



THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA
OROMIA NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE FORESTED LANDSCAPE
PROGRAM

Environmental and Social Review of
the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project and REDD+
Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora
Zone, Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II
Project

FINAL REPORT

July 2018
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Acronyms	vi
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction and Background.....	22
1.1. Introduction.....	22
1.2. Brief description of the REDD+ Projects	23
1.2.1. The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project.....	23
1.2.2. REDD+ Joint Forest Management in five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project.....	25
1.3. Rationale for Conducting Environmental and Social Review	27
1.4. Environmental and Social Management Requirements	28
2. Objectives, Methodology and Methods of the ESR	31
2.1. General Objective	31
2.2. Specific Objectives	31
2.3. Methodology	32
2.4. Methods of data collection.....	36
2.5. Data Collection Tools	39
2.6. Methods of Data Analysis.....	40
2.7. Ethical Issues	41
3. REDD+ Projects: Activities, Processes and Operations.....	41
3.1. Project based activities of the two REDD+ Projects:.....	42
3.2. Non-REDD+ (GOV, NGOs, and Community-based) initiatives in the two REDD+ project areas	45
3.2.1. GoE, NGOs and other investment project activities	45

3.2.2. Community-based initiatives/activities.....	46
4. National Environmental and Social Legislative and Regulatory Frameworks, and the WB Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies	47
4.1. Policy Framework.....	47
4.1.1 Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.....	47
4.1.2. Environmental Policy of Ethiopia.....	48
4.1.3. National and Regional Conservation Strategy	49
4.1.4. Forest Conservation and Utilization Policy and Strategy, 2007	50
4.1.5 National Energy Policy	50
4.1.6 National Health Policy	52
4.1.7 Land Tenure Policy.....	52
4.1.8 National Biodiversity Policy	53
4.1.9 National Policy for Women	54
4.2. Legislative Framework	54
4.2.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (Proclamation No, 299/2002)	54
4.2.2 Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation (No. 542/2007)	56
4.2.3 Environmental Pollution Control (Proclamation No. 300/2002)	58
4.2.3 Public Health Proclamation	58
4.2.4 Rural Land Administration and Use	58
4.2.5 Expropriation of Landholdings for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation Proclamation	59
4.2.6 Payment of Compensation for Properties Situated on Landholdings Expropriated for Public Use (Regulation No.135/2007)	60
4.3 International Conventions relevant to the projects.....	60
4.3.1 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).....	61
4.3.2 Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).....	64

4.3.3 Other International Agreements	65
4.4 The World Bank’s Operational Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards	65
4.4.1 Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	66
4.4.2 Natural Habitat (OP/BP 4.04)	66
4.4.3 Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09)	67
4.4.4 Indigenous/underserved Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)	68
4.4.5 Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)	69
4.4.6 Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	69
4.4.7 Forests (OP/BP 4.36)	70
4.4.8 Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4. 37)	71
5. Key Findings from Community Consultations	72
5.1. Forest and REDD+ Initiative in the Eyes of the Community	72
5.2. Land acquisition and resettlement.....	73
5.3. Membership and Membership Criteria	74
5.4. Grievance Redress Mechanism	75
5.5. Traditional institutions of resource management and conflict resolution	76
5.6. Gender.....	78
5.7. Conflicts of Interest.....	79
5.8. Benefit sharing and Unmet Expectation	81
5.9. Environmental Benefits	82
5.10. Bale Mountains National Park: Designation and the risk of Resettlement	83
5.11. Implication of instability in Oromia for the OFLP	84
5.12. Lessons Learned on the two REDD+ Projects.....	85
6. Review of the two REDD+ projects’ Safeguards against the GoE’s and the WB’s Safeguards, and the UNFCCC Safeguards Principles	88

6.1. Review of safeguard procedures of the BMER project	88
6.1.1. Comparison of CCB safeguard standards with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's safeguards requirements	90
6.1.2. Project Level Review on Compliance Status of BMERP's Implementation with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's Safeguards Requirements	98
6.2. Review of Safeguard Procedures of the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project	109
7. Description of Potential and Actual Environmental and Social Impacts/Risks.....	111
7.1. Actual and Potential Environmental and Social Impacts of the REDD+ projects	112
7.2. Actual and potential environmental and social impacts of the Non- REDD+ interventions	114
7.3. Actual and potential risks and challenges of the forested landscapes projects	116
8. Institutional Arrangement and Gaps	118
8.1. Institutional Arrangement	118
8.2. Institutional Capacity Gaps	121
8.3. The New Institutional Arrangement and Its Implication	123
9. Conclusions, Recommendations and the Way Forward	125
9.1. Conclusions.....	125
9.2. Recommendations to Address REDD+ Projects Compliance gap.....	127
9.3. Proposed Mitigation Measures for Non-REDD+ initiatives	139
9.4. The Way forward on external factors impacting the REDD+ projects goals.....	145
References	148
Appendix A: Bale Mountains Eco-region Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Project.....	151
Appendix B: REDD+ JFM in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II.....	158
Annexes	163
Annex I: List of persons/Agencies to be interviewed or discussed with, documents and reports to be reviewed:.....	163

Annex II: Key Issues/topics and Guiding Questions	164
Annex III: Document verification & field observation checklist to be filled at kebele & woreda level	168
Annex IV: Institutional & capacity need assessment at higher & project levels in implementing environmental & social safeguard instruments (OFWE, OFLP CU, Project offices & field offices) ..	172
Annex V. Environmental and Social Review/Auditing Guiding Questions for Government Officials and Social group (PAP and Beneficiaries).....	175
Annex VI: Community Consultation Attendance Sheets.....	176
Annex VII: List of Stakeholders Validation Workshop Participants	177
Annex VIII: CCB Verification Statement BALE MOUNTAINS ECO-REGION REDD+ PROJECT	178

List of Acronyms

ADLI	Agricultural Development Led Industrialization
BER	Bale eco-region
BoA	Bureau of Agriculture
BoANR	Bureau of Agriculture and Natural Resources
BoRLAU	Bureau of Rural Land Administration and Use
BoWME	Bureau of Water, Minerals and Energy
BMERP	Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project
CBO	Community based organizations
CCBA	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CCB	Climate, Community and Biodiversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CRGE	Climate Resilient Green Economy
CSE	Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia
DA	Development Agent
DO	Development Objective
EFY	Ethiopian Fiscal Year
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIO	Ethiopian Institute of Ombudsman
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority (the previous Federal Environmental organ)
EPE	Environmental Policy of Ethiopia
ER	Emission Reduction
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
ESR	Environmental and Social Review
EWCA	Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority
EWNRA	Ethio-wetlands and Natural Resources Association
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FDP	Forest Dependent Peoples
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
FMT	Facility Management Team
FDCU	Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GHG	Greenhouse gases
GMP	General Management Plan
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanisms
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
JFM	Joint Forest Management
KII	Key Informant Interviews

MEFCC	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
MRV	Measuring, Reporting and Verification
MSE	Micro and Small Enterprise
NBP	National Biodiversity Policy
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NTFP	Non-timber forest products
OFLP	Oromia Forested Landscape Program
OEFCFA	Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority
OFWE	Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise
OP	Operational Policy
ORCU	Oromia REDD+ Coordination Unit
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PAPs	Project Affected People
PCR	Physical Cultural Resources
PD/D	Project Design /Document
PF	Process Framework
PFA	Priority Forest Areas
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PGHO	Public Grievance Hearing Offices
PIC	Prior Informed Consultation
PMP	Pest Management Plan
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REJFMA-SW	Ethiopia II-REDD+ Joint Forest Management Areas South-west Ethiopia II
RPF	Resettlement Policy Framework
SA	Social Assessment
SDP	Social Development Plan
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
WAJIBs	<i>Waldayaa Jiraatoota Bosonaa</i>
WB	The World Bank
WoEFCCA	<i>Woreda</i> Office of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority
WRLAUO	Woreda Rural Land Administration and Use Office
ZoEFCCA	Zonal Office of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority

Address:

**Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate
Change**

National REDD + Secretariat

P. O. Box: 12760

Telephone: +251-115-58-05-36

Fax: +251-115-58-05-90

Web: <https://reddplusethiopia.wordpress.com>

E-mail: yitebitumoges@yahoo.com; esid@ethionet.et

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

**Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change
Authority**

Oromia REDD+ Coordination Unit

E-mail: tesfaye.gonfa@yahoo.com

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Executive Summary

This report presents the Environmental and Social Review (ESR) results of the two REDD+ projects: *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ (BMER) project*; and *REDD+ Joint Forest Management Areas South West Ethiopia - Phase II Project (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II)*. The general objective of this ESR was to assess the overall social and environmental impacts (existing and potential) of the two ongoing REDD+ initiatives that will be aligned with the umbrella Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP), analyze and document the process used by these projects in addressing environmental and social impacts and risks as it relates to the GoE's environmental and social laws, the WB and UNFCCC safeguards requirements. Moreover, in light of the identified gaps during the ESR, it also proposes measures/action plans that will enable these projects to comply with the relevant GoE laws, and World Bank and UNFCCC safeguard requirements. The study was conducted in November 2016 and January and February 2017 and a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was employed. Five *woredas* (10 *kebeles*) from the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ (BMER) project and two *woredas* (4 *kebeles*) from the REDD+ Joint Forest Management Areas (REJFMA)-SW Ethiopia II Project were selected and visited for this study.

Based on the findings of this Review, mitigation measures were identified and specific action points forwarded. Attempts were also made to distinguish between 'REDD+ project' impacts and risks and non-REDD+ intervention risks and recommendations and the way forward proposed accordingly. It is believed, if the proposed action points are implemented and recommendations are heeded to, the projects will attain their goals, the gaps observed in safeguards procedures will be addressed, and the overall development goals of sustainable use of natural forest resources through community participation will be attained.

The major findings of the ESR, lessons learned and the possible recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. General Observations

Members of the forest community are aware of and appreciate the values, functions, attributes and services of the forest ecosystem. With a growing sense of ownership,¹ there is high commitment, among members of all PFM cooperatives and *WAJIBs* (*Waldayaa Jiraatoota Bosonaa*, which means Forest Dwellers' Association) on sustainable management of their respective forest blocks. PFM cooperatives and *WAJIBs* have well-structured organs with working procedures including bylaws.

PFM cooperative membership is voluntary and open to all. But, registration fees and share contributions, are still reported as barriers for the poor households in many of the communities visited. PFM cooperatives, which evolved from *WAJIBs* are not open for new membership because of *WAJIB* principles, i.e., the carrying capacity of land. \The *Godaantu* and *Gopo/Kopo* systems serve both as rights restoration, resource sharing and conflict aversion mechanism in BMERP and REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project, respectively.

2. Gender

Women constitute a significant portion of PFM cooperative membership; they are actively involved in the PFM cooperative leadership. However, less represented in the leadership positions among the associations formed from the *WAJIBs* in West Arsi of the BMERP. Specific measures for equitable gender benefits will be assessed as part of an upcoming OFLP gender assessment.

Since poverty is more entrenched among the female-headed households, their full participation is hampered by the registration fee and more importantly by share contribution requirements to join service cooperatives. Specific recommendations for ensuring affordability of membership to service cooperatives is included in table below.

3. Conflicts of interest

Conflicts of interests were observed between PFM cooperative members and non-members over the use of forest resources. *WAJIB* members and non-members (*ammatamaa*, lit. the embraced), who dwell in the forest lands and whose number has reached twice the number of association

¹Here, the reference is made to the local community, forest resources' users.

members, are engaged in serious conflict over the use of forest resources. Fatal incidents were reported in Barisa *Kebele* of Dodola *Woreda*. *WAJIBs* are closed to new members: “*WAJIB gubbaan cufaadha, jalaan bananaadha*” (lit. *WAJIB* is closed at the top and open at the bottom). The unemployed and landless youth contest the older generation’s exclusive rights claim over the use of forest and forest resources.

4. REDD+ initiatives

As off-shoot of the PFM cooperatives that have been in place for several years in most of the areas covered in this ESR, REDD+ projects had strong community support. There have been series of open public consultations, with varying degree from place to place, and most of the people support the projects. This does not, however, mean that there are not people who still have some reservations about these projects. Awareness about REDD+ initiative is very high in all sample *kebeles*, but more so among the communities in BMER project. The WB’s prior informed consultation was met. FPIC was well emphasized in the project documents of BMERP and the minutes of community consultation meetings and ‘consents’ well recorded. However, there are gaps that need improvement to make FPIC a guiding principle² at operation level.

Unmet/inflated expectation – people complain that they have waited for too long for the “REDD+ money” to come and said “*motummaan dur hinsobu ture, amma sobuutti ka’e*” (In the past, government didn’t lie, now it has started lying.”). Despite their immense contribution in awareness creation and conservation of forest resources, NGOs who have been running these projects are blamed for creating high expectation for financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative.

²Consultation and participation are crucial components of a consent process. Consultation should be undertaken in good faith. The parties should establish a dialogue allowing them to find appropriate solutions in an atmosphere of mutual respect in good faith, and full and equitable participation. Consultation requires time and an effective system for communicating among interest holders. Indigenous peoples should be able to participate through their own freely chosen representatives and customary or other institutions. The inclusion of a gender perspective and the participation of indigenous women are essential, as well as participation of children and youth as appropriate. This process may include the option of withholding consent. Consent to any agreement should be interpreted as indigenous peoples having reasonably understood it. Consent in the context of FPIC, however, does not imply that the agreement of *every* individual is required. Rather, consent is based on collective considerations, reached through customary processes of dialogue, deliberation, and agreement.

5. Basic social services

With varying degrees, all the areas visited lack basic facilities such as schools, health services (human & veterinary), electricity, access roads and safe water services, which pose serious challenges on the wellbeing of the community. Absence of these basic services also negatively impacts on forest conservation (use of fuel wood, charcoal production and sale, population growth – limited access to reproductive health services - absence of market linkage) and the well of the community.

6. Safeguards Issues

Land acquisition that necessitated resettlement (O.P 4.12) was not reported by the communities visited for this study. However, the project should continue and strengthen recognition of the existing access to customary use rights such as improving quality of forest coffee with assumption of generating better income and beekeeping activities and other rights to reduce frustration or concern of the local communities in equitably drawing benefits from the natural resources including the forest. Project specific grievance redress mechanisms (GRM) are either missing (REJFMA) or not well functional (BMERP). For instance, Article 26 of the PFM cooperatives in the BMERP provides for the establishment of *Gumi Hayoota* (Council of Elders) to play the role of GRM at each CBO level. However, community consultations revealed that there was no functioning inbuilt GRM.

Potential irrigation schemes may cause wetland degradation or loss and might necessitate agricultural extension practices causing pollution. High agricultural extension practices including the use of pesticides offsite of the forest area and near natural forest widely reported.

Awareness about the Environmental and Social procedures and tools was low among the lower level implementers of both projects. None of the projects or interventions have passed through environmental and social screening and safeguard processes (no document was found showing this). Some of the experts at the project site level interviewed for this Review had no idea of the safeguards instruments, especially the ESIA procedures (screening – final ESIA).

The finding of this ESR shows that although the BMERP used CCB standards at a framework or higher level during project design and subscribed in principle to CCB's safeguard

criteria/principles, these criteria and principles were not consistently used by the project both at procedural and operational levels. The finding revealed that BMERP has no safeguards instruments prepared for its implementation, which means safeguard instruments required by the GoE's, the WB's and the UNFCCC's REDD+ standards were not considered during project implementation.

In view of this, for instance, the *following subprojects/project activities* which are planned to be implemented in the 2nd phase of BMER project are likely to have significant adverse environmental consequences if no proper safeguards instruments are put in place.. Hence, preparing and implementing site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plan) for subprojects/project activities, as per the OFLP's safeguards framework instruments, is highly required.

- a. Agricultural intensification and provision of economic alternatives;
- b. Provision of alternative fuel wood and construction poles supply from newly established plantations on non-forest lands;
- c. Constructing 10 biogas plants; and
- d. Piloting timber harvesting.

The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project has not adopted or used any internationally accepted safeguard standards such as VCS, CCBA and Plan VIVO applicable for REDD+ projects, which means it has no safeguards instruments prepared for its implementation. Simply put, the safeguard instruments required by the GoE's, the WB's and the UNFCCC's REDD+ standards were not considered. This, therefore, means in the absence of proper safeguard framework instruments guiding project implementation, some subprojects/project activities which are planned to be implemented in the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia phase II project are likely to have adverse environmental and social consequences. Thus, site specific instruments for REJFMA-SW subprojects/project activities should be prepared and implemented as per the OFLP's safeguards framework instruments.

7. Implication of instability in Oromia for the Project

The instability being ensued in different parts of the region have caused different negative impacts on development infrastructure which also created negative impact on BMERP

infrastructure. The instability in the region started in April 2014 due to lack of good governance. Thus, to address the problem in general and implication to the forest development the government should work on good governance challenges and provide quick response and corrective measures starting from the grassroots level.

8. Institutional capacity gaps

OFWE does not have zonal and *woreda* structures, instead it has branches (which coordinate four to six district offices) and districts (covering two to seven *woredas*). Lack of cross-sectoral coordination at *woreda* levels (e.g., demarcated non-REDD+ project forest lands are often given to investors by the *woreda* Investment Committee and approved by higher structures) was reported as a major challenge.

Absence of social and environmental safeguards positions at OFWE branch and district levels compromises effective implementation of safeguards procedures as a proponent of these REDD+ projects. Shortage of experts – number and the mix of expertise required to facilitate, coordinate and monitor the activities of PFM cooperatives and resources (e.g., budget and vehicles) to effectively run the day to day operational activities was also observed. Lack of budget for follow-up/back-stopping activities to cooperatives by OFWE and lack of support from the government structure (corruption in the *woreda* law-enforcement structures) were also reported. *However, the newly established OEFCCA, with its regulatory role and through its structure from regional to woreda levels, is believed to narrow these gaps.*

9. Lessons Learned

The benefits of PFM cooperatives are well noted since the communities are benefiting a lot both in terms of improvement in their livelihoods and sustainable use of forest resources. This was realized through continuous community engagement and consultation. PFM has changed the human-forest relationship, created strong sense of ownership because of which forest is regenerating very well.

Sustainability of forest protection might be threatened if the income of the community members does not improve through the diversification of the livelihood strategies of the forest dependent communities. For instance, illegal logging, forest clearing for cultivation, civil unrest resulting

from high youth unemployment, charcoal production and sale of firewood will threaten both the attainment of project goals and the sustainable use of natural forest resources.

