Idea Note (ER-PIN) in 2012. In September 2015, the Republic of Congo submitted its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), presenting forests and REDD+ as the country's main contribution to global mitigation efforts. The Government validated its final National REDD+ Strategy in October 2016, setting out the strategic options for achieving its vision of pursuing low-carbon development pathways; the Emission Reduction Program for Sangha and Likouala (ERP-SL) is fully in line with this Strategy. In June 2017, the FCPF Carbon Fund Participants conditionally approved the Emission Reductions Program Document (ER-PD), and in January 2019 the government fulfilled a series of measures agreed to with the Carbon Fund Participants' Committee and submitted the ER-PD for final approval. In March 2019, the ERP-SL was approved in the FCPF countries portfolio.

Congo emitted an estimated 29.34 MtCO₂e of greenhouse gases in 2012, and there is potential to reduce this figure. The country's non-land use change and forest (LUCF) emissions rose 206 percent between 1990 and 2012, driven primarily by higher emissions from energy production and to a lesser degree by agriculture and transportation. However, despite Congo's deforestation rate being among the lowest in Central Africa, 74 percent of Congo's emissions stem from LUCF. As a result, Congo lost 145,356 hectares of forest cover to other land uses, or about 12,113 ha per year, between 2000 and 2012. Current trajectories and development plans indicate that the country's LUCF emissions could rise in the future without mitigating measures. Accelerated development during the recent period of high oil prices led to major infrastructure projects that opened up previously remote forest areas to economic activity. The recent dramatic drop in oil prices has lent urgency to the government's drive to diversify its economy away from its overwhelming dependence on hydrocarbons. This represents a potential threat to the forest stock, as agriculture, forestry, and mining are among the key alternative sectors identified for development. This is in line with the ERPD's finding that historical emission baselines are not adequate to capture future risk of forest loss due to land use trends after 2012, population growth, activation of forest concessions that were previously not operational, and expansion of industrial agriculture. Even if Congo can maintain its HFLD profile, there is potential for reducing emissions further. The 2015 INDC, for example, estimates that net emissions from deforestation could be reduced to 0 tons CO₂e by 2035 with international support.

At the same time, the Government has identified REDD+ as an opportunity to further its objective of economic diversification. The ER-Program uses climate finance to set the development path of a new and rapidly growing commodity sector on a sustainable track. It thus yields an important opportunity to demonstrate the feasibility of innovative approaches to economic development that minimize impacts on forests and shape the development trajectory of the country. It is hoped that the proof of concept that the ER-Program provides can have an impact well beyond its accounting area and four-year duration.



C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s) (From PAD)

To make payments to the Program Entity for measured, reported, and verified greenhouse gas emission reductions from reduced deforestation, forest degradation and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in Sangha and Likouala of the Republic of Congo, and to distribute these payments in accordance with an agreed Benefit Sharing Plan

Key Results

The achievement of the PDO will be measured through the following indicators:

- i. Volume of CO₂e Emissions Reductions that have been measured and reported by the Program Entity and transferred to the FCPF Carbon Fund (tCO₂e);
- ii. Payment by the FCPF Carbon Fund for CO₂e Emission Reductions generated by the program (US\$);
- iii. Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan and arrangements (Yes/No).

D. Project Description

The ERP-SL will support a combination of sectoral and enabling activities to address the direct drivers of deforestation and forest degradation as well as underlying causes. The program focuses on the linkages between reducing poverty and promoting forest conservation. Agriculture is one of the primary occupations for households within the program area and also a major driver of deforestation. The ERP-SL seeks to combine the protection of forest cover and biodiversity with livelihood improvements. This will be achieved particularly through promoting sustainable agriculture techniques and improved energy production from charcoal.