PFM cooperative registration fees, share contribution requirements and strict application of *WAJIB* principles restricts access to cooperatives and will eventually jeopardize sustainable use of forest resources and further marginalize the vulnerable members of the communities. The two REDD+ projects lacked a *functioning* inbuilt GRM; the attempt to institute it hardly went beyond fulfilling the procedural requirements. However, there are strong and functioning indigenous institutions of dispute settlement (e.g., *Jaarsummaa*) which could serve as a complement to the formal systems and project specific GRM.

The fear of the government's motive of forest related projects was overcome through transparent and honest discussion and negotiation with the community on issues of entitlements, duties and responsibilities of each project partner or stakeholder. FPIC principles were not always observed in engagement with forest dependent communities.

Benefit sharing arrangement agreed upon from emission reduction payment was not realized and the unmet expectation of the community might have adverse effect on the sustainable use of forest resources. Illegal logging and lack of good governance (e.g., corruption) in the local level administration and law-enforcement organs pose serious threat to the attainment of project goals and sustainable use of forest resources.

Lack of market outlet for the forest based resources (e.g., coffee, honey, spices, other NTFP) forces them either to sell their produce at throw away price at the local market or venture into unpredictable price speculation long after the harvest.

10. Recommendations

Even though the project used FPIC as a tool to engage the local community and demonstrated transparency in informing the objective of the project, still it requires updating status of the project and discussing the benefits accrue from every stage of the project. The guiding principle should be “*never promise what you cannot deliver!*” This will also address the problem of inflated expectation of support from REDD+ projects.

To overcome access restriction problem (e.g., *WAJIB* principles), follow the cooperative principles of voluntary membership of the residents of *kebele* as per the legal provisions rather than applying the carrying capacity of the land principle, i.e., 12 hectares per household as was the case when *WAJIBs* were established in the early 2000s. *WAJIBs* need to be restructured into PFM cooperatives and *WAJIB* collective/group membership into PFM cooperatives be replaced by individual membership. Since pressure is very high on *WAJIB* members from non-members a workable modality of the uses of the resources of *WAJIBs* could be negotiated through continuous consultation. A taskforce consisting of pertinent stakeholders (*Woreda* administrator; WOEFCCA; WRLAUO; OFWE district office Head; Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Representative; CBOs and *WAJIBs* to be represented by one person each) should be established to accomplish this task.

Poor households who could not join PFM cooperatives due to inability to pay the registration fee should be supported through flexible local level solutions such as exemption (means-test-based) of registration fee; allowing them sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; by keeping the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and by introducing installment based payment. PFM cooperative members who cannot raise the required share contribution payment to join Forest Users Service Cooperatives should be supported through lower share contributions to be paid on installment basis. The specific details of these proposals can be worked out through discussions with the respective local communities as ‘one size fits all’ proposal cannot be made from the outset.

Strengthen the existing diversified livelihood activities such as coffee and honey quality improvements, market value chain development, seed money/revolving funds, Micro and Small Enterprises (MSE) implementation is very useful. In addition, the livelihood diversification and strengthening activities need to encompass the vulnerable groups and underserved peoples, unemployed youth, non-PFM and non-Wajib members. In this regard, there is a need to organize them in associations/cooperatives/SMEs and provide training, capital and working places so that they will have sustainable means of livelihood.

Work to link the local producers to the big markets, i.e., negotiate with the companies to offer reasonably fair price to encourage farmers to sell their products fresh and assist and if need be

train farmers to use their money to diversify their livelihood strategies rather than venture into precarious price speculative practices. Although this requires further studies, key issues to be addressed include value addition and processing activities. The challenges that need to be addressed are, among others, lack of market information and access, equipment and skills for processing, and lack of organization of the producers to engage with policy makers and other stakeholders to advance their interests and promote their products, i.e., organic product.

To fight illegal logging and lack of good governance (e.g., corruption), which threaten both the attainment of the project goals and the sustainable use of natural forest resource, emphasis should be given to strengthen and work on: (i) awareness raising and organize training for *kebele* administration and *woreda* law enforcement structures; and (ii) closely with law enforcement structures to ensure strict legal measures are taken on the illegal loggers and their benefactors based on the formal legal structures.

OFWE needs to ensure that its profit-making objective does not override its commitment to protect, conserve and sustainably use forest resources. OEFCCA needs to play its critical role in harnessing the synergetic endeavor of all stakeholders to advance the mission for which it was set up and realize specific project objectives. OEFCCA should also coordinate with pertinent sector offices to enhance the provision of basic services such as education, health, safe water, electricity and access road since absence of these services is the major driver of poverty, which in turn negatively impacts on sustainable use of natural forest resources and the wellbeing of the communities.

11. Action Plan

The key action points proposed for the two REDD+ projects' compliance gaps and mitigations measures are briefly shown below.

1. Distribute hard copies of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA documents for the 16 (11 in BMER+ and 5 in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project) REDD+ *woredas* (REDD+ Hosting/focal offices) and *woreda* administration offices;

2. Undertake a one day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF and the social safeguard guidelines for all REDD+ *woreda* administrators, three officials from each *woreda* (*woreda* administrator, *Woreda* Rural Land Administration and Use Office Head and REDD+ focal IA head);
3. Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF,SA, PF and SESA, particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for all REDD+ *woredas*/members of REDD+ technical committee (three experts from each *woreda*);
4. Cascading these trainings to all *woreda* IAs, DAs (10 participants from each *woreda* and 2 days training program);
5. Conduct one day training on ESIA tools for the 16 REDD+ *woredas* (especially, eligibility and screening checklist) at cooperative level, one person each from the 114 (64 from BMERP and 50 REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project) cooperatives/CBOs;
6. The OEFCCA and ORCU, in collaboration with environmental and social focal persons (to be assigned/hired) of the two legacy REDD projects, will ensure implementation of the identified actions.
7. To address problems related to GRM: (i) translate GRM (Annex 11 of OFLP ESMF) into Afaan Oromo and distribute to 114 cooperatives; (ii) conduct one day training on GRM for 16 REDD+ *woredas* at each cooperative level, one person each from the 114 cooperatives/CBOs; and (iii) establish GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level where they never existed or strengthen their capacity through awareness raising and training where they existed but were not functional;
8. To overcome access restriction caused by rigid WAJIB principles, restructure the 68 WAJIBs in BMERP area following the cooperative principles of voluntary membership of the residents of a kebele as per the legal provisions rather than sticking to the carrying capacity of the land principle, i.e., 12 hectares per household as was the case when WAJIBs were established in the early 2000s. WAJIB collective/group membership into PFM cooperatives be replaced by individual membership. Since pressure is very high on WAJIB members from non-members, through continuous consultation, a workable modality on the uses of forest and WAJIB resources could be

negotiated. Establish a Task Force composed of relevant stakeholders to accomplish this task.

9. Poor households who could not join PFM cooperatives due to inability to pay the registration fee should be supported through flexible local level solutions such as means-test-based exemption of registration fee; allowing them sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; keeping the registration fee affordable to the poorest of the poor; and introducing installment based payment. PFM cooperative members who cannot raise the required share contribution payment to join Forest Users Service Cooperatives should be supported through lower share contributions to be paid on installment basis. The specific details of these proposals can be worked out through discussions and negotiations at each PFM cooperative level since ‘one size fits all’ proposal cannot be made from the outset.
10. Manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through an honest, transparent and realistic discussion with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. The guiding principle should be “never promise what you cannot deliver!” This will also address the problem of inflated expectation of support from REDD+ projects. More specifically, conduct a one day workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 11 REDD+ woredas at cooperative level, two persons each from the 64 cooperatives.
11. Strengthen the already implemented livelihood activities, with a focus on the unemployed youth and underserved community members with an aim to address the problem of youth unemployment and lack of means of livelihood for the poor and other underserved members of the community.
12. OEFCCA needs to take full responsibility and revitalize the woreda level structures (institutional platform) for addressing environmental and social safeguards issues and institutional coordination gaps. Moreover, Woreda Steering and Technical Committees (the latter chaired by OEFCCA) need to be strengthened and periodically

review the projects implementation performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.

13. Prepare and implement site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plan as required) for the Phase II of the two REDD+ legacy projects' activities/subprojects to address the potential environmental and social impacts as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments.
14. Conduct annual environmental and social performance monitoring/review for ensuring the implementation of the proposed action points (OFLP, in collaboration with MEFC, OEFCCA, project implementing entities).

The total budget for the proposed actions to be implemented in the two REDD+ project areas is given as follows:

- a) **BMERP:** (a) REDD+ project = ETB 3,000,456; and (b) Non-REDD+ =ETB 1,396,364. **Grand Total = ETB 4,396,820³.**
- b) **REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project:** (a) REDD+ project = ETB 1,098,100; and (b) Non-REDD+ =ETB 647,500. **Grand Total = ETB 1,745,600.**

For the detail mitigation measures/actions plans for non-REDD+ projects' activities undertaken in REDD+ forested landscapes and the external factors impacting REDD+ project goals, see Table VI. A and VI. B in Chapter 9.

³For both REDD+ projects, salary for the Environmental and Social safeguard specialist is not included in the proposed budget for the implementation of the action plan as it will be determined based on the scale of the organization.

Summary of the Mitigation measures (Action required) for BMER Project

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1	One of the instruments (procedures) of the Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard requirements, and the GoE's EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002 requirement has not been addressed or considered	Distribute hard copy of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA documents for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (REDD+ Hosting offices) and <i>woreda</i> administration office	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	8,228.00
		Undertake one-day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA for all REDD+ <i>woreda</i> administrators, three officials from each <i>woreda</i> (<i>Woreda</i> administrator, <i>Woreda</i> office of Rural Land Administration & Use Head and REDD+ focal IA head) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 3 days x 500 birr/day= 49,500.00 Transport/fuel: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 150 birr/round trip= 4,950.00 Total= 54,450.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	54,450.00
		Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF, PF and SES. Particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for 11 <i>woredas/zones</i> IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda/zone</i>) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 5 days x 300 birr/day = 49500.00 Transport: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 100 birr/round trip= 3300.00 Total= 52800.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	52,800.00
		Cascade these trainings to 11 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and 1 days training program) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 3 days x 300 birr/day = 99000.00 Transport: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 100 birr/round trip= 11000.00 Total= 110000.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	110,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		<p>Conduct one-day training on the important ESIA tools for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (especially, eligibility and screen checklist) at cooperative level, two persons from each cooperative of a total of 64 cooperatives.</p> <p>64cooperatives x 2 people x 3 days x 150 birr/day = 57600.00 Transport: 64 cooperatives x 2 people x 100 birr/round trip= 12800.00 Total= 70400.00</p>	<p>OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required</p>	<p>1st quarter of 2011 EFY</p>	<p>70,400.00</p>
		<p>Establish at project level a functional fully responsible Environmental and Social safeguards unit by assigning and/or hiring a professional environment and social safeguards specialist.</p>	<p>OEFCFA and OFWE in collaboration with Farm Africa and SOS-Sahel Ethiopia</p>	<p>1st quarter of 2011EFY</p>	<p>Salary as per the organization's scale</p>
S. Total					295,878.00
Operation cost⁴					50,000.00
G. Total					345,878.00
2	The existing PFM structure does not have an inbuilt grievance Redress mechanism (GRM)	<p>Translate GRM (Annex 11 of the OFLP ESMF) into Afan Oromo and distribute for 64 cooperatives</p>	<p>OEFCFA, ORCU</p>	<p>1st quarter of 2011 EFY</p>	<p>656.00</p>
		<p>Conduct one-day training on GRM as provided for in the OFLP ESMF (see Annex 11) for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, one person from each cooperative of a total of 64 cooperatives.</p>	<p>OEFCFA, ORCU</p>	<p>1st quarter 2011 EFY</p>	<p>35,200.00</p>

⁴ Facilitation cost involves administrative expenses such as per diem for trainers, fuel, secretarial and stationery.

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		Strengthen or establish inbuilt GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level as per the provisions of the OFLP ESMF and ensure they are functional. Activities include: awareness raising, training and refresher workshop. (64 PFM coop x 5 members of <i>Gumii Hayyoota</i> x 5 days/year x 150 Birr/day)	Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	2 nd quarter 2011 EFY	240,000.00
3	WAJIB structure is not open for new membership	Conduct a two-day awareness raising and consensus building workshop for the 68 WAJIBs having an average of 30 members.	OEFCFA, ORCU, with the support of Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	122,400.00
		Establish a task force composed of relevant stakeholders with an objective to restructure the 68 WAJIBs into PFM cooperatives. Proposed stakeholders: Woreda administrator; WOEFCCA; WRLAUO; OFWE district office Head; Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Representative; PFM Coop. and WAJIB to be represented by one person each (5 <i>kebeles</i> x 2 days each x 7 people x 200 Birr/person/day) = 14,000.00 Consultation with WAJIB members: 68 WAJIBs x 30 HHs/WAJIB x 150 Birr/day/person x 2 days = 612,000.00 Transport of the Task Force members: 5 <i>kebeles</i> x 2 days x 7 people x 100 birr/day=7,000.00	OEFCFA and OFWE in collaboration with Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	1 st and 2 nd quarters of the 2011 EFY	663,000.00
4	Registration fee and share contribution requirement as	Through community consultation and negotiations, introduce means-test-based exemption of registration fee; allowing them to sell firewood from dead trees to raise	OEFCFA, ORCU in collaboration with Farm	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	120,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
	barriers to PFM cooperative membership	the required registration fee; keep the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and introduce installment based payment. Introduce a lower share contribution requirement and ensure they are paid on an installment basis.	Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia		
5	Over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative	Conduct one day workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, two persons each from the 64 cooperatives. (64x2x150=19,200.00)	OEFCCA and ORCU with the support of Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	19,200.00
		Since addressing this problem requires continuous engagement, conduct honest, transparent and realistic discussions with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. The guiding principle should be “ <i>never promise what you cannot deliver!</i> ” <i>Lump sum budget allocated to conduct series of meetings and community consultations.</i>	OEFCCA, ORCU with the support of Farm Africa, SOS- Sahel Ethiopia	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	200,000.00
6	Gap in diversifying and strengthening livelihood activities with a focus on unemployed youth and vulnerable peoples	Customize livelihood needs assessment as per the OFLP livelihoods activities and implement it through strengthening the ongoing livelihood activities, with a focus on the unemployed youth and underserved community members .	OEFCCA, ORCU with SOS Sahel/Farm AFROCA	Assessment: 2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY Strengthen the livelihood activities: at least throughout the project period	500,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
7	Institutional coordination and capacity/coordination gaps	<p>OEFCCA needs to take full responsibility to ensure through its <i>woreda</i> level structure that all environmental and social safeguards issues of these projects are addressed.</p> <p>Use institutional platform to address the gaps. <i>Woreda</i> Steering committee and technical committees need to be strengthened and periodically review their performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.</p> <p>OEFCCA should play its roles as a leader of the Technical Committee.</p>	OEFCCA, through its <i>woreda</i> structures	At least throughout the project life	Regular budget
8	Environmental & social management gaps	Prepare and implement site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plan) for its Phase II subprojects/project activities as per the OFLP's safeguards framework instruments.	Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia with OEFCCA/OFWE	Throughout the project life	Regular budget
9	Environmental and Social Performance Monitoring	OFLP and partners will conduct environmental and social monitoring/review to ensure the implementation of the proposed action points.	ORCU and Partners	Annually	1,000,000
				Sub Total	2,900,456.00
				Operation cost	100,000.00
				G. Total	3,000,456.00

Summary of the Mitigation measures (Action required) for REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1.	One of the instruments (procedures) of the Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard requirements, and the GoE's EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002 requirement has not been addressed or considered	Distribute hard copy of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA documents for 5REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (REDD+ focal offices)	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	2420.00
		Undertake one-day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA for all REDD+ <i>woreda</i> administrators, 3 officials from each <i>woreda</i> (<i>Woreda</i> administrator, <i>Woreda</i> office of Rural Land Administration & Use Head and REDD+ focal IA head) 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 3 days x 500 birr/day = 22500.00 Transport/fuel: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 150 birr/round trip= 2250.00 Total= 24750.00	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	24,750.00
		Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF, PF and SESA. Particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for 5woredas/zones IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda</i> /zone); 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 5 days x 300 birr/day = 22500.00 Transport: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 100 birr/round trip= 1500.00 Total= 24,000.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	24,000.00
		Cascading these trainings to 5woreda IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and 2 days training program) 5 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 3 days x 300 birr/day = 45000.00 Transport: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 100 birr/round trip= 5000.00 Total= 50000.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	50,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		<p>Conduct one day training on the important ESIA tools for 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (especially, eligibility and screen checklist) at cooperative level, one person each from the total of 50 cooperatives.</p> <p>50 cooperatives x 2 people x 3 days x 150 birr/day = 45000.00 Transport: 50 cooperatives x 2 people x 100 birr/round trip= 10000.00 Total= 55000.00</p>	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	55,000.00
		Establish at project level a functional fully responsible Environmental and Social safeguard unit by assigning and/or hiring a professional environment and social safeguard specialist.	Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association with OEFCFA/OFWE	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	Salary as per the organization's scale
		Sub Total			156,170.00
		Operation cost			25,000.00
		Grand Total			181,170.00
2	The existing PFM structure does not have an inbuilt grievance Redress mechanism (GRM)	Translate GRM (Annex 11 of ESMF) into Afan Oromo and distribute for 50 cooperatives	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	600.00
		Conduct one day training on GRM as provided for in the OFLP ESMF (see Annex 11) for 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, one person each from the total of 50 cooperatives.	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	27,500.00
		Establish inbuilt GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level as per the provisions of the OFLP ESMF and ensure they are functional.	EWNRA with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	55,000.00
3	Registration fee & share contribution	Through community consultation and negotiations, introduce means-test-based exemption of registration	OEFCFA, ORCU in collaboration with	2 nd quarter 2011	100,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
	requirement as barriers to PFM cooperative membership	fee; allowing them to sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; keep the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and introduce installment based payment. Introduce a lower share contribution requirement and ensure they are paid on an installment basis.	EWNRA	EFY	
4	Over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative	Conduct one day workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, 2 persons each from the 50 cooperatives. (50x2x150=15,000.00)	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of EWNRA	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	15,000.00
		Since addressing this problem requires continuous engagement, conduct honest, transparent and realistic discussions with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. The guiding principle should be “ <i>never promise what you cannot deliver!</i> ” <i>Lump sum budget allocated to conduct series of meetings and community consultations.</i>	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	100,000.00
5	Gap in addressing and strengthen livelihood activities by focusing on unemployed youth and vulnerable people	Customize livelihood needs assessment as per the OFLP livelihoods activities and implement it through strengthening the ongoing livelihood activities, with a focus on the unemployed youth and underserved community members with a focus on the unemployed youth and vulnerable people	OEFCFA, ORCU, with EWNRA	Assessment: 2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY Strengthen the livelihood activities: at least throughout the project	The cost for this activity is covered in BMERP Action number 6 above.

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
				period	
6	Institutional coordination and capacity/coordination gaps	<p>OEFCOA needs to take full responsibility to ensure through its <i>woreda</i> level structure that all environmental and social safeguards issues of these projects are addressed.</p> <p>Use institutional platform to address the gaps. <i>Woreda</i> Steering committee and technical committees need to be strengthened and periodically review their performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.</p> <p>OEFCOA should play its roles as a leader of the Technical Committee.</p>	OEFCOA, through its <i>woreda</i> structures	At least throughout the project life	Regular budget
7	Environmental & social management gaps	Prepare and implement site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plan as needed) for its Phase II subprojects/project activities as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments.	Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association with OEFCOA/OFWE	Throughout the project life	Regular budget
8	Environmental and Social Performance Monitoring	OFLP and partners will conduct Environmental and Social monitoring to ensure the implementation of the proposed action points.	ORCU and Partners	Every year	750,000.00
				Sub Total	1,048,100.00
				Operation cost	50,000.00
				Grand Total	1,098,100.00

1. Introduction and Background

1.1. Introduction

Environmental issue in general and climate change in particular has become a world-wide concern in the last decades and being the focus of discussions in a variety of forums at national and international levels. Hence, various international conventions and accords on climate change adaptation and mitigation have been made and agreed upon between UN member states. Since environmental problems are rooted in economic and social policies and occur at all levels, corrective actions have been made by each nation and international organizations dealing with this issue. Concurrently, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) has been doing its best to address this over the years by creating policies and programs enacting environmental legislation, and through international institutions and treaties, laws and regulations, and expenditures, among others.

Ethiopia is one of the countries that have endeavored in realizing sustainable socioeconomic development by developing and implementing Climate Resilience Green Economy (CRGE) strategy. In line with the CRGE Strategy and the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP), the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC) is implementing the National Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)⁵ Readiness Program to prepare the country for receiving and deploying climate finance for sustainable forest management. One of the ongoing REDD+ readiness activities is the preparation of a pilot umbrella program called Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP). The main purpose of the OFLP is to reduce net greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve sustainable forest management in Oromia. As Oromia accounts for more than 70% of the high forests of the country, the lessons from the implementation of the OFLP will have significant implication to inform the national REDD+ Readiness process in particular and the CRGE initiative in general.

⁵REDD+ stands for countries' efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (www.forestcarbonpartnership.org).

The successful implementation of the OFLP will be decisive to roll out the national REDD+ Readiness Program through accessing and deploying additional climate finance.

The Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority (OEFCCA) with the technical support from the World Bank has finalized the preparation of the document and recently launched the Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP) (2017- 2022) as a jurisdictional program with the rules of the game set at the regional level. The jurisdictional approach of the OFLP is anchored in: (i) supporting state-wide policies that help improve the enabling environment for reducing deforestation and rural poverty; (ii) strategic coordination of ongoing and planned REDD+ relevant initiatives in the regional state across sectors and projects; and (iii) Accounting, and Measuring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) at the level of the Oromia Regional State. Therefore, the OFLP implementation will require good coordination of existing and future initiatives financed by multiple sources and implemented by various actors.

1.2. Brief description of the REDD+ Projects

As described under section 1.3 below, this environmental and social review was undertaken in two projects, namely, the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project (BMERP) and Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone in Oromia Regional State. The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ project covers 11 *woredas*; while the previous Nono Selle REDD+ project covered only Nono Selle *Woreda* and phased-out in 2015. However, in year 2016 a new initiative or project under the name of “REDD+ Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Ababara Zone (Ale, Becho, Diddu, Halu and NonoSelle), Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project” has been established. This project covers 5 *woredas*, which includes the Nono Selle *Woreda* from the already phased-out of Nono Selle REDD+ project, as an upgrading program and lesson learning project and the newly included 4 *woredas*. Hence, the description of these projects that were covered under this environmental and social review is presented as follows.

1.2.1. The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project

The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project (BMERP) lies between 50°22'–80°08'N and 38°41'– 40°44'E in Oromia Regional State. Administratively, the area comprises 11 *Woredas*

namely Agarfa, Adaba, Dodola, Goba, Gololcha, Delo Mena, Kokosa, Berber, Hareenna Buluk, Nensebo, and Mada Walabu. In these *woredas* there are six priority forest areas (PFAs): Aloshe Batu, Goro Bale, Harana Kokosa, Menna Angetu, Kubayu, and Adaba Dodola, which in total are 566,258 ha including the forests in the Bale Mountains National Park or 480,910 ha without the park forests. The BMER presents very interesting physiographic attributes.

The eco-region is inhabited by about 1.6 million people (urban and rural combined) and it is estimated around 12 million people both in the eco-region and beyond within Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya directly and indirectly depend on several ecosystem services of the forests of the Bale eco-region. Particularly, rural people in the eco-region are directly dependent on the forest and other natural resources of the area.

Even though there is significant potential to improve the management of the eco-region to sustain and enhance conservation and the livelihoods of the local community and beyond, the eco-region is facing pressure that is growing over time. The pressure it is experiencing currently will challenge the long term sustainable conservation of this globally unique ecosystem and its biodiversity resources.

Hence, the BMERP has come into existence, which is under implementation since January 1, 2012 with a project lifetime of 20 years. This project was designed to support improved management of the eco-region and its biodiversity for multiple benefits that include climate, community and biodiversity outcomes. Accordingly, the project has been designed and being implemented in such a way that it leverages a range of social and economic benefits to the local community and thereby confronts the ongoing deforestation. Therefore, the designed project activities include:

1. Agricultural intensification and provision of economic alternatives to ensure the well-being of local communities;
2. Provision of alternative fuel wood and construction poles supply from newly established plantations on non-forest lands;
3. Forest Protection and Environmental Measures;

4. Strengthening enforcement of existing policies and law; and strengthening the young and weak local institutions and structures for managing forest lands.

With these activities, the BMERP has endeavored to improve government and community partnerships on the one hand and facilitate the development of community based local institution on the other to result in an improved forest ecosystem and landscape management in the Bale Eco-region (BER). Accordingly, 64⁶ local PFM cooperatives have been established and their capacities being strengthened.

The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Pilot Project Phase II, officially launched at the beginning of June 2017, with effective date of 1 July 2016, was designed with the objective of making Bale REDD+ project to continue becoming the knowledge hub for REDD+ best practices in the country. As a pilot project it applies reviewing and learning the potential and risks of including sustainable timber production into PFM-REDD+ implementation, further developing forest product enterprises and access to markets, continue building the capacity of CBOs and other stakeholders including law enforcement agencies, and strengthen the national REDD+ actors network (project doc. P.2). The project objectives include both local and national level activities with several project outcomes set to be achieved over the three years project life (project end date 30 June 2019).

1.2.2. REDD+ Joint Forest Management in five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project

The already phased-out project called Nono Selle REDD+ project was implemented in Nono Selle *Woreda*, one of the highly forested *woredas* of Ilu Abba Bora Zone in South-western Ethiopia. South-western Ethiopia forests are one of the two important biodiversity hotspot areas found in the country having immense floral and faunal diversity. However, with high population pressure and increasing demand for food and shelter, the biodiversity rich forests are under severe threats due to anthropogenic factors such as deforestation, conversion to agriculture and agriculture related investment fields. Thus, the project aimed to address the prevailing and other

⁶The exact number of PFM cooperatives might not be known because the recently formed cooperatives, sometimes two in one *kebele* as is the case in Buuraa Addeelle *Kebele* of Dodola *Woreda*, might not be updated regularly.

emerging challenges through enhancing sustainable forest resources management actions in the *woreda*.

The key objective of the project was to contribute to enhanced carbon storage in the natural forests of southwest Ethiopia, Nono Selle *Woreda*, Oromia. The project was implemented in close collaboration with the forest dependent communities, Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE) and government partners who are actively engaged in forest resources development and natural resources management in the area.

The experience gained from this project helped to scale up the on-going application of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) in neighboring forested areas, and also bolsters the so-called Joint Forest Management (JFM) - a practice recently evolved across Oromia's forest areas and promoted by OFWE, with the main intentions of increasing carbon storage in the natural forests and benefiting the forest dependent communities.

Accordingly, the recently emerging project, called "REDD+ Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone (Ale, Becho, Diddu, Halu and Nono-Selle), Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project", has come into effect since January 1, 2016 and has a 5-year lifetime (up to December 31st, 2020). The proposed project is being implemented in the five forested *woredas* and aims to address the prevailing and emerging challenges (e.g., deforestation and forest degradations due to anthropogenic factors such as expansion of coffee into forests, conversion to agriculture and agriculture related investment fields) through enhancing sustainable forest resources management actions.

The project is expected to benefit a total of 127,642 people (106,910 directly and 20,742 indirectly) within the intervention *woredas* and several more in downstream areas and across the globe. The main objective of the project is to implement sustainable REDD+ models that ensure forest dependent communities' rights and interests in the forests of south-west Ethiopia, particularly in Ale, Becho, Didu, Halu, and Nono-Selle *Woredas*. The project is being

implemented in close collaboration with the forest dependent communities, OFWE⁷, Cooperative Promotion Offices, and government partners who are actively engaged in forest resources development and natural resources management in the area. The project uses Joint Forest Management (JFM) approach as a vehicle for REDD+ implementations that will help to scale-up the on-going application of JFM linked REDD+ approach to neighboring forested *woredas*.

1.3. Rationale for Conducting Environmental and Social Review

As stated in the OFLP' PAD and ESMF, the OFLP has three components. *Component 1: Enabling Investments*, *Component 2: Enabling Environment*, and *Component 3: Emission Reduction (ER) payments for verified ERs as they are delivered over a long-term period*. Based on the nature of the program activities, OFLP is rated Category B. Generally, the Program will have positive environmental impacts through its activities stated under Components 1 and 2. However, some of the local-level activities under Component 1 may have limited adverse environmental risks; these activities could potentially include construction or rehabilitation of physical structures such as afforestation/reforestation, area closures, check dams, water harvesting structures, agricultural intensification (including small-scale irrigation that may necessitate applying agrochemicals such as pesticides), and access roads. Component 3 may have also adverse environmental and social impacts, specifically in relation to benefit sharing. Adverse environmental and social risks of these activities can be avoided or mitigated if proper mitigation measures are developed and implemented. Hence, the following safeguard policies have been already triggered by the OFLP: *Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)*, *Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)*, *Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09)*, *Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)*, *Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)*, *Indigenous Peoples/Underserved and Vulnerable peoples (OP/BP 4.10)*, *Forests (OP/BP 4.36)*, and *Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)*

Therefore, safeguards risks from activities under Components 1 and 3 can be avoided or mitigated using the OFLP safeguard instruments, including the ESMF, the SA, and SDP (as part

⁷ With the establishment of Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority (OEFCCA) in July 2016, most of the jurisdiction OFWE had over forests was transferred to the former, although the latter continues to be a key player in the sustainable use of forest resources in Oromia.

of the SESA). The ESMF includes measures for addressing broader environmental and social assessment procedures and impacts on natural habitats, forests, physical cultural resources, pest management, and safety of dams, in cases of small dam construction (less than 4.5 m). The ESMF will serve as a broader framework to guide how specific projects develop their own Environmental and Social Management Plans or environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA) before the commencement of activities. Furthermore, the ESMF includes standard methods and procedures along with appropriate institutional arrangements for screening and reviewing program activities and monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures to prevent adverse and cumulative impacts. Accordingly, the effective use of the ESMF, SESA, RPF and PF will be regularly reviewed and audited.

The OFLP, as Oromia's strategic programmatic umbrella and coordination platform for multi-sector, multi-partner interventions on all forested landscapes in Oromia, needs to ensure good coordination with existing ongoing REED+ projects and future initiatives, financed by multiple sources and implemented by various actors. The environmental and social review is therefore needed to ensure this coordination and alignment of the safeguards instruments. In this regard, this environmental and social review provides information on the status of two REDD+ projects safeguard requirements against the safeguard procedures and standards of the GoE and the World Bank as well as the UNFCCC safeguards principles. The environmental and social review focused on *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ project* which is under implementation in 16 *woredas*, and *Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone* which is being implemented in 5 *woredas*, that would be aligned with the OFLP to ensure consistency in how social and environmental sustainability approaches are applied following the GoE, and WB safeguard policies and procedures and UNFCCC safeguard principles.

1.4. Environmental and Social Management Requirements

The REDD+ projects subjected for this review are *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project* and *REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project* that are implemented since 2012 and 2013, respectively. In due course of time different standards such as Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), and Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) safeguard instruments were employed for project description, design, and implementation. (See Chapter six for the detail reviews of these

safeguard instruments). Concurrently these safeguard instruments have been guided by the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principle to engage the identified stakeholders of REDD+ projects, particularly the local community. Considering this situation the already functional environmental and social safeguards of these projects are reviewed on how it has been and will be harmonized with the umbrella (OFLP) program's SESA⁸, ESMF⁹, RPF¹⁰ and PF¹¹. More importantly, the review focused on how the existing environmental and social safeguards of these projects and activities comply with the GoE's environmental and social laws, the WB and UNFCCC safeguards requirements; and identify gaps and propose measures/action plans.

For one project setting out and fulfilling the environmental and social management requirements is a crucial step for sustainability of the project in general and the wellbeing of the community and environment in the project area. The environmental and social management requirements request for the selection, planning, design and implementation of ongoing REDD+ projects'

⁸Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) of the REDD+ Strategy is a critical requirement for the process and to guide decision making for a successful implementation of the REDD+ in a manner consistent with Ethiopia's environmental and social policies, laws and regulations and the World Bank's environmental and social safeguard policies. The SESA study was carried out with the aim of mainstreaming sustainable development principles into the REDD+ strategy options. (MEF the National REDD+ Secretariat and Oromia REDD+ Coordination Unit, 2015. *SESA For the Implementation of REDD+ in Ethiopia including the OROMIA Forested Landscape Program (OFLP) Social Assessment (SA)*. Addis Ababa. P. 1.)

⁹"Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP) has been prepared based on the national REDD+ safeguards instruments and other relevant national and Oromia regional environmental and social policies and legal frameworks. The purpose of the ESMF was is to provide guiding principles for assessment and management of environmental and social aspects of the program activities to be financed under the OFLP." (MEF (nd). *Oromia Forested Landscape Program Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)* (Revised Final Draft). <https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/Ethiopia%20ESMF.pdf>.p.1.)

¹⁰"For OFLP, the RPF will apply mainly to the implementation of subprojects under component one, financing investment in participatory forest management and reforestation in deforestation hotspots in sites to be selected, as well as extension services, and land-use planning state-wide at state and local levels. The RPF ensures that any possible adverse impacts of proposed project activities are addressed through appropriate mitigation measures, against potential impoverishment risks." (MEFCC and OEFCCA. *Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP) Resettlement Policy framework (RPF)*. Updated February 2017. p.9.)

¹¹Process Framework (PF) is "to outline the procedures and process for the NR in general and for OFLP on the ground of investment activities that may lead to restriction of access to natural resources, to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potentially adverse effects of such restrictions as per the OP/BP 4.12 requirements. The overall objective of the PF is to establish an enabling environment in which the Persons Affected by the Program (PAPs) will be able to participate in mitigating against these negative impacts. It includes the PAPs own input on program activities (e.g. habitat restoration, reforestation and the design of necessary measures to reduce social impacts caused by the limitation in access and setting up process and monitoring plans as needed." MEFCC and OEFCCA. *Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP) (OFLP) Process Framework (PF)*. Updated February 2017. P.2.

activities/initiatives. The requirements have to be consistent with the relevant national environmental and social management requirements, with the World Bank safeguards policies and UNFCCC safeguard principles applicable to the projects. In line with this, in each case, national, regional, *woreda* and local institutions to be involved in screening, reviewing and approving projects and/or projects' activities are identified, and they will carry out their respective roles and responsibilities. The responsibilities of these institutions may also include identification of projects/ projects' activity, implementing proper safeguard tools (screening for environmental and social risk/impact and review) for ensuring compliance to obligatory requirements under laws and regulations, issuing approvals for undertaking a project, supervision, monitoring and reporting of the implementation of the ESMF.

Moreover, as a social safeguard strategy, free, prior and informed consultation has been conducted in the project areas. During the process the nature of the project, locality that will be affected, the likely benefit of the project, the benefit sharing modalities were discussed and negotiated with the community.

2. Objectives, Methodology and Methods of the ESR

2.1. General Objective

The general objective was to assess the overall social and environmental impacts (existing and potential) of ongoing REDD+ initiatives that will be aligned with the umbrella of OFLP, analyze and document the process used by initiatives in addressing environmental and social risks as it relates to the GoE's environmental and social laws, the WB and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) safeguards requirements; and identify gaps and propose measures/action plans that will enable these projects comply with the relevant GoE laws and World Bank safeguard requirements. Accordingly, the following specific objectives and detailed tasks were articulated for two REDD+ projects.

2.2. Specific Objectives

- i. Review the environmental and social safeguards implementation in the ongoing Bale Mountains Eco-region and REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project as per the safeguard requirements of the GoE, the World Bank, and UNFCCC;
- ii. Assess specifically, how land acquisition, restriction of access and use of natural resources and related issues have been addressed by these operations;
- iii. Assess whether activities to improve livelihood and increase agricultural production were/are being done without adverse impacts to the environment and communities;
- iv. Assess the overall institutional arrangement and capacities of the implementing agencies to implement environment and social safeguard activities as required by the WB;
- v. Identify relevant lessons that can be applied for the OFLP; and
- vi. Identify any gaps in safeguards implementation and propose appropriate corrective activities;
- vii. Provide reliable information on environmental and social risk planning and management, gaps, and lessons.

Furthermore, due attention was given to the following tasks as part of the overall assessment.

1. Assess whether benefit sharing was negotiated or not? If yes, describe and see reflections on how to manage expectations and assess the level of expectations;
2. Assess whether functional grievance redress mechanism exists or not? If yes, describe the process and procedures;
3. Assess the level of consultation in the design and implementation of the ongoing projects;
4. Assess the overall modalities and context of the planned resettlement in Bale Mountains National Park;
5. Assess the situation of the ongoing unrest in Oromia Region vis-à-vis these ongoing REDD+ projects and on how these projects be impacted, and;
6. Assess the risk that could be emanated from provision of land for investors near the projects area.