The sectoral activities fall under four intervention areas:

- i. First, the program seeks to address degradation in forest concessions by engaging forest companies in RIL and forest protection and by supporting continuous improvement of the techniques used.
- ii. Second, the program aims at reducing emissions from deforestation in palm oil concessions by avoiding the conversion of forests with high conservation value (HCV) through contractual agreements and the promotion of certification under the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) standard. It may also provide technical assistance to mining concessions to promote reduced impact planning of mining sites and supporting infrastructure.
- iii. Third, the program will work with communities to improve their livelihoods and provide alternative sources of income by: (i) promoting smallholder agroforestry systems for cocoa in degraded forest areas in CDZs, (ii) introducing climate-smart subsistence agriculture schemes (including for cassava and maize via agroforestry systems) to increase agricultural productivity and crop diversification, (iii) promoting smallholder outgrower schemes for palm oil on deforested areas within palm oil concessions, and (iv) potentially providing Payments for Environmental Services (PES) for both individuals and communities that protect forests and wetlands.



- iv. Fourth, the program includes measures to improve the management of existing protected areas through enhanced protected area management.

The enabling activities of the program cover three categories: i) Improving governance, e.g. through capacity building of program partners and synergies with the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) process; ii) strengthening land use planning at national and local levels; iii) improving livelihoods through value chain development for agricultural products, e.g. for cocoa and palm oil.

Component Name:

The program has three components:

- i) Payments of Emission Reductions generated in Sangha and Likouala following Measurement, Reporting, and Verification;
- ii) Distribution of the financial benefits from the Emission Reductions sale in accordance with a Benefit Sharing Plan; and,
- iii) Program Management, Monitoring, and Evaluation.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The implementing agency will be the Ministry of Forest Economy (MEF). It has been the main counterpart for preparing the ERPA and will lead its implementation, overseeing the National REDD+ Coordination (CN-REDD) and signing REDD+ related contracts with private operators, in line with the decision made by the preparation committee under the leadership of the Ministry of Planning (MPSIR). The Ministry of Finance will be the signatory of the ERPA. The Prime Ministry will play an important role in policy coordination, while technical leadership of the REDD+ process will remain with the MEF. MEF's Department of Studies and Planning (DSP) will have overall responsibility for program preparation, coordination, and implementation.

CN-REDD, an operational unit under the MEF, will serve as a technical secretariat for CONA-REDD and assess the alignment of the ER Program implementation plan with the national REDD+ strategy. CN-REDD is responsible for implementation of REDD+ at country level and will provide support to the PMU (Project Management Unit) for the Reduction Emission Level and on social and environmental safeguards. It will ensure alignment of the ERP with the national REDD+ Strategy.

At the subnational level, the REDD Department Committees (CODEPA-REDD) of Sangha and Likouala will be in charge of supporting the PMU in the implementation of the ERP REDD+ Strategy as well as decision-making and conflict resolution. These Committees are composed of representatives from departmental government authorities, Ministries, and LCIPs. Specifically, the CODEPA-REDD disseminate information on REDD+ to stakeholders, review the project proposal submitted by communities to use the funds for emission reductions. They will also address complaints through the complaint resolution mechanism.

The ER Program will be managed and administered by a PMU, which will be in charge of the operational and financial management (FM). An external service provider will be recruited for that purpose through a competitive process, unless