2.3. Methodology

This review assessed the overall social and environmental impacts of the ongoing *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project* and Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone in Oromia Regional State in light of the environmental and social laws of the GoE, the WB and UNFCCC safeguards requirements and eventually proposes measures that will enable these projects to comply with the relevant laws and safeguard requirements that the OFLP has subscribed.

The first project covers *11 woredas* in Bale and West Arsi Zones, while the latter covers *5 woredas* in Ilu Abba Bora Zone. The two projects differ not only in their ecosystems and the number of the *woredas* they cover, but also in their life spans. The latter also differs from the former in one other aspect, i.e., out of the five *woredas*, only Nono Selle *Woreda* was operational during the whole project life. This means, the other four *woredas* are at the initial phase of their inclusion into the project, with activities focused so far only on awareness raising.

Accordingly, the number of *woredas* included in this ESR as fair representatives of the whole *woredas* needed to reflect these variations. Moreover, information about these projects was also available from secondary sources, namely project design documents, mid-term and end-term reports, review reports, etc. Finally, the time allocated, particularly the field visit period of three weeks, necessitated being selective and limited the *woredas* to be visited to a reasonably manageable size.

Considering the above, seven *woredas* (*five* from the BMER project and *two* from the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project) were selected for the field visit to gather relevant primary and secondary data for the ESR. The focus of this study is clearly spelt out in the ToR and listed below as **key issues** that guide the review and identify the data collection methods. These are:

1. *Social, environmental and demographic characteristics;*
2. *Legal and policy framework review;*
3. *Environment and social impacts and risks of the ongoing REDD+ Project initiatives;*
4. *Community consultation and participation;*
5. *Institutional arrangement and gaps¹²;*
6. *Benefit sharing and grievance redress mechanisms;*
7. *Lessons learned; and*
8. *Recommendation and mitigation measures for corrective activities.*

A combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was used for this ESR and both primary and secondary data sources were consulted. Social, environmental and demographic characteristics of the communities, legal and policy frameworks, partly data on environmental and social impacts and risks of the projects and institutional capacity can be drawn from secondary sources. Impacts of the project activities (environmental and social) on the local

¹²There is clearly a gap in the capacity of OFWE and the communities to increase productivity and improve return from PFM forests. Likewise, further support to CBOs to strengthen their voice at higher levels, e.g. through forming more Unions and even higher level community organizations would be important to help ensure the communities have the strength of voice to protect their rights in PFM and REDD+ (Temesgen, et al, p. 10). OFWE did admit their limited capacity to support communities in sustainable forest management practices in natural forests and associated enterprise development.

communities and different groups within the community such as women, youth, and the underserved, the level of community participation in the project planning and implementation and their role in mitigating the risks, and what should be done in the future to make the projects beneficial to the community and sustainable both socially and environmentally were gathered through qualitative research approach.

As indicated above, the *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+* project, which is bigger and of longer life span, was represented by more *woredas and kebeles* as compared to the *REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project*. Relative to the number of *woredas*, representative *kebeles* and communities were selected to gather pertinent primary data. The following criteria have been set to select the *woredas and kebeles* that were assessed as sample sites out of the total *11 woredas* in *Bale Mountain Eco-region REDD+* project and *five woredas* in *REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project*.

- a. Representativeness of the ecological and agro-ecological zones;
- b. Presence of rural infrastructure and agricultural intensification activities of the project;
- c. Representativeness in terms of economic status, with a focus on the underserved peoples and vulnerable groups;
- d. Representativeness in terms of dependence on forest resources as main livelihood strategies;
- e. Accessibility of the project sites; and
- f. Projects activities/initiatives implementation period (where possible a combination of old and new initiatives).

Accordingly, for *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+* project, five *woredas* and two *kebeles* in each *woreda* were selected. Sample *woredas* of this project covers two ecological Zones: *Southern part*, the Moist Evergreen Montane Forest; and *North part*, the Dry Evergreen Montane Forest. Regarding the *REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project*, 2 *woredas*, namely, Nono Selle *Woreda* and Becho *Woreda* (two *kebeles* each), the former with REDD+ initiatives since 2013 and the latter, in which the initiatives started only in 2016 were selected. The sample *woredas* and *kebeles* offer a wide range of REDD+ initiative experience, namely the BMER REDD+ initiative *kebeles* having several years of experience as opposed to the new entrant *kebeles* of Becho

woreda to obtain a balanced view of the project. The final lists of *kebeles* selected for the ESR were agreed upon at the Inception workshop held on November 04, 2016 at the WB Ethiopia country Office. See the table below for the summary.

Table 1: Total number of woredas and kebeles selected in these two REDD+ projects

<i>Project</i>	<i>Woreda</i>	<i>Kebele</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ project</i>	1. Dallo Manna	1. Chirri 2. Waabaro 3. Burqitu	<i>Southern part, moist forest</i>
	2. Harena Buluq	1. Shawe 2. Soduwelmal	
	3. Goba	1. Wajitushabe	<i>Northern part, dry forest</i>
	4. Dodola	1. Buura Addeelle 2. Barisa 3. Deneba	
	5. Nansabo	1. Gerembamo	
<i>REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project</i>	1. Nono Selle	1. Gemechisa 2. Kupi	<i>Old, operation since 2013</i>
	2. Becho	1. Gemechisa 2. Gorbi	<i>New, started in 2016</i>
Total	7	14	

The table below gives a brief profile of the Participatory Forest Management Cooperatives in the sample *kebeles*. *The detail woreda and kebele profiles are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B of this report.*

Table II: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample woredas and kebeles

<i>Woreda</i>	<i>Kebele/ Cooperative</i>	<i>Number of HHs</i>		<i>No. of Cooperatives</i>	<i>No. of Blocs</i>	<i>Forest coverage (ha)</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>			
<i>Dallo Manna</i>	Chirri	1600	380	1	4	4744
	Waabaro	683	117	1	4	5966
	Burqitu	252	64	1	4	1874
<i>HarannaBuluq</i>	Shawe	716	460	1	5	5250
	Sodduwalmal	587	51	1	4	5014
<i>Goba</i>	Wajitushabe	270	17	1	3	1599
<i>Dodola</i>	BuuraaAddeelle	424	132	2	22	9578

	Barisa	137	21	1	6	2645
	Deneba	238	65	1	11	4141
<i>Nansabo</i>	Garambamo	560	120	1	3	12145
<i>NonoSelle</i>	Gemechisa	214	20	1	3	6250
	Kupi	243	13	1	3	13862
<i>Becho</i>	Gemechisa	467	70	1	3	INA
	Gorbi	222	26	1	3	INA
Total		6613 (81%)	1556 (19%)			

2.4. Methods of data collection

Secondary data

Since several studies and assessments have previously been made on these projects, the review had to start from the project documents and compare the projects' activities with the project design documents and against the legal and policy framework, desk review was also one of the major data collection tools (*see Annex I:2*). Based on the analysis of the information and data available in the existing literature and legal and policy framework documents, the gap in information was filled from field data collected from selected *woredas* of the two projects.

Secondary data pertinent to the assignments (global, national, regional and local), which included but not limited to the followings were reviewed, and analyzed.

Policy, Legal Frameworks and other Relevant Documents Review

The following policy, legal frameworks and other relevant documents were reviewed.

1. Constitution of The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (Proclamation No. 1/1995)
2. Environmental Policy of Ethiopia (EPE, 1997)
3. Forest development, conservation and utilization policy and strategy (April, 2007)
4. Forest development, conservation and utilization (Proclamation No 542/2007)
5. National Energy Policy of Ethiopia (2006)

6. Development, conservation and utilization of wildlife (Proclamation No 541/2007)
7. Environmental Impact Assessment (Proclamation No. 299/2002)
8. Legislation on Expropriation of Landholdings for Public Purposes and Payment of
9. Compensation (Proclamation No 455/2005)
10. National Social Protection Policy, 2014
11. The Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation No. 456/2005
12. Regulations on land Expropriated and payment of Compensation (Reg. No. 135/2007)
13. The Rural Development Policy and Strategy (2001)
14. Sustainable Land Management and Productive Safety Net Program
15. Ethiopian Water Resources Management Policy (1999)
16. Access to Genetic Resources and Community Knowledge, and Community Rights(Proclamation No. 482 /2006)

Relevant natural resources related document reviewed

1. Ethiopia's Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE, 2011)
2. REDD+ Readiness preparation proposal (R-PP) (2011)
3. Draft National REDD+ Strategy (2015)
4. SESA for the Implementation of REDD+ in Ethiopia 2015
5. Process Framework(PF) for OFLP, October, 2015
6. OFLP RPF. Updated February 2017.
7. *OFLPESMF* (Revised Final Draft).

World Bank Safeguard Policies reviewed

1. Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)
2. Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)
3. Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09)
4. Indigenous/underserved People (OP/BP 4.10)
5. Physical and Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)
6. Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)
7. Forests (OP/BP 4.36)
8. Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)

International Legal Frameworks

1. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
2. United Nations Framework Conventions on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

Primary data

The primary data collection methods included community consultation, semi-structured interviews, key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGDs) with forest dependent community members and underserved people, and observation. Except key informant interviews, which involved experts in the head offices of the two projects in Addis Ababa, these data collection methods involved field visits to ‘*Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project*’ in Bale and West Arsi Zones and to ‘*REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project*’ in Illu Abba Bora Zone as these created the opportunity to observe what is going on (see Annex III) , how do the people see these projects and conduct wider community consultation(see Annex II) and taking photos as illustrative examples of data generated from other sources.

Field Visits

Following the review of the existing literature and gap analysis, the identification and selection of sample *woredas* constituted the first step in the ‘*environmental and social review*’. Within the sampled *woreda*, the fieldwork focused on *kebeles* with one PFM cooperative each. Regarding selection of *kebeles*, care was taken to include samples that reflect most of the typical as well as the critical social features (women, youth, female headed households, poor households and other vulnerable groups) of the *woreda* in light of the environmental and social review of the two projects. Local communities with a range of experience related to the project were selected. It is also important to note that the ‘Review’ study consulted with both beneficiaries *and* non-beneficiaries (i.e. the broad community). Field visits were conducted in two rounds, i.e., December 17-15, 2016 in the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project and January 22 – February 03, 2017 in BMERP.

2.5. Data Collection Tools

Community consultation and field observation guides, and focus group discussion and interview checklists were prepared and used to collect relevant information and also to handle the discussion process easily (*see Annex II, III and V*). As deemed necessary photo camera was used to capture information intact and easily available whenever needed to integrate it during the analysis and as illustrative examples during the report writing.

Community consultation guides (with a focus on key issues identified), focus group discussion and key-informant interview checklists were prepared on the minimum set of topics selected to be covered during the field visits. Attempts were made to make sure that different community members, namely traditional leaders, women, youth, female-headed households, the poor and other underserved, are represented and their views both on their experiences with the implementation of the project activities and potential risks and the way forward were thoroughly recorded.

Interviews and community consultations were conducted, which are expected to portray the diverse perspectives of a range of people. For all practical purposes, *Afaan Oromo* is the vernacular among the local communities in the two project areas and it was used during community consultations. Nevertheless, there were people who preferred Amharic to *Afaan Oromo* to better express themselves and they did so.

Informed community consultation is the process in which free and prior consultation is sought from the community and the purpose is to measure whether there was broad community support for the projects in their respective *kebeles*. The consultation process also focused on exploring the social and environmental impacts of project activities in addition to the broad issues outlined in the above *Key Issues* section. It also identified needs of certain groups for which specific questions were asked regarding appropriate interventions required to improve the social outcomes of future project activities.

Women-only focus-group discussions and key informant interviews were organized to understand women's level of acceptance of the project activities and their specific impacts on

women, since they are traditionally excluded in many areas. The review details the advice that communities provide to improve or change how some aspects of the project activities are implemented and how future project design features benefit from this exercise.

Community consultations have been carried out in all selected study sites. In 14 *kebeles*, a total of 580-600¹³ (See Annex VI for the attendance sheet) people participated in the consultations and, depending on the social context of the consultation area, participants had been drawn from people of all walks of life (different ethnic groups, clans, social statuses, religious groups, gender, age groups, and educational groups).

The report has also benefitted from comments of various people representing different stakeholder organizations who participated in the Inception workshop (Nov. 04, 2016), OFLP Technical Working Session workshop (February 13-14, 2017) and the ESR Stakeholders Validation workshop (June 22, 2017). Moreover, comments from the ESR Task Team both on the first and revised drafts of the report have immensely helped in the revision of the final report to the required level. The major issues raised for further articulation and clarification during the validation workshop include, among others, action plans with clear identification of responsible body, timeline and budget, whether the UNFCCC safeguards principles, World Bank safeguard requirements, and relevant environmental and social guidelines, regulations and policy documents of the GoE are complied with, the need to differentiate between REDD+ and non-REDD+ projects induced impacts, and identification of gaps in the use of safeguards instruments differentiated at procedural and operations levels.

2.6. Methods of Data Analysis

Data obtained from both the primary and secondary sources were thematically organized and analysed. Data gathered from field observation, and pictures captured during the field observation of the sub-projects were integrated as a supporting evidence.

¹³ The list annexed to this report contains 536 people from 13 *kebeles*, but the attendance sheet containing the list of 55-60 people who participated in the community consultation in Wajitushabe *Kebele* of Goba *Woreda* is not included here as it was misplaced in route.

Data obtained from documentation and desk review were presented in tabular or figurative form. Description of patterns and trends supported by relevant tables and illustrations were also carried on.

2.7. Ethical Issues

Ethical issues are the pillars of any research that involves human beings. Although the stakeholders of any research include research participants, researchers, and funding institutions, the former become more vulnerable to harm in this exercise. Therefore, the primary duty of the researchers is to protect informants from any threatening conditions and this is realized when researchers abide by the general ethical principles applied in social science research. Informed consent, confidentiality and trust are the most important ethical principles that guided this study.

3. REDD+ Projects: Activities, Processes and Operations

This environmental and social review focused on *Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ project* which is under implementation in 11 *woredas*, and REJFMA-SW Ethiopia Phase II project which is being implemented in the *five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II*, that would be aligned with the OFLP so as to ensure consistency in how social and environmental sustainability approaches have been applied following the GoE and WB safeguard policies and the already prepared OFLP safeguard instruments.

More importantly, this environmental and social review was conducted to provide information on the status of the safeguard requirements of the two ongoing REDD+ projects against the safeguard procedures and standards of GoE, and the World Bank as well as the UNFCCC safeguards principles. Accordingly, this ESR has been undertaken in two approaches. The first approach deals with those *ongoing REDD+ projects'* related activities and operations, while the second approach deals with *Non-REDD+ investment* induced impacts (e.g. Government infrastructure development initiatives and NGOs initiatives/activities on basic infrastructure development and livelihood improvement interventions) in these two REDD+ project areas.

3.1. Project based activities of the two REDD+ Projects:

BMER project is at an advanced stage than any other pilots that the country has been implementing to realize the REDD+ readiness at regional and country level. The objective of the BMERP is to prevent high rate of deforestation and achieve a net anthropogenic GHG emission reduction, which is estimated (ex-ante) 44,687,543 tCO₂e. With the buffer for risk of 15%, equivalent of buffer credit of 6,703,131 tCO₂e estimated for the project, the net ex-ante anthropogenic GHG emission reduction under the project scenario was 37,984,412 tCO₂e. (Source: BMER project)

Hence the project was designed to support improved management of the eco-region and its biodiversity for multiple benefits that include climate, community and biodiversity outcomes. Concurrently, the project has been implemented in such a way that it leverages a range of social and economic benefits to the local community and thereby confronts the ongoing deforestation. In line with this, the project was planned to implement, the following activities in the first and second phases of the project, respectively:

BMER project- Phase One

1. Agricultural intensification and provision of economic alternatives to ensure the well-being of local communities;
2. support communities business plans (coffee quality improvement, honey production, village lending and saving association)
3. Provision of alternative fuel wood and construction poles supply from newly established plantations on non-forest lands;
4. Forest protection and environmental measures;
5. Strengthening enforcement of existing policies and law; and
6. Strengthening the young and weak local institutions and structures for managing forest lands.

BMER REDD+ Pilot Project- Phase Two

The second phase of this project has been launched after the ESR team has finalized its fieldwork and during a draft report writing period. It was believed to address some issues of the first phase

of this project. Accordingly, some pertinent proposed outputs (1 and 4 among a total of 4 outputs) and activities of the second phase of this project are listed as follows:

Output 1: Develop OCAT Version 2 software and assess forest CBOs capacity

1. Introducing and demonstrating energy efficient technologies;
2. Identifying suitable place for biogas;
3. Constructing 10 biogas plants;
4. Purchasing and distribution 500 fuel efficient stoves; are some among others

Output 4: Explore the potential and risk of including sustainable timber harvest into PFM-REDD+

1. Piloting timber harvesting
2. Assessing potential risk of timber inclusion into PFM-REDD+
3. Exploring certification scheme as a strategy to mitigate risk of timber inclusion into PFM-REDD+ based forest management
4. Developing timber harvesting guideline
5. Training CBOs on sustainable timber production

The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia Phase II project was designed to demonstrate how cost-effective carbon storage through avoided deforestation can be achieved in a mutually inclusive way with objectives related to sustainable development and poverty reduction of forest dependent peoples (FDP). The main objective of the project is to implement sustainable REDD+ models that ensure forest dependent communities' rights and interests in the forests of south-west Ethiopia. The project follows the Joint Forest Management (JFM) approach as a vehicle for REDD+ implementations that will help to scale-up the on-going application of JFM linked REDD+ approach to neighboring forested *woredas*.

Accordingly, the project has articulated the following specific outcomes that will contribute towards the realization of the project's overall objectives:

1. JFM user groups manage an increased area of forested landscape;
2. Local governance structures use community-based institutional systems for REDD+;
3. Forest dependent communities have increased income from forest products; and

4. Forest dependent communities' contribution to reduced deforestation and forest degradation is recognized by national REDD+ authorities.

Based on the projects' objectives, various activities have been conducted at the project levels to realize the objectives stated by these two REDD+ initiatives. Activities that have been undertaken by these two projects are the following, among others:

A. BMER project:

1. Organizing and legalizing the PFM groups;
2. Awareness raising activities for the established PFMs;
3. Providing technical support;
4. Provision of tools and equipment that help quality production of forest coffee and other NTFP products, for e.g., provision of Wire mesh for quality forest coffee processing;
5. Undertaking standard baseline assessment (**measuring**) of the carbon stock of the BMER forested landscape area and then undertake **reporting** for internationally accepted **verification** of the BMER Landscape area's carbon stock by designing and implementing the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project that met VCS + CCBA standards; and
6. Provision of field equipment for forest management and monitoring activities.
7. Support communities' business plans (coffee quality improvement, honey production, village lending and saving association).

B. REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project:

1. Organizing and legalizing the PFM groups, especially in Nono Selle *Woreda* (where the project started its first phase with the objective of organizing community members as NTFP).
2. For newly established PFM groups such as those in Becho *Woreda* the establishment of PFM blocs using PFM guidelines are underway. In this process, some major activities including awareness raising, forest boundary demarcation and membership registration with a vision of legal registration of the associations are being accomplished. In the forest boundary demarcation process, all relevant stakeholders including *woreda* level experts,

Development Agents, *kebele* administrators and selected community facilitators such as clan leaders and highly forest dependent groups have been involved.

3. Providing technical support and delivering awareness raising activities as deemed necessary for the already established PFM.
4. Processing MRV of the carbon stock of the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia Phase II project Forested Landscape area.
5. Seed money support for women group.
6. Construction of concrete field for coffee drier and coffee store; and
7. Construction of stores for honey producers.

3.2. *Non-REDD+ (GOV, NGOs, and Community-based) initiatives in the two REDD+ project areas*

3.2.1. GoE, NGOs and other investment project activities

As it has been known, these ongoing REDD+ projects are being implemented in the rural areas of the country where there is high demand for infrastructures such as rural road, electric power; schools, clinics, and irrigation schemes, among others. The intervention of the government (*woredas* and/or Region) in constructing these infrastructures for these rural landscapes is inevitable. Such infrastructural developments have been observed in most of these forested landscape areas where this ESR has covered.

For instance, during the ESR fieldwork the team was told that a big road project (103kms) connecting Adaba and Angetu¹⁴ (the capital of Harana Buluq *Woreda*) and traversing the virgin forest in BMER project and the BMNP areas was under construction. The Adaba – Dodola OFWE staff based in Dodola was complaining that the road project is devastating huge area of virgin forest land and his office had already filed formal complaints to ERA. He shared his concerns with the ESR team and the effort he has made to ensure the road construction project

¹⁴Regarding the 103km connecting Adaba and Angetu road, the Ethiopian Roads Authority has used the country system to prepare the required safeguard instruments, including the ESIA and the RAP; and the project is under implementation, not yet finalized.

does not further damage this virgin ecosystem. Recorded video, photos and an official letter that explains the concern of the office and calls upon all key actors (from *woreda* to regional levels) to act on this issue were shown to the ESR team.¹⁵

Although such projects are not initiated by the REDD+ projects, the activities that emanate from projects initiated by GoE and/or NGOs will have significant impact in these forested landscapes. Furthermore, such Non-REDD+ projects/activities could confront the overall objective of these two REDD+ projects unless proper environmental and social safeguards are used for such Non-REDD+ projects.

3.2.2. Community-based initiatives/activities

Irrespective of agro-ecological differences, advancement, and difference in structures of the associations of the forest community/inhabitants, i.e., structural arrangement being either PFM or *WAJIB*, similar activities and initiatives are being implemented in all sampled ongoing REDD+ initiatives' (projects') *woredas*', *kebeles*' and their respective community based forest management blocs (PFMs/JFMs/*WAJIBs*). Accordingly, at community or individual level the following activities or interventions in the forest area have been carried out.

1. Since these ongoing REDD+ projects are in the rural areas of the country, mixed farming system (crop production and animal rearing) is common in the *qebeles* covered by these two REDD+ projects. Major crops produced in these landscapes include maize, sorghum, *teff*, barely, chick pea, and sesame.
2. Forest coffee collection and forest honey production are the other two major sources of livelihood support.
3. Dry season free grazing inside forest area is also one of the major activities for livestock production.
4. A growing tendency and practice of planting exotic and fast growing tree species (e.g., eucalyptus tree), for domestic use and sale inside their plots has been increased and observed.
5. Fuel wood collection for their own consumption and sale has been widely reported;
6. Controlled construction wood collection for domestic use of the members of the forest groups.

¹⁵At that time, he promised to share the documents with the ESR team, but later declined to do so.

4. National Environmental and Social Legislative and Regulatory Frameworks, and the WB Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies

4.1. Policy Framework

The 1995 Ethiopian constitution is the supreme law of the land that has laid out the foundations for Ethiopia's commitment to ensure sustainable development, environmental and social safety. As a result, Ethiopia has given due attention to protect the environment and natural resources by ratifying international agreements and preparing national legal frameworks pertinent to environment and natural resources protection.

The Constitution recalled that the social, environmental, economic and public health related issues be considered in all development projects and programs. Hence, relevant policies and laws at various government levels have been drafted and issued. The summary of the legal, policy and institutional frameworks, including international conventions relevant to the REDD+ and the OFLP, is presented in the sections that follow.

4.1.1 Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

As the supreme law of the country, the provisions of the Constitution must be complied with by all other policies, regulations and institutional frameworks. The Constitution of the FDRE (Proclamation No. 1/1995) is the foundation for human rights, and natural resources and environmental management. The concepts of sustainable development and environmental rights are enshrined in the Constitution through articles 43 and 44, which states, among others, the right to development and the right to live in clean and healthy environment. Other constitutional articles related to fundamental environmental, social, and development rights are stated as follows:

1. Article 44(2) states that all persons who have been displaced, or whose livelihood has been adversely affected because of state programs have the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation including relocation with adequate state assistance.

2. Article 43 (2) dealing with the rights to development states that nationals have the right to participate in national development and, to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community.
3. Article 89 (5&6) states the economic objectives in such a way that the Government has the duty to hold, on behalf of the people, land and other natural resources and to deploy them for their common benefits and development. Government shall all the time promote the participation of the people in the formulation of national development policies and programs; it shall also have the duty to support the initiatives of the people in their development endeavors.
4. Article 92 states that the design and implementation of any program and development projects shall not damage or destroy the environment, and people have the right to be fully consulted and express their views in planning and implementation of environmental policies and project.

4.1.2. Environmental Policy of Ethiopia

The goal of the umbrella Environmental Policy of Ethiopia (EPE, April 1997) is to improve and enhance the health and quality of life of all Ethiopians and promote sustainable social and economic development through sound management and use of natural, human-made and cultural resources and their environment as a whole, to meet the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This umbrella policy consists guiding principles and various sectoral and cross-sectoral policies for sustainable environmental management.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) policies are included in the cross-sectoral environmental policies. The EIA policy emphasizes the early recognition of environmental issues in project planning at all levels of administration.

The policy establishes the Federal Environmental Protection Authority (nowadays Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority) federal and regional organs, respectively, to harmonize sectoral development plans and implement environmental management programs for the country and the Oromia Regional State, respectively.

Based on the principal features of this policy, the two ongoing REDD+ initiative projects proposed to be aligned with the Oromia umbrella REDD+ program called “Oromia Forested Landscape Program” (OFLP) have been subjected for Environmental and Social Review (ESR). The main purpose of the review was to verify how these projects comply with the national environmental and social legal frameworks and the WB operational policies. Moreover, to look for possible options and means to harmonize the OFLP proposed activities with these ongoing REDD+ projects initiative and safeguards requirements. Hence, this policy framework has given a platform for sustainable development by focusing on social, economic and environmental issues raised as a result of this proposed OFLP project.

4.1.3. National and Regional Conservation Strategy

The Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia (CSE, 1996) provides a strategic framework for integrating environment into new and existing policies, programs and projects. It is also an important policy document, which views environmental management as an important component of development. It recognizes the importance of incorporating environmental factors into development activities from the outset.

The major environmental and natural resources management issues facing Ethiopia are well documented in the CSE. The CSE sets out detailed strategies and action plans as well as the institutional arrangements required for the implementation of sectoral as well as cross-sectoral interventions for the management of Ethiopia’s natural, man-made and cultural resources. The most important areas that are addressed by the CSE include the following:

1. Management of forest and woodland resources.
2. Land resource use policy and strategies; physical land use planning.
3. Integration of social, cultural and gender issues in sustainable resources and environmental management.
4. Promotion of participation in sustainable development of natural, artificial and cultural resources, and environmental protection.
5. Development of environmental education, public awareness and human resources.

4.1.4. Forest Conservation and Utilization Policy and Strategy, 2007

The main objective of the policy and strategy is improving the economic contribution of the forest sector and meeting the communities' demands for forest products. Moreover, the policy envisages enhancing the forest sector economic contribution by promoting the engagement of the private sector and farmers. The policy substantiates the need to certifying forest use right which is an important provision to enhance the engagement of farmers, communities and the private sector. The policy also provides statements on the support that should be provided to create market opportunities for forest products. The policy statements are comprehensive enough to promote participatory forest management schemes by engaging the local people; issuance of forest ownership certificates for individuals, associations (e.g. forest use groups) and private investors. This policy and strategy document can be utilized for the implementation of REDD+ as it provides for: possibilities of income generation from forests for the communities; and the establishment of participatory forest management schemes by engaging the local people.

4.1.5 National Energy Policy

This policy is intended to enhance and foster “Agricultural Development Led Industrialization (ADLI)” strategy and is consistent with sector policies. In addition to this, it provides the necessary support and incentives for the participation of the private sector and community, particularly women in the development of energy.

This policy has come into effect with the following general objectives:

1. To ensure a reliable supply of energy at the right time and at affordable prices, particularly to support the country's agricultural and industrial development strategies adopted by the government;
2. To ensure and encourage a gradual shift from traditional energy sources use to modern energy sources;
3. To stream-line and remove bottlenecks encountered in the development and utilization of energy resources and to give priority to the development of indigenous energy resources with a goal toward attaining self-sufficiency;

4. To set general guidelines and strategies for the development and supply of energy resources;
5. To increase energy utilization efficiency and reduce energy wastage; and,
6. To ensure that the development and utilization of energy is benign to the environment.

Based on the general objectives, the policy has stipulated and set energy sector policy priorities:

1. To place high priority on hydro-power resource development, as hydrological resources are Ethiopia's most abundant and sustainable energy forms;
2. To take appropriate policy measures to achieve a gradual transition from traditional energy fuels to modern fuels;
3. To set, issue and publicize standards and codes which will ensure that energy is used efficiently and properly;
4. To develop human resources and establish competent energy institutions;
5. To provide the private sector with necessary support and incentives to participate in the development of the country's energy resources; and
6. To pay due and close attention to ecological and environmental issues during the development of energy projects.

The policy document has also identified main policy issues, including, among others, energy resource development, energy supply, energy conservation, and efficiency. Furthermore, comprehensive policy measures were also addressed as main policy issues. The policy measures try to cover and address the following: energy and environment, energy science and technology, manpower development and energy education, and energy institutional issues.

The policy issues referred in the policy document have direct linkage with the proposed project by providing pertinent issues to be considered during the whole project cycle. In line with this the Government will ensure that the development of energy projects, energy generation, transmission and use is benign to the environment.

4.1.6 National Health Policy

Despite the improvement over the last decade, Ethiopia still has a low level of health coverage even in comparison with other Sub-Saharan African countries. This is largely related to low levels of income and widespread poverty, low levels of education, nutritional deficiencies, poor environmental conditions, and inadequate access to health services. The government has, therefore, assigned a very high priority to significantly improving health care and, in 1998, issued a health policy based on the following main principles:

1. Promotion of disease preventive components;
2. Ensuring accessibility to health care for the whole population;
3. Development of appropriate capacity based on needs assessment;
4. Promotion of private sector and NGO participation in the provision of health care;
5. Promotion and strengthening of inter-sectoral activities through a national self-reliance program; and
6. Democratization and decentralization of the health care system.

Health Sector Development Plans and Strategies have been designed to implement the stated health principles within a defined period. The strategies include raising the awareness of personal and environmental health care and sanitation through information, education and communication (IEC); control of disease; and promotion of primary health care through community participation.

4.1.7 Land Tenure Policy

The Constitution of the FDRE (1995) states that the right to ownership of rural and urban land, as well as natural resources, is exclusively vested in the State and People of Ethiopia. Article 40 of the Constitution indicates that land is a common property of the Nations, Nationalities and the People of Ethiopia, and shall not be subjected to sale or to other means of transfer or exchange.

The Constitution retained land under the control of the people and government of Ethiopia thus, prohibiting its buying and selling. Also, article 4(5) of the Proclamation 94/1994 deals with

provision of land for the conservation, development and utilization of state forests or protected areas. However, this can be effective only after the consultation and consent of the peasantry and subject to the assurance of their benefits.

In general, all legal provisions cited above, make rural and urban lands the property of the People and Government of Ethiopia, and buying and selling of land is prohibited but leasing rights is allowed. Moreover, it is the right for existing land user to be compensated fully and satisfactorily if land is expropriated by the state.

The Land Policy of Ethiopia strongly supports that project plans must include attractive and sustainable resettlement strategies to the people who are going to be displaced as a result of the development plan, and they have to be fully convinced, compensated and have to participate in all phases of the project implementation. Hence this policy has laid a foundation in building trust among the people who are involved in this development endeavor. Consequently, for effective implementation of the policy intent, the FDRE has proclaimed the expropriation of landholdings for public purposes and payment of compensation (proclamation No. 455/2005), and Regulation on Payment of Compensation for Properties Situated on Landholdings Expropriated for Public Purposes (Regulation No.135/2007).

4.1.8 National Biodiversity Policy

The National Biodiversity Policy (NBP) was established in 1998 based on a holistic ecosystem approach to conserve, develop and utilize the country's biodiversity resources. The policy provides for guidance towards effective conservation, rational development and sustainable utilization of the country's biodiversity, and contains comprehensive policy provisions for the conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity. Integration of biodiversity conservation and development in federal and regional sectoral development initiatives, and mobilization of international cooperation and assistance, have been identified as the principal strategies for implementation of the policy.

This policy framework provides direction and regulatory tools on overall conservation and sustainable development of the country. In line with this, the proposed project will have and be expected to support the conservation of nature including the forest resource as has been required.

4.1.9 National Policy for Women

The national Policy for the Ethiopian Women was issued in March 1993. In this policy it is indicated that government policies, laws, regulations, plans, programs and projects should be based on the following objectives:

1. To ensure participation of women in the formulation of government policies, laws, regulations, programs and projects that directly or indirectly benefit and concerns women;
2. To insure participation and involvement of women in implementation and decision-making processes; and
3. To ensure equal access of men and women to the country's resources.

4.2. Legislative Framework

4.2.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (Proclamation No, 299/2002)

The FDRE proclamation No. 691/2010 amended the definition of powers and duties of the executive organs, among which was included the transfer of powers and duties of the previous Federal Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) (that was re-established by proclamation 295/2002) to the newly established Ministry, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and climate Change (MEFCC). Accordingly, all the responsibilities of the former EPA under proclamation 299/2002 have been transferred to the newly established MEFCC.

Proclamation no. 299/2002 aimed primarily at making the EIA mandatory for categories of projects specified under a directive issued by the MEFCC. Among the powers and duties of MEFCC with regard to EIA are included: to establish a system for environmental impact assessment of public and private projects, as well as social and economic development policies, strategies, laws and programs, and to establish a system for the evaluation of environmental impact assessment of investment projects submitted by their respective proponents to the

concerned sectoral licensing organ or the concerned regional organ prior to granting a permission for their implementation in accordance with the environmental impact assessment proclamation.

Apparently, Proclamation no. 299/2002 specifies projects and activities that will require an environmental impact assessment (EIA). The proponent of the project must prepare the EIA following the format specified in the legislation. The MEFCC or the relevant regional environmental agency will then review the EIA and either approve the project (with or without conditions) or reject it. The Proclamation requires, among other things:

1. Specified categories of projects to be subjected to an EIA and receive an authorization from the MEFCC or the relevant regional environmental agency prior to commencing implementation of the project.
2. Licensing agencies to ensure that the requisite authorization has been duly received prior to issuing an investment permit, a trade or operating license or a work permit to a business organization.
3. The MEFCC or the relevant regional environmental agencies may issue an exemption from carrying out an EIA in projects supposed to have an insignificant environmental impact.
4. A licensing agency may suspend or cancel a license that has already been issued where the MEFCC or the relevant regional environmental agency suspends or cancels environmental authorization.

Procedures that need to be followed in the process of conducting an environmental impact assessment are described in the Proclamation. Thus, a project developer is expected to act as follows:

1. Undertake a timely environmental impact assessment, identifying the likely adverse impacts, incorporating the means of their prevention, and submitting the environmental impact study report accompanied by the necessary documents to the EPA or the relevant regional environmental agency.
2. Submit an environmental impact study report to the EPA or the relevant regional environmental agency for review.

Environmental guidelines are among the tools for facilitating the consideration of environmental issues and principles of sustainable development and their inclusion in development proposals. To put this Proclamation into effect the MEFCC issued guideline documents, which provide details of the EIA process and its requirements. According to this EIA guideline projects are categorized into three schedules:

Schedule 1: Projects which may have adverse and significant environmental impacts thus requiring a full Environmental Impact Assessment;

Schedule 2: Projects whose type, scale or other relevant characteristics have the potential to cause some significant environmental impacts but are not likely to warrant a full EIA study; and

Schedule 3: Projects which would have no impact and do not require an EIA.

However, projects situated in environmentally sensitive areas such as land prone to erosion; desertification; areas of historic or archaeological interest; important landscape; religiously important areas, etc. will fall under category 1 irrespective of the nature of the project.

According to this guideline all project proponents and executing bodies (agencies) in the country should operate in close cooperation with the MEFCC to ensure that proper mitigating measures are designed and implemented, especially for projects with an adverse effect on the environment. This in effect means that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should be prepared by project proponents and be examined, commented and approved by the MEFCC.

Based on the basic objective and principles of the national Environmental Impact Assessment (Proclamation No, 299/2002), all Regional States have adopted and customized to their regional realities. Hence all regions have EIA proclamation and/or regulations, base on which development projects in their jurisdictions have been evaluated.

4.2.2 Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation (No. 542/2007)

This proclamation attempts to provide legal grounds to the Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Policy and Strategy of 2007. The proclamation recognizes two types of forest

ownerships, state and private. The proclamation puts communal forest ownership under the category of private forest ownership.

This Proclamation has given great emphasis, among others, that forests should be protected from fire, unauthorized settlement, deforestation, undertaking of mining and other similar activities. It also highlighted the need for community participation and sharing from the benefits of sustainable forest management. Furthermore, this proclamation states that:

1. Conditions have to be facilitated whereby inhabitants within a state forest shall continue living in the forest, while participating in the development and conservation of the forest, in a manner that shall not obstruct forest development; or, based on a study and in consultation with the appropriate body, they shall evacuate the forest area and settle in other areas suitable for living.
2. Forests be managed and utilized only in accordance with approved management plans. Accordingly, it clearly prohibits activities such as: cutting trees, settling temporarily or permanently, grazing domestic animals, carrying out hunting activity, carrying cutting saws and any other tools used for cutting trees; and keeping beehives or extracting honey inside forests without seeking permissions from appropriate government authority.

Similarly, the Oromia Forest Proclamation (72/2003) also prohibits the following activities without appropriate permission: cut any trees, make charcoal, settle in the forests, keep domestic animals in the forest, hunt, keep beehives or harvest honey, and take natural resources. The Oromia Forest Proclamation also specifically prohibited cutting and utilizing of some tree species from natural forests. These include *Hagenia abyssinica*, *Cordia africana*, *Podocarpus falcatus*, *Prunus africanus*, and *Juniperus procera*.

These proclamations, the Federal Forest Proclamation (542/2007) and the Oromia Forest Proclamation (72/2003), have laid strong foundation for these two REDD+ projects existence (designing) and make them functional to attain their objectives effectively.

4.2.3 Environmental Pollution Control (Proclamation No. 300/2002)

Proclamation No. 300/2002 on Environmental Pollution Control primarily aims to ensure the right of citizens to a healthy environment and to impose obligations to protect the environment of the country. The law addresses the management of hazardous waste, municipal waste, the establishment of environmental quality standards for air, water and soil; and monitoring of pollution. The proclamation also addresses noise as one source of environmental pollution and it seeks for standards and limits for noise providing for the maximum allowable noise level considering the settlement patterns. In general, the Proclamation provides a basis from which the relevant environmental standards applicable to Ethiopia can be developed, while sanctioning violation of these standards as criminally punishable offences

Furthermore, it empowers the Federal Environmental Protection Authority now MEFCC or the Regional Environmental Authority to assign environmental inspectors with the duties and responsibilities of controlling environmental pollution. To ensure implementation of environmental standards and related requirements, inspectors belonging to the MEFCC or the relevant regional environmental agency are empowered by the Proclamation to enter, without prior notice or court order, any land or premises at any time, at their discretion. Such wide powers derive from Ethiopia's serious concern and commitment to protecting the environment from pollution.

4.2.3 Public Health Proclamation

The Public Health Proclamation (200/2000) comprehensively addresses aspects of public health including, among others, water quality control, waste handling and disposal, availability of toilet facilities, and the health permit and registration of different operations. The Proclamation prohibits the disposal of untreated solid or liquid hazardous wastes into water bodies or the environment that can affect human health.

4.2.4 Rural Land Administration and Use

The Rural Land Administration and Use Proclamation (Proc. No. 456/2005) defines the state ownership of rural land and the tenure rights of the land occupant, including rights to “property produced on his land”, rights of inter-generational tenure transfer, and rights of exchange of land

and limited leasing rights. Provisions are made for the registration and certification of tenure rights. Part Three of the Proclamation presents regulations relating to the use of rural land, particularly as it relates to soil and water conservation and watershed management. The rural land administration and land use laws are to be implemented by the regional states.

Article 7(3) of the Proclamation reinforces the rights of land users to compensation for the development they have made on the land. It also states that when the land holder is evicted by federal government, the rate of compensation would be determined based on the federal land administration law. When the rural land holder is evicted by regional governments, the rate of compensation would be determined based on the rural land administration laws of regions.

It is envisaged that the Proclamation will create a sense of ownership among the majority of the rural population and enable them to take initiatives and collectively engage in environmental management activities.

4.2.5 Expropriation of Landholdings for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation Proclamation

The expropriation of landholdings for public purposes and payment of compensation (Proclamation No. 455/2005) was proclaimed because it has become necessary to define the basic principles that have to be taken into consideration in determining compensation to a person whose landholding has been expropriated, and to define organs that shall have the power to determine and the responsibility to pay the compensation. Under Part Two of the proclamation, provisions are made for the power to expropriate landholdings, notification of expropriation order and responsibilities of the implementing agency. Part Three of the Proclamation presents regulations relating to determination of compensation, particularly as it relates to basis and amount of compensation, displacement compensation, and valuation of property, establishment of property valuation committees, and complaints and appeals in relation to compensation.

Regarding complaints and appeals in relation to compensation the proclamation clearly stated how to go about under Article 11 of the proclamation. In rural areas and in an urban center where an administrative organ to hear grievances related to urban landholding is not yet established, a

complaint relating to the amount of compensation shall be submitted to the regular court having jurisdiction. A party dissatisfied with a decision, rendered in accordance with Sub-Article (I) and (3) of the Article may appeal, as may be appropriate, to the regular appellate court or municipal appellate court within 30 days from the date of the decision. The decision of the court shall be final.

For the proper implementation of this proclamation, Article 14 of the proclamation specified power to issue regulation and directives for Council of Ministers and Regions, respectively. This Proclamation is applicable to this project and will be effective as deemed necessary.

4.2.6 Payment of Compensation for Properties Situated on Landholdings Expropriated for Public Use (Regulation No.135/2007)

The regulation has three parts, with a total of 24 Articles, comprising general section of the regulation, assessment of compensation, and provision of replacement of land, and payment of displacement compensation. For this purpose and this proposed project some pertinent articles and provision are discussed briefly. Since the projects are mainly located in vast rural land and settlement area, review on compensation for crops, perennial crops, trees, protected grass, and compensation for permanent improvement on rural land, has been made. Furthermore, a provision of replacement rural land, and displacement compensation for land used for crops and perennial crops are covered.

4.3 International Conventions relevant to the projects

Ethiopia is a country that is signatory to and ratified many international conventions and agreements related with environment. Framework for Climate Change Convention and Stockholm Conventions are few among others that are related to the projects under consideration. Accordingly, Ethiopia has proclaimed several legislations, which are applicable to *Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants* (POPs) and climate change (mitigation measure for global warming by controlling greenhouse gas emission to the accepted level). Environmental Pollution Control (Proclamation No. 300/2002) and Pesticide Registration and Control (Council of State Special Decree No. 20/1990) are among the most important legislations for regulating

POPs chemicals and regulating the emission of greenhouse gases in Ethiopia. Furthermore, the country has also developed the National implementation plans for these conventions as per the agreement made by the conference of the parties for each convention.

4.3.1 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

Ethiopia participated on the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and ratified the UNFCCC convention in 1994 (Proc. No. 97/1994) and became a party to it. The ultimate objective of this Convention and any related legal instruments that the Conference of the Parties may adopt is to achieve, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.

To achieve the objective of the Convention and to implement its provisions, the Parties shall be guided by various principles, among which those pertinent to these projects are:

1. The Parties should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof.
2. The Parties should take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects. In line with this, these two REDD+ projects will contribute and support the global effort so far made on stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.

The REDD+ initiatives have come to effect in various member parties/countries of the UNFCCC. REDD+ is an international climate mitigation strategy that aims to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in tropical forest countries, support the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

REDD+ has the overall objective of contributing to the reduction of global carbon emissions from deforestation by improving forest governance at the country level, and by providing financial incentives for halting or reversing forest lost. In line with this, appropriate environmental and social safeguards (UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards) and standards (REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards) for the implementation of REDD+ initiatives/projects have been developed.

A. UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards

In December 2010, the Sixteenth Conference of the Parties (COP 16) to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Cancun agreed to a set of seven safeguards to support REDD+ implementation (hereafter referred to as the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards). The UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards aim not only to mitigate the risk of adverse social and environmental impacts of REDD+ activities, but also to actively promote benefits beyond carbon emission reductions, such as increased land tenure security, enhancing biodiversity, improving forest governance and empowering relevant stakeholders by ensuring their full and effective participation. The UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards outline a global framework of social, environmental and governance principles according to which REDD+ actions and activities must be implemented. The seven UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards are the following:

1. Safeguard (a): that actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and relevant international conventions and agreements;
2. Safeguard (b): transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;
3. Safeguard (c): respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
4. Safeguard (d): full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, including in particular indigenous peoples and local communities in actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of the decision;

5. Safeguard (e): actions that are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions referred to in paragraph 70 of the decision are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;
6. Safeguard (f): actions to address the risks of reversals;¹⁶ and
7. Safeguard (g): actions to reduce displacement of emissions.¹⁷

By following this framework, countries can minimize risks posed by REDD+ activities, and maximize the potential for realizing REDD+ benefits – both carbon and non-carbon. Hence, actors designing, funding and implementing REDD+ actions and activities will need to find a way to ensure the effective implementation, monitoring and reporting of the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards.

B. REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+SES)

The REDD+ SES cover all the key issues included in the UNFCCC safeguards (other than those related to carbon) and in most case go considerably beyond what the UNFCCC states both in terms of what is required and the level of detail. This suggests that the REDD+ SES has the potential to be a useful tool for demonstrating that the UNFCCC safeguards are being met and exceeded.

The REDD+ SES have been developed to support the design and implementation of government-led REDD+ programs that respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and generate significant social and environmental benefits. The standards have been explicitly designed to go beyond laying out minimum safeguards, and to identify and elaborate benefits. The REDD+ SES is made up of 8 Principles and 34 Criteria. The principles are the following:

Principle 1: The right to lands, territories and resources are recognized and respected.

¹⁶Governments are encouraged to “promote and support” “actions” that prevent the destruction or degradation of forests protected through REDD activities.

¹⁷Governments are encouraged to “promote and support” “actions” to “reduce” leakage, which is what happens when forest destroyers move from one area to another.

Principle 2: The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably among all relevant rights holders and stakeholders.

Principle 3: The REDD+ program improves long-term livelihood security and well-being of Indigenous Peoples and local communities with special attention to the most vulnerable people.

Principle 4: The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development, respect and protection of human rights and good governance objectives.

Principle 5: The REDD+ program maintains and enhances biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Principle 6: All relevant rights holders and stakeholders participate fully and effectively in the REDD+ program.

Principle 7: All rights holders and stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable informed decision-making and good governance of the REDD+ program.

Principle 8: The REDD+ program complies with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments.

4.3.2 Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

Ethiopia has signed and ratified Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (May 22, 2001) on 17 May 2002 and 2 July 2002, respectively. Mindful of the precautionary approach as set forth in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of this Convention is to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants.

Article 5 of the convention requests for measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production. Consequently, each Party shall at a minimum take the following measures to reduce the total releases derived from anthropogenic sources of each of the

chemicals listed in annex of the Convention¹⁸, with the goal of their continuing minimization and, where feasible, ultimate elimination.

4.3.3 Other International Agreements

Ethiopia has also ratified the following international conventions that are relevant to natural resources and environmental management:

1. Convention on Biological Diversity (ratified through Proc. No. 98/94);
2. Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the Montreal Protocol (ratified in January 1996);
3. United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification (ratified through Proc. No.80/1997); and
4. CITES (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) (through proclamation No.14/1970).

The government has established an Environmental Protection Authority [now MEFCC], which is designated as a focal point for the implementation of the conventions.

4.4 The World Bank's Operational Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards

The World Bank (WB) safeguard policies are designed to help ensure that programs proposed for financing are environmentally and socially sustainable, and thus improve decision-making. The Bank's Operational Policies are intended to help promote socially and environmentally sustainable approaches to development as well as to ensure that Bank operations do not harm people and the environment.

Since the main objective of this ESR was to review and identify gaps of the two REDD+ projects' activities against GoE's and WB's safeguards and the UNFCCC safeguards principles requirements and to enable the two REDD+ projects will be aligned with the OFLP (umbrella

¹⁸ http://www.pops.int/documents/convtext/convtext_en.pdf

program), the WB safeguard policies that are triggered by the OFLP have been considered in the ESR.

The OFLP triggered eight out of ten World Bank's safeguard operational policies. Those WB safeguard operational policies requirements subjected for the review against the two REDD+ projects are: Environmental Assessment (*OP/BP 4.01*), Natural Habitats (*OP/BP 4.04*), Pest Management (*OP/BP 4.09*), Indigenous Peoples/Underserved and Vulnerable peoples (*OP/BP 4.10*), Physical Cultural Resources (*OP/BP 4.11*), Involuntary Resettlement (*OP/BP 4.12*), Forests (*OP/BP 4.36*), and Safety of Dams (*OP/BP 4.37*).

Hence the two ongoing REDD+ projects' safeguard procedures have been reviewed against these eight World Bank's safeguard operational policies to identify how these ongoing REDD+ projects comply with the WB safeguard requirements and be aligned with the OFLP.

4.4.1 Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)

Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01) is applied to identify, avoid, and mitigate the potential negative environmental impacts associated with Bank lending operations. This policy is the umbrella policy for the Bank's environmental 'safeguard policies'.

In line with this, the World Bank Policy for Environmental Assessment is guided by Operational Policy/Bank Procedure (OP/BP) 4.01 and consists of seven basic elements: (i) screening; (ii) environmental assessment (EA) documentation requirements; (iii) public consultation; (iv) disclosure; (v) review and approval of EA documentation; (vi) conditionality in loan agreements; and (vii) arrangements for supervision, monitoring, and reporting. Accordingly, an assessment has been made on how these REDD+ projects' safeguards address the requirement of this operational policy in their interventions and project activities.

4.4.2 Natural Habitat (OP/BP 4.04)

The objective of this OP is to promote environmentally sustainable development by supporting the protection, conservation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of natural habitats and their functions. This policy prohibits Bank support for projects that would lead to the significant loss or degradation of any Critical Natural Habitats, whose definition includes those natural habitats

that are: legally protected; officially proposed for protection; and unprotected but of known high conservation value. The policy is “triggered” if a project could result in any one or more of the following four events:

1. A loss of natural habitats;
2. Construction of “linear features” (e.g., roads, transmission lines, pipelines) that might cut through natural habitats;
3. An effect on the water supply to or drainage from natural habitats; and
4. A direct or indirect result in resettlement or migration of people in a way that would adversely affect natural habitats.

This policy is expected to be triggered by Non-REDD+ projects by ongoing REDD+ project areas, e.g. a big Road project (103kms) connecting Adaba and Angetu towns and crossing the virgin forest in BMER project and the BMNP areas, and other GoE and NGOs infrastructure development projects around these REDD+ project areas.

4.4.3 Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09)

The objective of this OP/BP is to minimize and manage the environmental and health risks associated with pesticide use and promote and support safe, effective, and environmentally sound pest management. Hence the rural development and health sector projects have to avoid using harmful pesticides. A preferred solution is to use Integrated Pest Management techniques and encourage their use in the whole of the sectors concerned.

If pesticides are considered necessary at full ESIA stage, either for crop protection at resettlement sites or in the fight against water-related vector-borne diseases, a Bank-funded project should include a Pest Management Plan (PMP), prepared by the borrower, either as a stand-alone document or as part of the Environmental Assessment. Currently, this policy is expected to be triggered by small holding farmers and Non-REDD+ projects inside and around both ongoing REDD+ project areas.

4.4.4 Indigenous/underserved Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)

The Ethiopian government recognizes that all people in Ethiopia are indigenous and there are only underserved communities.¹⁹ The World Bank ensures that any project financed by it is not against the underserved peoples' dignity, rights, economic benefit and cultural practices. The Bank further wants to ensure that there is free, prior and informed consultation with the underserved people before endorsing the project. There is a complex relation between local underserved people and natural resources, which they depend on for their livelihoods, spiritual and cultural practices and hence the Bank recognizes this relationship with due regards.

This Operational Policy, therefore, provides policy guidance to ensure that indigenous/underserved people benefit from development projects, and to avoid or mitigate potentially adverse effects on underserved people caused by Bank-assisted activities. Special action is required where Bank investments affect indigenous peoples, tribes, ethnic minorities, or other groups whose social and economic status restricts their capacity to assert their interests and rights in land and other productive resources. The Bank defines “indigenous peoples”, “indigenous ethnic minorities”, “tribal groups”, and “scheduled tribes” as social groups with a social and cultural identity distinct from the dominant society that makes them vulnerable to being disadvantaged in the development process.

The people living in the project areas are from different ethnic groups and are extremely poor, vulnerable and in need of great care concerning resettlement and restoring/improving livelihoods. These people are vulnerable not because they have ‘distinct cultural identity’ from the rest of the community members living in the project areas, but because they are already disadvantaged economically.

¹⁹The WB's indigenous people concept is adopted as underserved or vulnerable people in the Ethiopian legal lexicon because the 1995 constitution of the FDRE recognizes that all people in Ethiopia are indigenous and the difference between them are based on their social, cultural and economic status. See OFLP SESA (pages 80-81) for the detail list of vulnerable people in Oromia based on the social assessments conducted by the GoE as part of the World Bank's Safeguards Requirement.

4.4.5 Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)

The objective of this OP is to assist in preserving PCR and in avoiding their destruction or damage. PCR includes resources of archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, and religious (including graveyards and burial sites), aesthetic, or other cultural significance.

Cultural resources are important as sources of valuable historical and scientific information, as assets for economic and social development, and as integral parts of a people's cultural identity and practices. The loss of such resources is irreversible, but fortunately, it is often avoidable. The objective of OP/BP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources is to avoid, or mitigate, adverse impacts on cultural resources from development projects that the World Bank finances.

The World Bank requires that, before proceeding with a project that may risk damaging cultural property (e.g., any project that includes large scale excavations, movement of earth, superficial environmental changes or demolition), the cultural property aspects of the project site must be determined. Though site specific information on the nature of the physical cultural resources likely to be affected are yet to be determined, ritual sites of indigenous religions and cemeteries are likely to be affected by the project.

4.4.6 Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)

This policy applies to this Project because involuntary resettlement may be required. Any requirement for involuntary resettlement is one of the most important environmental impacts of a proposed project, and Bank guidance on resettlement and compensation is now very comprehensive and specific, particularly in relation to the identification, participation and support of project-affected persons (PAPs). The policy objectives stated in this safeguard operational policy are as follows:

1. Involuntary resettlement should be avoided where feasible, or minimized, exploring all viable alternative project designs;
2. Where it is not feasible to avoid resettlement, resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programs, providing sufficient investment resources to enable the persons displaced by the project to share in project benefits. Displaced persons should be meaningfully consulted and should

have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing resettlement programs;

3. Displaced persons should be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.

4.4.7 Forests (OP/BP 4.36)

The Objective of this Operational policy is to realize the potential of forests to reduce poverty in a sustainable manner, integrate forests effectively into sustainable economic development, and protect the vital local and global environmental services and values of forests. Whilst the objectives are principally related to the World Bank activities in the forestry sector, including policies on the conservation of forest biodiversity, the sustainable management of forest areas, and the participation of local people particularly in the management of the surrounding forests, this policy will be triggered by some activities (e.g., Adaba - Angetu road project) of the Non-REDD+ development activities in the project areas.