the government can demonstrate that its own structures have sufficient technical and fiduciary capacity. The PMU will not only support program implementation, but also seek to build capacity among key institutions, so that the functions fulfilled by the PMU can be progressively integrated into the departmental and national government in the medium term. The PMU will ensure coordination between local and national level and will (i) be responsible for overall management and monitoring of community and private sector activities, (ii) produce carbon and safeguards monitoring and reporting reports based on the national Safeguards Information System and the MRV system run by the National Forest Management Inventory Center (CNIAF), (iv) support beneficiaries in the implementation of Safeguards Plans (iv) hiring and supervising the NGO for community project development and capacity building, and (v) review of private sector and NGO technical and financial reports of private sector beneficiaries and NGO on the use of ER payments (vi) follow up on payments of beneficiaries.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The two northernmost departments of Congo are Sangha and Likouala, bordering on Cameroon to the northwest and Central African Republic to the northeast. Their combined population is estimated at 306,405 (2015), with Likouala leading the split by a roughly 2:1 margin. Population density is very low, at about 2.5 people per km². Natural population growth of 2.86 percent and migration from both within and without Congo have combined to increase the area's population. The poverty rates in Sangha and Likouala are 64 percent and 67 percent, respectively, about twice the national average (MEF, 2018). The ERP-SL accounting area covers the entirety of Sangha and Likouala, for a total of 12.4 million ha (split 47 percent, Sangha, to 53 percent, Likouala), 11 million of which (94 percent) are forested. Representing nearly 60 percent of Congo's forests, the program area is home to relatively intact equatorial lowland rainforest, with mostly closed canopy. Undisturbed natural forests are generally limited to protected areas and remote areas within forest concessions, as well as extensive tracts of largely inaccessible forested wetlands. The program area includes three national parks and one community reserve (2.7 million ha), private concessions (6.8 million ha), and unattributed areas (2.9 million ha). Among the protected areas are Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park (NNNP) in Sangha, which constitutes a portion of the Trinational World Heritage Site (TNS) - the single most biologically intact landscape in the Congo Basin - the Odzala-Kokoua National Park, which comprises a part of the Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkébé (TRIDOM) Site (proposed for UNESCO recognition as a "Man and Biosphere" Reserve) and the Lac Télé Community Reserve in Likouala (the world's largest swamp forest and second largest wetland area after the Pantanal in South America). The peatland areas in Likouala hold an estimated average carbon stock of 2,186 tC/ha (Dargie et al., 2017). The PAD includes a map of the project area. The majority of Sangha and Likouala is allocated as industrial concessions. The two departments contain 17 forest concessions (6.6 million ha), two agro-industrial concessions (200,000 ha), and 13 mining exploration and research concessions (overlapping claims in forestry concessions). Concession management implies that communities face access restrictions.



G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Donat Vema Tunamau, Social Specialist
 Albert Francis Atangana Ze, Environmental Specialist
 FNU Owono Owono, Social Specialist
 Charlie Foyet Sonkeng, Environmental Specialist
 Fabena Divine Babindamana Nee Niemet Gampika, Social Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Impacts could be expected from the activities that will generate emission reductions so the policy is triggered. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) describes possible impacts as well as mitigation measures.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The project will mainly target the forestry sector, which in Congo constitutes an important heritage that is interrelated with other sectors of activity and with all other environmental and social components. The ESMF addresses issues related to natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project is intended in part to promote better management of production forests so the provisions of this policy are triggered. The ESMF addresses issues related to forests and lays out provisions, if needed, for forest management plans or certification road maps, as required by OP 4.36.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Some of the activities that will generate emission reductions will involve changes in agricultural practices. The policy is triggered as some sectoral activities will involve enhanced vector control or could promote integrated pest management practices. The Pests and Pesticides Management Framework describes possible impacts as well as mitigation measures.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	A chance finds procedure has been included in the ESMF on the unlikely chance that a project-related



		activity results in a possible impact on physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	As the project will be implemented in Sangha and Likouala Departments, home to an estimated population of 21,400 IPs, it will be critical to ensure that IPs benefits from the project. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework has been prepared.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project will finance investment which will lead to emission reductions payments. As some of these activities may reduce access to protected areas, a Process Framework has been prepared. No involuntary resettlement is expected to result from any project-related activity.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The activities leading to ERs do not involve dams and so the policy is not triggered.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Neither the project nor related investments will be located on international waterways, so this policy is not triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Neither the project nor related investments will be located in disputed areas and so the policy is not triggered.

KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

The program is being implemented under the Safeguards Policies and not the Environmental and Social Framework because the Concept Review Meeting took place prior to October 1, 2018. The program is rated moderate for environmental risks and substantial for social risks, which are aggregated to a substantial risk rating. This classification considers the capacity of the implementing agencies, the sector-specific risks and other stakeholders involved, and the previous experience in management of related Bank projects (including the Forest and Economic Diversification Project, P124085/P158604, which has been implemented in the same geographic area). Developed in close cooperation with key stakeholders, the ER Program is designed to mitigate environmental and social risks in the forest sector. It supports more sustainable forest management and agricultural practices and benefit sharing, and strengthens the voice of Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples (LCIP).

Given its emphasis on promoting RIL and reducing the conversion of forest conversion to agricultural land, the ER Program is expected to have positive environmental impacts. These include habitat and biodiversity conservation and the support of Payment for Environmental Services schemes that are expected to reduce erosion and maintain soil



fertility, among other benefits. Environmental risks will be managed through the relevant frameworks listed below. The program will comply with the provisions for Commercial Harvesting of OP 4.36 by defining a process in the final version of the Benefit Sharing Plan that will ensure that ER payments for forest companies will only be made for operations that are certified under an independent forest certification system or adhere to a time-bound phased action plan acceptable to the Bank for achieving certification to such standards.

While environmental risks are considered low, there are moderate social risks due to the remote nature of the program area and the presence of particularly vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples and refugees from neighboring countries. Risks could also result from the power relations and differences in culture and expectations between transnational logging and agribusiness firms on the one side and rural workers on the other, requiring suitable grievance redress and mediation mechanisms. Also, there is potential for social discontent as stakeholders might not be satisfied with the outcome of the sharing of benefits resulting from the ER payments. This could result from disagreement with the findings of the performance evaluation of their ER generation or with the allocated benefits, from non-payment of the full amount of benefits payable, failure to receive payments within the agreed time period, or misinformation on project implementation.

In line with the Bank's guidance on Managing Environmental and Social Risks for the FCPF Emission Reductions Programs, the focus of the supervision responsibilities of the World Bank, as Trustee of the FCPF, will be on the performance of agreed safeguards systems, and not on supervising the safeguards aspects of all individual activities of an ER Program. Thus, the proposed approach recommends that the World Bank should retain the responsibility to determine that the safeguards systems developed by the Program Entity for an ER Program are designed and supported sufficiently to result in ER Program implementation that is consistent with World Bank safeguards. In addition to self-reporting by the Program Entity and World Bank due diligence, the ERP-SL will have independent third-party monitoring. The third-party monitoring will be separate from verification of emission reductions generated from the ER Program, and the World Bank, acting as Trustee, will review the information from third-party monitor, along with the self-reporting and verification report (verifying the volume of emission reductions generated) to determine whether or not to make the ER payments under the ERPA in whole or in part to the Program Entity. Third-party monitoring can take various forms but typically should involve a combination of independent verification of self-reporting data provided by the Program Entity and annual audits of a sample of ER Program activities to confirm that the safeguards systems in place are functioning (e.g, timely preparation of key safeguard documents, consultation processes, effectiveness of safeguard management measures, and disclosure of information, among other important aspects, all in a manner consistent with the ESMF).

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: Implementing a REDD+ ER Program has inherent social risks that require prudent management. This is particularly the case with regards to land tenure and the rights to forest resources. Other risks include risk of soil pollution from inappropriate use of fertilizers and pesticides use and their consequences on human and animal health, risk of conflicts in income sharing, risk of loss of biodiversity due to monospecific plantations.