The policy emphasizes that the management, conservation, and sustainable development of forest ecosystems and their associated resources are essential for a lasting poverty reduction and sustainable development goal. This Policy states that:

1. The Bank does not finance projects that, in its opinion, would involve significant conversion or degradation of critical forest areas or related critical natural habitats;
2. If a project involves significant conversion or degradation of natural forests or related natural habitats that the Bank determines are not critical, and the Bank determines that there are no feasible alternatives to the project and its siting, and comprehensive analysis demonstrates that the overall benefits from the project substantially outweigh the environmental costs, the Bank may finance the project if it incorporates appropriate mitigation measures.

4.4.8 Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4. 37)

The objective of this OP is to ensure quality and safety in the design and construction of new dams and the rehabilitation of existing dams, and in carrying out activities that may be affected by an existing dam. The overarching dam safety objective is to protect people, property and the environment from the harmful effects of mis-operation or failure of dams and reservoirs. To ensure that dams and reservoirs are operated and that activities are conducted so as to achieve the highest standards of safety that can reasonably be achieved, measures have to be taken to achieve fundamental safety. This OP will be triggered in most REJFMA-SW Ethiopia Phase II Project and in very few *kebeles* of BMERP where suitable rivers/streams for small scale irrigation are available in view of the demands for small scale irrigation schemes in some of the *kebeles* visited as a livelihood diversification strategy.

5. Key Findings from Community Consultations

5.1. Forest and REDD+ Initiative in the Eyes of the Community

In all the community consultations, it came out clearly that the forest was handed down to them from their forefathers and they care about it very much because, as one discussant from Gemechisa *kebele* of Nono Selle *woreda* proudly put it “we are what we are because of the forest.” Their livelihood depends mainly on forest resources such as honey and coffee. In Nono Selle *woreda*, cardamom is another important source of cash.

Before the establishment of cooperatives through the Participatory Forest Management (PFM) program, the communities have been using the forest resources as was inherited from their ancestors, which was the basis of their legitimate claim to the forest.

The government, on the other hand, claims the forest belongs to the state and argues that only under its management that the forest resources can be used in a planned and sustainable manner. In light of this, the communities consulted from Nono Selle and Becho *Woredas* of Ilu Abba Bora zone reported that they were suspicious of the government’s motive as it might lease their forest lands to investors resulting not only in denying them access to the land but complete destruction of the forest. This perception has taken a long time to gradually fade away (through intensive community consultation/engagement) and make the local community accept the PFM initiative as a genuine proposal that would enhance their benefits from the forest while conserving and developing the forest resources at the same time. The situation was different among the communities consulted in BMERR+ *woredas* as they had a long history of PFM, which were initiated and developed by various NGOs, namely GTZ, SOS-Sahel, Farm Africa, among others.

Because of enhanced knowledge about the wide range of uses of forest and the cooperatives, which has to approve the use of forest resources that involves cutting of trees even if that was in their family (*Gopo/Badda*) holding, they are using the forest resources more wisely. They have a vision about the forest – anticipating the worst case scenario if they do not use it in a sustainable way. One male discussant mentioned the recurrent problem of drought-induced famine in other,

especially northern parts of Ethiopia as an example to emphasize the need to protect and develop their forest resources.

*Gopo*²⁰ refers to both the system and the resource. As a system, it refers to the tradition in which forest lands are handed down from generation to generation and recognized by the members of the community as uncontested legitimate right of the descendants. As a resource, it refers to the forestland held by a given family with its high trees on which beehives are hanged and a big shade where beehives are safely kept until the next hanging season. It also includes the forest coffee land held by a family under the same principle. In Bale, it is called *Bada* and works on the same principle, except for the use of hive trees and a shade for the safe keeping of the hives because in Bale they harvest honey while the hives are still hanged.

Knowledge about REDD+ project varies between the different communities consulted in the two REDD+ project areas. Among the communities of the BMERR+ project, knowledge about REDD+ project and its components was very high while it was relatively lower among the Nono Selle and Becho *woredas* of the REDD+ Joint Forest Management of Ethio-wetlands in Ilu Abba Bora Zone.²¹ In all the *kebeles* visited for this study, there was very high expectation of the benefits of the REDD+ project. In several of the community consultations conducted in BMERR+ project areas, people were complaining that they have waited for too long for the REDD money and said “*motummaan dur hinsobu ture, amma sobuutti ka’e*”, (in the past, government didn’t lie, did it start now”), to express their frustration.

5.2. Land acquisition and resettlement

There was no reported case of land acquisition that necessitated resettlement in areas visited for this study. In fact, people were saying that the forest land is expanding into their farmlands in almost all *kebeles* visited for this review. In Becho *Woreda*, however, community members who attended the community consultation reported that there were cases where some farmlands were

²⁰ A traditional resource access and management system in South Western Ethiopia.

²¹ In Gemechisa and Kupi *kebeles* of Nono Selle *woreda*, all the discussants reported of the case being discussed by the Ethio-Wetlands staff, but no detail information was given as regards the components. In Gorbi and Gemechisa *kebeles* of Becho *woreda*, the few discussants who have heard about it attributed the source of their information to the mass media.

mistakenly demarcated as forestland, which in principle restrict access for any form of use by the community and some of them corrected later through the intervention of the *woreda* administration. Still many households from Gorbi and Gemechisa *kebeles* of Becho *Woreda* are worried about their farmlands included in the demarcated state forestland during the mapping. They said, “lands for which they have land certificates were designated into forest land.”

In some *kebeles* of BMER+ project where PFM started by organizing the community into *WAJIBs*, very few households among those who had not been included in the *WAJIBs* were relocated to other places in their respective *kebeles* in Adaba and Dodola *woredas* when *WAJIBs* were formed in the year 2000. There is not much information as to how many people have been relocated from the *kebeles* in which *WAJIBs* were established in 2000. Given the time span since their relocation and the small number of households affected in each *kebele*, specific data as regards the number of households relocated could not be obtained as none of the interviewees were able to recall.

5.3. Membership and Membership Criteria

PFM cooperative membership is voluntary and open to all and registration fee and share contributions are agreed upon by all members during the formation of the cooperative. Among the communities consulted for this study, membership registration fee ranges from Birr 5-50 and share contributions vary depending on the age and capital of the service cooperatives formed in those *kebeles*.

For the question, what if there are members of the community who may not be able to raise the membership fee, most agreed that registration fee cannot be a barrier for most of the people in their respective communities. They reiterated there is a strong sense of community life and social support system built in their culture and depending on the merit of the case of person, the PFM committee might waive the registration fee requirement and doing so will be in the best interest of the PFM members as it contributes more sustainable use of forest resources, rather than excluding people leaving alone to abuse the resources. But still, there are households who could not join the PFM cooperatives because of registration fee and share contribution problems in most of the *kebeles* covered in this study in BMER+ project. In Wajitushabe *Kebele*, for instance they allow those who want to join the association but had no money to the registration to collect

firewood and sell, and pay their fees and shares on installment basis. But still, they admit, it is a problem for some families.

PFM cooperatives, which evolved from *WAJIBs* are not open for new membership because of *WAJIB* principles that grant exclusive user rights to the recognized members of the association. The main principle of *WAJIB* is granting exclusive user rights to the recognized members of *WAJIB*. For this purpose, the FPA (Forest Priority Areas) in a given village is subdivided into forest blocks.

5.4. Grievance Redress Mechanism

A grievance redress mechanism is a locally based, formalized way to accept, assess, and resolve community feedback or complaints. The existence of grievance redress mechanisms (GRM) as a core program component, enhances stakeholders' confidence. In view of this, this review exercise tried to assess whether GRM was built into the two ongoing REDD+ projects and the finding shows that the projects, though with varying degrees, did not have a *functioning* inbuilt GRM²² to handle REDD+ project related grievances in the *kebeles* visited for this study.

However, the two projects are different in the sense that the bylaws of PFM cooperatives in BMERP clearly describe the structure and duties and responsibilities of the GRM put in place as part of the project, while the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project does not have one. Article 26 of the bylaws of PFM cooperatives in BMERP provides for the establishment of *Gumi Hayyoota* (Council of Elders) composed of three elders and two religious leaders and defines its duties and roles, and clearly states it will be appointed by the General Assembly (GA) and is accountable to the GA. However, when asked whether the Project has put in place project-based GRM to handle grievances or complaints, the communities who took part in the ESR discussion said they are not aware that such a structure exists. They rather emphasized on the role of indigenous institutions

²² CCB standards require that a project demonstrates “a clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with Communities and Other Stakeholders that may arise during project planning, implementation and evaluation with respect but not limited to, Free, Prior and Informed Consent, rights to lands, territories and resources, benefit sharing, and participation.⁴⁵The project shall include a process for receiving, hearing, responding to and attempting to resolve Grievances within a reasonable time period.⁴⁶ The Feedback and Grievance Redress Procedure shall take into account traditional methods that Communities and Other Stakeholders use to resolve conflicts.” CCBA. 2013. Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards Third Edition. CCBA, Arlington, VA, USA. December 2013. At: www.climate-standards.org. P.21.

of *Jaarsumma/mangudumma* (conflict resolution through the mediation of elders) to settle disputes and resolve conflicts. This, therefore, means: (i) the GRM was not functional and the people do not know about it because of lack of awareness creation; and (ii) people opt for the indigenous systems of dispute settlement, which could be used as an alternative means of GRM by the projects. In Nono Selle and Becho *Woredas* of Ilu Abba Bora, *Jaarsumma* was emphasized as a very strong dispute settlement mechanism, while *Iddirwas* mentioned as a complement to *Jaarsumma* in some *kebeles* of the two *woredas*.

Moreover, though not meant to serve as GRM structures, often members file their complaints with the smaller structures of the PFM cooperative (blocs) and in case he/she is not satisfied with the decision of the committee, he/she will go to the Executive Committee of the PFM Cooperative,²³ and then to the *kebele* administration or even to the *woreda* court if satisfactory solutions to grievances could not be achieved at the lower level structures.

5.5. Traditional institutions of resource management and conflict resolution

The Oromo people have age old traditional institutions of resource management, resource sharing and conflict resolution embedded in their life. The *Gadaa* system, a complex customary administrative structure, is a social and political institution providing guidance on customary practice of the Oromo society to demarcate, among the pastoral communities of Borana and Guji, dry and wet season grazing, with a set of specific rules and regulations. Such cyclical grazing and range management is compatible to the requirements of range ecology, keeps equilibrium of vegetation dynamics by minimizing overgrazing and depletion of water. It has strong unwritten customary regulations governing forest tenure, resource access, use and management. The *Kallu* is the religious institution of the Oromo. The *Kallu* also handles conflicts and provide adjudication to grievances.

²³ PFM Cooperative structures are charged with different roles and responsibilities in the day to day operation of the CBOs, and the GRM, on the other hand, should have been constituted as an independent structure to ensure check and balance for the healthy functioning of the PFM cooperatives.

The Arsi-Bale have well-instituted traditional range management systems (herd management, grazing areas, settlement stratification, management of water points, hierarchical cohort based responsibilities) most of which are designed for conflict prevention and peaceful coexistence. Their view on nature and environment are instituted in their customary laws not only to protect the natural environment and eco-system, but also to reduce conflicts that may arise on over utilization and rapid depletion of resources. The communities have a customary law that prohibits cutting trees without adequate reasons. Some trees are prohibited for their spiritual, economic, social and cultural values. The type of trees grown in specific areas is also an indication of the availability or shortage of ground water. The *Gada* system and rules allow cutting of trees only for fencing and building houses. Big trees should not be cut and only small branches are permitted for the construction of Barns. The Arsi's believe that trees have and sustain life.

Traditionally, there is an institution of *Jaarsumma/Mangudmma* (conflict resolution through the mediation of elders). In all the *kebeles* visited, *Jaarsumma* was stressed as the most effective traditional conflict resolution mechanism, which is not only active to date but also used by the government judiciary system to mediate complicated dispute cases between disputants from the same *kebele* or neighborhood. They also play important role in the establishment of PFM cooperatives drawing on the wisdom of indigenous institutions that sustained natural resources conservation for several generations. They also play vital role in handling grievances on entitlements protected by *Godaantu*²⁴(Arsi and Bale) and *Goopo*²⁵ (Ilu Abba Bora) systems and a

²⁴*Godaantuu* “is a transhumance system of Oromo pastoralists, and key feature of traditional human use of forest based resources especially in the Bale/Arsi forested landscape. In this system, livestock, particularly cattle are sent to higher grazing grounds during the months when crops are growing in lower altitude areas or into the forest for shade during the dry season. When drought hits the pastoral and agro pastoral areas beneath the forests of Oromia, the people move to the forests with their livestock for grazing, watering and shelter seasonally. The accession of resources during the seasonal migration of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists is governed by the *Gada* system including, allocation of grazing, watering and shelter areas.... *Godaantuu* system is a customary natural resource use practice regulated by the traditional institution called *Abbaa Ardaa*. *Abbaa Ardaa* regulates the opening and closing dates for seasonal livestock grazing, use area and use patterns of grazing to avoid degradation of particular areas, and enable particular groups to control their grazing territory.” (OFPL –SESA-Social Assessment, October 14, 2015: p.79)

²⁵*Goopo* system “is a forest (tree) tenure institution that grants first claimers an exclusive use right over a block of forest, usually for collection of forest coffee, hanging beehives and access to other non-timber forest products (NTFP). Once claimed, the forest block is de facto individual property, respected by fellow citizens of the area, and the owner has the right to exclude others. The system is prevalent in Western Ethiopia among people residing

range of issues that arise between people. The wide range of issues the *Jaarsumma* institution handles and the level of acceptance of its decisions by all parties and the acceptance it won from the official legal system were consistently reported across the *kebeles* visited for this study.

Godaantu and *Goopo* systems are used to strike a fair balance between access right and protection of the traditional user-right. *Iddir*—a voluntary self-help association – is also used to augment the effort of the *Jaarsumma* institution to handle grievances at the neighborhood levels.

5.6. Gender

In the *kebeles* visited for this ESR, women constitute a significant portion of PFM cooperatives although their participation in the leadership of the cooperatives varies. In the sample *kebeles* visited for this ESR, out of a total of 8169 registered PFM cooperative member households, 1556 (19%) are female-headed and among the PFM cooperative leadership of seven executive members at least two are women, except among the *WAJIBs*. The remaining 6613 male-headed households also include women since household membership includes the husband/wife of the registered partner. PFM cooperative treasurers are almost all women. It was observed that women are actively involved in the PFM cooperative leadership at both the blocs and the *kebele* level cooperative structures as two out of five and three out of seven, respectively, are women. Among the forest users' associations formed from the originally *WAJIB* blocs in West Arsi zone, women are less represented in the leadership of the blocs and the Associations, but they are revising their bylaws to a standard practice followed by all PFM cooperatives. As poverty is severe among the female-headed households, their full participation is hampered by the registration fee and share contribution requirements. Credit facilities need to be arranged for households who cannot afford to raise the required registration fee and share contribution payments. The specific measures for equitable benefit sharing under the OFLP and redressing inequalities in the ESR areas will be assessed as part of the OFLP gender assessment (this is an upcoming task for understanding the gender aspects of OFLP).

outside the forest, but historically have resources (bee hives, coffee, spices) paying service charges for keeping and ensuring access to people.” (OFLP –SESA-Social Assessment, October 14, 2015: p.79)

5.7. *Conflicts of Interest*

The major conflict of interest reported during the fieldwork was the one among the *WAJIB* members and non-members who live in the areas demarcated as forest lands. The number of non-*WAJIB* households (*ammatamaa*, lit. the embraced) has increased and in many places, was twice the number of association members. For instance, the community consultation conducted in Barisa *Kebele* turned into heated debate among the participants and what came out vividly was honest recognition by the *WAJIB* members of the problems the non-members face and the threat this posed on the forest. In Deneba *Kebele*, participants reported the dispute over the use of forest in *WAJIB* areas led to the death of two people (one *WAJIB* member and the other non-*WAJIB* member) in two separate incidents three years ago.²⁶ A 23 years old young man from Barisa *Kebele* complained that citizens' right to life was threatened in the interest of protecting the forest and limiting the use of its resources to few hundred households who joined the *WAJIBs* formed 17 years ago. They challenged the application of a static principle of carrying capacity of the forest for a sustainable use of the resources. Another person, himself, a *WAJIB* member said that the government evaluates its performance every five years taking different sectors, namely, education, health, good governance, power supply, water, road, etc. Based on these evaluations, new strategies and policies are designed to address the problems identified. But, "we have never heard of the government talking about forest and the 12 hectares per household criterion used to organize *WAJIBs* with a maximum of 30 households." The unemployed and landless youth contest the older generation's exclusive rights claim over the use of forest and forest resources.

"Population is dynamic, but the *WAJIB* principles are not", commented one discussant recalling a saying, which they had been told repeatedly from their NGO trainers, which is "*WAJIB gubbaan cufaadha, jalaan bananaadha*" (lit. *WAJIB* is closed at the top and open at the bottom), to describe the rigidity of the principles upon which *WAJIBs* were founded 17 years ago. This means, people are free to leave *WAJIB*, but no one can join once it has been formed. He wondered, why did not the criteria set as a *carrying capacity* of the forest land change?

²⁶ In the first incident, a *WAJIB* member guarding the forest was killed by a group of 4-5 five people illegally cutting trees in the *WAJIB* forest, while in the second a person who was cutting trees in the forest was killed by *WAJIB* members guarding the forest.

Apart from a few, households who had been excluded from *WAJIB* membership at the time neither received land outside of the forest areas nor given other opportunities despite the promise made originally by the government. People who live in the forest but are not members of *WAJIB* are experiencing economic difficulties (complex interplay between population pressure and lack of arable land and other means of livelihood), which is getting worse with the increasing population and demand for land by the newly established households. These circumstances, in turn force the non-*WAJIB* members who inhabit in the forest areas to engage in illegal cutting of trees and clearing of forest. One *WAJIB* member discussant expressed his bewilderment saying, “there are rules which *WAJIB* members need to follow to use forest resources, but none for non-members, which means the latter use, illegal as it is, forest resources without commensurate duty and responsibility to protect it”.