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

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

The Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and five sub-frameworks have been developed and were validated in January 2017. The latter include the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework, Resettlement Policy



Framework, Pests and Pesticides Management Framework, Cultural Heritage Management Framework, and Process Framework. All safeguards instruments were disclosed on the websites of the MEF and the World Bank. They will be updated and specified through additional instruments as needed during program implementation. The frameworks define the guidelines to be adopted, specific studies that should be conducted, the compensation to be provided, the procedures to allow people to appeal against the proposed activities, the procedures for managing these appeals and the monitoring and evaluation process needed to verify the sound implementation of mitigation measures. In line with the institutional arrangements designed for the ER Program, the PMU will be responsible for guiding and ensuring compliance with safeguard requirements. That includes for the PMU to assist implementers, such as concession holders, NGOs and communities, in conducting environmental and social impact assessments and developing specific safeguard plans if required. The PMU will be responsible that implementers comply with a code of conduct, and implementers will have to ensure the same regarding their contractors. All activities need to comply with national health and safety standards, particularly with sanitary guidance by health authorities to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

Safeguards implementation and monitoring will be coordinated at two levels. CN-REDD, as an integrated unit of the MEF attached to the Technical Chamber of CONA-REDD, is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of safeguards for any REDD+ project or program in RoC. In addition, the PMU will ensure compliance with the safeguards requirements specifically for the ER Program, guiding and ensuring compliance with safeguard requirements. That includes for the PMU to assist implementers, such as concession holders, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and communities, in conducting environmental and social impact assessments and developing specific safeguard plans if required. The PMU will be responsible that implementers comply with a code of conduct to define labor management standards and avoid misconduct (including with regards to gender-based violence, sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment). Implementers will have to ensure the same regarding their contractors. All activities need to comply with national health and safety standards, particularly with sanitary guidance by health authorities to prevent the spread of COVID-19. The PMU will assist implementers, such as concessionaires, NGOs and communities, in conducting environmental and social impact assessments and developing specific safeguard plans if required. The PMU will be responsible for compiling and analyzing safeguards data and preparing annual safeguards monitoring reports to be assessed and reviewed by CONA-REDD. Furthermore, the PMU will conduct field missions for verification purposes together with LCIPs and civil society representatives. The information provided in the reports will be made publicly available and communicated through the national SIS.

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

To help mitigate these risks, the REDD+ process has been highly inclusive. The SAP and the ESMF were developed through a participatory approach to identify social risks and develop mitigation measures. Risks related to land acquisition and restrictions in access to natural resources in legally designated parks and protected areas were identified as part of the preparation of the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and the Process Framework (PF), respectively. As the departments of Sangha and Likouala are among the departments with the largest number of indigenous people, an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) was prepared to ensure that program activities do not negatively affect their rights or cultures.



B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
27-Aug-2018	31-Aug-2018	

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Republic of
23-May-2019

Comments

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
27-Aug-2018	31-Aug-2018

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Republic of
23-May-2019

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
27-Aug-2018	31-Aug-2018

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Republic of
23-May-2019

Comments

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure



Yes	27-Aug-2018	31-Aug-2018
<p>"In country" Disclosure Congo, Republic of 23-May-2019 Comments</p>		
<p>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP. If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</p>		
<p>C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)</p>		
<p>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</p>		
<p>Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report? Yes</p>		
<p>If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report? Yes</p>		
<p>Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan? Yes</p>		
<p>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</p>		
<p>Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats? Yes</p>		
<p>If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank? Yes</p>		
<p>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</p>		
<p>Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues? Yes</p>		
<p>Is a separate PMP required? Yes</p>		



If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?

Yes

OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?

Yes

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?

NA

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

OP/BP 4.36 - Forests

Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?

Yes

Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?

Yes

Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?

Yes

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?

Yes



Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?

Yes

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

David Maleki
Environmental Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Calixte Nganongo, Minister of Finance, Budget and Public Portfolio
Calixte Nganongo
Minister of Finance
cg.minfin@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Forest Economy
Georges Claver Boundzanga
Coordinator
bouzgegeredd@gmail.com



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	David Maleki
----------------------	--------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Nathalie S. Munzberg	23-Dec-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Sanjay Srivastava	23-Dec-2020
Country Director:	Keiko Kubota	14-Jan-2021

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here. *Please delete this note when finalizing the document.*