Though not as serious as the one in the case of *WAJIBs*, all PFM cooperatives are experiencing these problems as non-members continue to exploit forest resources without any obligation to protect it. Members complain that the free-riders attitude among the non-members served as disincentive not only for would-be members to join the cooperatives, but for the members to stay in the CBOs.

Therefore, they need support from the government, not only through the law enforcement mechanism, but through the Cooperatives Promotion Agency to revise the membership criteria, namely the 12 ha/household carrying capacity principle.

There are conflicts of interests in implementing the forest conservation objectives and in administrating the high forest areas especially about forest coffee management and coffee plantation between OFWE and BoA.²⁷ Lack of coordination of activities between different sectors makes OFWE’s forest protection and conservation effort a frustrating endeavor. Several district and branch managers expressed frustration that demarcated non-REDD+ project forest lands are given to investors by the *Woreda* Investment Committee and approved straight away by

²⁷The establishment of Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority (OEFCCA) is hoped to resolve this problem, as it will have more structures following the state administrative structure and more importantly because of its mandate to play a regulatory role on all other sectors when it comes to its jurisdiction on environment, forest and climate change.

the *woreda* and zonal structures until it is table for a final approval by the Regional Investment Board in which OFWE is represented, where the OFWE Director asks for site specific information from the concerned branches, which often succeeds in reversing the decision. The so-called investors take this as personal matter and complain that they have spent a lot of money to reach to this level and ask why OFWE does this to them? Informants believe this is a challenge they face almost on daily basis and attribute this to an illicit deal between the so-called investors and investment office and other *woreda* administration structures and sector offices.

Therefore, proper demarcation of roles, accountability, consultation and awareness creation, and cross-sectoral coordination among concerned government institutions, enterprise and NGOs, should be carried out timely at all administrative levels of the proposed project areas.

5.8. Benefit sharing and Unmet Expectation

Community expectation from the REDD+ project is very high, which has forced people to lose hope on what the government promises. In many community consultations held in BMERR+ project area, people challenged the ESR team saying, ‘where is the money?’ They said, ‘we are tired of people, black and white, coming every now and then telling us to conserve the forest promising the money is coming.’ They said bitterly “we waited for too long”. Used the Oromo proverb ‘*dubbiin soddaa afaan guutti malee garaa hin guttu*’ (contextually, the would-be in-laws’ negotiations for bride wealth payment before the conclusion of the marriage is attractive [fills the mouth], but never realized [but not the stomach]). They said ‘we have done our part, protecting the forest, it is the government which failed to deliver what it has promised. If people start going to bed empty stomach, then the forest is at risk’.

In short, the community members are aware of the REDD+ related benefits of carbon revenue (in Becho *Woreda*; and they heard the news from the media and in fact narrated the story of the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference of December 2009) and highly expect financial and non-financial support to diversify their livelihoods. It is, therefore, very important to manage expectations and further negotiate on a sustainable benefit sharing mechanism. It requires consultation and clear guidance on what should be given to the community directly (cash or otherwise), both as social infrastructure and income generating activities from the outset of the project. In several of the community consultations conducted in BMER+ project *kebeles*,

community members expressed frustration on how some of the NGOs which have invested a lot in bringing the PFM to its present status left the area without even telling them their projects have phased out.²⁸ In spite of their immense contribution in awareness creation, capacity building and conservation of forest resources, NGOs who have been running these projects are accused for creating high expectation for financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative.

Regarding specific benefit sharing arrangement of carbon financing in BMER project, the deal has been made between OFWE on behalf of the government and PFM cooperatives on behalf of the community, that if the carbon financing proposal/plan materializes, from the emission reduction (ER) payments, out of the total payment 60% will be channeled for the community while the remaining 40% will go to the government. The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II project is in the process of forming PFM cooperatives, designating forest boundaries, etc. in the *kebeles* of the newly included *woredas* and in the process of meeting the MRV system in other *woredas* such as Nono-Selle. In both cases, the NGOs running these projects are playing a catalyst role in realizing sustainable use of natural forest resources through participatory forest management using donor funds and there is nothing that they get in cash from the emission reduction payment.

5.9. Environmental Benefits

In almost all visited sample *kebeles* of REDD+ projects, members of the community reported that the rate of forest degradation in their locality has been decreasing over years. In some of the *kebeles*, an increase in forest coverage has been reported. People living in these forested landscapes highly acknowledge the forest resource values, functions and services. Apart from direct income generated from the NTFP, the provision of pure water, annually drained streams in their locality, cool weather, and clean air are some of the benefits they associate to proper management of forest resources through PFM Cooperatives. People living in these forest areas

²⁸Farm Africa and SOS-Sahel Ethiopia started its second phase REDD+ project at the beginning of June 2017.

believe that the forest resources serve as a lifesaver for their livestock during drought and harsh seasons (grazing and sheltering).

5.10. Bale Mountains National Park: Designation and the risk of Resettlement

The Bale Mountains National Park (BMNP), a protected area of approximately 2,200 km², located 400 km southeast of Addis Ababa in Oromia National Regional State in south-eastern Ethiopia, was founded in late 1969. Since its inception, particularly in the last decade, many pastoralists, agriculturalists and timber users have moved into the area and natural resources use has increased exponentially throughout the park. This necessitated the long-awaited gazettement of the BMNP, the largest area higher than 3000m above sea level (a.s.l.) in Africa, in 2015 (Council of Ministers Regulation No. 338/2014). Following the issuance of the regulation, which hark on all sides, boundary re-demarcation process is underway, which has caused the local community living in the neighboring *woredas* and *kebeles* and in some areas within the designated boundaries of the BMNP to raise concerns about possible restriction of access for the use of the forest resources for the former and the risk of resettlement for the latter.

According to informants from the local community, there was no formal communication of resettlement, but rumors widely circulate that the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) is working hard to make it happen. Local level government officials do not want to discuss this matter given the sensitivity of the issue considering the ongoing Oromia instability at the time of the ESR. Another more recent document, i.e., the second General Management Plan (GMP) 2017-2027. In its ‘Interim Settlement and Grazing Management Programme’ section, the GMP states “to protect the ecosystem services and biodiversity of the Bale Mountains and the livelihoods of future generations, human settlement and cultivation will be controlled and reduced using collaborative resettlement initiatives, that strive to have no overall negative impact on human well-being.” (P. ix). The GMP further underscores that there will be continuous discussion with permanent forest (Rira, Geramba Gora and Chefe Dhera) and afroalpine settlers and park-adjacent communities to develop a detailed relocation plan, a task force will be formed, comprised of all stakeholders including local communities to identify most recent settlers in each locality and support retraction to their original settlements, and new land will be identified for

allocation to park settlers. It adds “As this process will play out over a number of years, temporary agreements will be made with the permanent forest settlers to ensure resources are used sustainability during that period and there is no further agricultural expansion.” (“The BMNP Interim Settlement and Natural Resource Management Strategy” October 2015.) EWCA has provided an official consent letter to MEFCC to use the OFLP safeguards instruments if the EWCA intends to conduct any resettlement issue in the park.

Experts at the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) interviewed for this ESR reiterated what was stated in the above cited documents and emphasized the complexity of the situation and the implementation of the programs and activities in the General Management Plan will take several years and the most important thing to do is to “create a common understanding of the process and to ensure the participation of those communities involved”. According to the experts, currently there is no specific plan on relocation of the people from the BMNP.

5.11. Implication of instability in Oromia for the OFLP

The instability in the region started in April 2014 due to lack of good governance. The conflicts being ensued in different parts of the region have caused different damage on human’s and development infrastructures which created negative impact on the BMNP project infrastructure. Thus, to address the problem in general and implication to the forest development the government should work on good governance problems and get quick response and corrective measures starting from the grassroots level.

In almost all *kebeles* visited for this study, community members express serious concerns over the future of the youth who neither have the land to farm nor any other means of earning livelihoods. However, REDD+ is working to make the people engage and get benefit from the forest in a sustainable way. According to informants, the youth, frustrated with the sense of hopelessness in the event of unemployment turned their frustrations on the *kebele* administration structures, service cooperatives and PFM cooperatives/*WAJIBs*. Like in other part of Oromia, the instability had negative impacts on forest development infrastructure of two PFM Kebeles (Buura Chellle CBO, Barisa, Deneba, and Garambamo *kebeles*).

The participants in the community consultations at Buura Addelle, Barisa, Deneba and Garambamo *kebeles* emphasized that unless the problems of the unemployed youth (most of whom are graduates from universities and secondary schools) are addressed in a meaningful way, there is a potential risk to any development initiative, particularly forest conservation related initiatives to derail achievements. PFM cooperative members emphasized that there are several hundred-young people who have grown up to maturity and established their own families since the establishment of *WAJIBs* (in 2000) and Forest associations (in 2005). Although they are sympathetic of the youth's situation, there was nothing they could do as the bylaws do not allow them to work against the principles upon which the *WAJIBs* and Associations were formed, namely 12 hectares per household to develop and use the forest resources in a sustainable manner.

In Buura Addelle, Barisa, Deneba and Garambamo *kebeles* and in Arsi Negele areas, demarcated forest areas have been cleared and illegal logging and cutting of trees were widely reported during the Oromia civil unrest. OFWE experts at branch levels attribute these destructions to increasing problem of educated youth unemployment, and OFWE's failure to live up to its promises of investing in community development through the construction of rural feeder roads, clean water, clinics, etc., which angered not only the youth but the whole community. In short, they emphasized development programs that are deprived of local community support are always vulnerable to this kind of risks.

5.12. Lessons Learned on the two REDD+ Projects

The consultations were conducted with communities to gauge their level of understanding on a range of issues on the two REDD+ projects, i.e., project initiation, level of community participation, PFM cooperatives, PFM membership criteria, land acquisition, grievance redress mechanism, traditional institutions of resource management and conflict resolutions, environmental management issues, gender issues, conflict of interest, benefit sharing, etc. The key issues identified by way of lessons learned during the consultations, most of which discussed in different chapters or sections of this report, are summarized as follows:

1. The benefits of PFM cooperatives are well noted from the discussions held in all the *kebeles* visited and they emphasized that the consultation among the community should continue throughout the implementation of the OFLP.
2. The need for financial resource mobilization and capacity building/training to help people diversify their livelihood strategies to non-forest based economies were emphasized in order to engage the local community in sustainable forest management.
3. Strengthen transparent and honest discussion and negotiation with the community on issues of entitlements, duties and responsibilities of each project partner/stakeholder.
4. Forest community members who for various reasons could not join the PFM cooperatives in WAJIB remains to be a challenge as keeping the status quo will threaten sustainable use of forest resources and further marginalizes the vulnerable (the poor, the elderly, the unemployed and landless youth, etc.).
5. Benefit sharing arrangement agreed upon from emission reduction payment was not realized and the unmet expectation of the community might have adverse effect on the sustainable use of forest resources.
6. Some PFM Cooperatives (e.g., Wajitushabe *Kebele*) allow poor households who for lack of money could not join PFM Cooperatives to collect firewood and sell and pay their fees and shares on installment basis. Exemption is also another possibility (strongly suggested as a workable solution in Gemechisa *kebele* of Nono Selle *Woreda*). These are best practices and potentials that could be further explored and used in other areas too.
7. Illegal logging and lack of good governance (e.g., corruption) in the local level system of justice poses serious threat not only to the attainment of the project goals, but also to the sustainable use of natural forest resource. This requires two-pronged approach: (i) awareness raising and training for kebele administration and woreda law enforcement structures; and (ii) taking strict legal measures on the illegal loggers and their benefactors in the formal legal structures.
8. The two REDD+ projects lacked a **functioning** inbuilt GRM. BMERP has it at procedural level, but not operational on the ground. However, there are strong and functioning indigenous institutions of dispute settlement which could serve as an important forum to tap on the knowledge and experience of these institutions (e.g.,

Jaarsummaa) to complement the formal systems and project specific GRM as is required by the standard safeguard principles.

9. Participants reiterated that PFM changed the human-forest relationship, created strong sense of ownership as a result of which forest is regenerating very well, even claiming farmlands in some *kebeles*. There is a need to link the local honey producers to the big markets – negotiate with the companies to offer reasonably fair price to encourage farmers to sell their products fresh and assist and train farmers to use their money to diversify their livelihood strategies rather than venture into unpredictable price speculation. *It is, therefore, very important to improve marketing and value-addition of the products in the project intervention areas, including coffee, honey and other NTFP.*
10. Both field data and review of documents show that there was broad community support for the projects. FPIC was well emphasized in the BMERP documents and minutes of community consultation meetings and consent were documented. Nevertheless, the documentation of the details of the processes followed were not sufficient. Consent was given through the representatives of the forest dependent communities, but there is not enough information and documentation as to how the representatives were elected/selected, their composition (age, sex, economic status, etc), how long the consultations and negotiations have taken before the consent was secured and if there were people who withheld their consents and why; if there were contested tenure rights claims and conflicts of interests over resources, the degree of independence exercised by the local community to choose their representatives, percentage of population present, percentage of votes, if the community was given sufficient time to discuss the proposed project or obtain independent information and advice about the project, etc.

6. Review of the two REDD+ projects' Safeguards against the GoE's and the WB's Safeguards, and the UNFCCC Safeguards Principles

The environmental and social safeguard instruments employed by the two REDD+ projects were reviewed and evaluated if and how they complied with GoE's, WB's, and UNFCCC's safeguards requirements. Accordingly, both field visit verification and document review were made to get a clear picture of how these projects have been addressing and managing the environmental and social concerns that emanate from the implementation of the project activities.

As reiterated by the projects' proponents, the preparation of these projects' documents and the implementation of the project activities have followed the well-known standards and principles of the VCS/CCB and PFM principles for the BMER project and REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II project, respectively. For further clarification, the detailed reviews of each of the two REDD+ projects are presented in the following sections of this chapter.

6.1. Review of safeguard procedures of the BMER project

The BMER project document clearly shows that the Project was designed using the VCS²⁹/CCB standards. The CCB safeguard standards are meant to address the Climate, Community and Biodiversity concerns and the main principle of which is the *Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)*, a more stringent principle than the World Bank's *prior, informed, consultation (PIC)* requirement. Furthermore, the CCB safeguard standards aim to address project induced environmental impacts, issues or concerns.

At a procedural level, the use of the CCB standards requires that Independent, Approved Auditors determine conformity with the CCB standards at two stages, namely *validation and verification*.

²⁹ The BMER project was designed to use CCB standards for the social and environmental safeguard standards in combination with a carbon accounting standard of the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS).

- 1) *CCB Validation* is an evaluation of the design of a land management project against each of the CCB standards criteria.
- 2) *CCB Verification* is an evaluation of a project's delivery of net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits in accordance with the project's validated design. Verification must be performed at least every five years.

In light of this, for the BMER Phase 1 project 'Measuring and Reporting', based on the agreed rules of ER, was made and subsequently using the MRV system, the Verification was undertaken by the third party. Subsequently, the result of the CCB standards validation and the verification level of this project was *approved by an independent and authorized third party auditor*, meaning all the CCB requirements were met.³⁰

Although this project was approved according to the MRV system, this review was made taking into account how the specified procedural (project design and set up of safeguard instruments) and operational (on-ground implementation) safeguard requirements working effectively on achieving the intended result. In line with this, compliance of the project's safeguards has been evaluated with the GoE's, WB's and the UNFCCC's safeguard requirements. The result of this review helps rendering supplementary information on how best to address both the procedural and operational gaps and mitigate impacts emanating from the project activities to further ensure the wellbeing of the community and sustainability of the environment covered by this REDD+ project.

Furthermore, besides a review on the compliance of the project's safeguards with the GoE's, WB's and the UNFCCC's safeguard requirements, on-ground field observation was made to see the potential and actual environmental and social impacts/risks of the non-REDD+ project (government's, NGOs' and local communities') activities undertaken in the landscape. The detailed analyses are presented in chapter seven.

³⁰ See **Annex VIII: CCB Verification Statement** BALE MOUNTAINS ECO-REGION REDD+ PROJECT.

6.1.1. Comparison of CCB safeguard standards with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's safeguards requirements

CCB standards have considered land management projects that can deliver net positive benefits for climate change mitigation, for local communities and for biodiversity. The standards can be applied to any land management project, including projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation or from avoided degradation of other ecosystems, and projects that remove carbon dioxide by sequestering carbon or other land management projects. CCB standards can be used for projects funded with either private or public investment, and they apply to projects that generate carbon credits for either compliance or voluntary markets. In line with this, the CCB standards perform two important roles: the *project design standard* and *multiple benefit standard*.

Project design standard: The CCB standards provide rules and guidance to encourage effective and integrated project design. The standards can be applied during project's design phase to validate projects that have been well designed, are suitable to local conditions and are likely to achieve significant climate, community and biodiversity benefits. This validation helps to build support for the project at a crucial stage and attract funding or other assistance from key stakeholders, including investors, governments and other important local, national and international partners. This early project support and funding can be particularly important for multiple-benefit land-based carbon projects, which often require considerable investment and effort for project development before greenhouse gas emissions reductions can be generated.

Multiple benefit standard: The CCB standards can be applied throughout the project's life to verify the adoption of best practices and the delivery of social and environmental benefits of a land-based carbon project. The standards can be combined very effectively with a carbon accounting standard, for example, the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS). In this case, the CCB standards provide a basis for evaluating a project's social and environmental impacts while the VCS enables verification and registration of quantified greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals. In this way, the CCB standards verify the social and environmental benefits generated by a project, enabling investors to select carbon credits with additional benefits, while screening out projects with unacceptable social and environmental impacts. VCS is not a standard that

stand for environmental and social safeguard, rather it is a carbon accounting standard. Hence, it is important to note that the CCBA does not issue quantified emissions reduction certificates, rather encourages the use of a carbon accounting standard (VCS) in combination with CCB standards.

According to the BMER project's proponent, this project as a government-community based project, that the project has followed VCS/CCB standards requirements both in CCB validation (designing of project) and CCB verification (implementation), and claim for its achievement based on this standard.

The CCB has a total of twenty standards, of which seventeen are required criteria that projects must satisfy to earn CCB standards approval while three are optional Gold Level criteria. For the details, please refer to checklist hereunder.

<i>CCB Standards Checklist</i>		
<i>General Section</i>		
G1	Project Goals, Design & Long-Term Viability	Required
G2	Without-project Land Use Scenario & Additionality	Required
G3	Stakeholder Engagement	Required
G4	Management Capacity	Required
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required
<i>Climate Section</i>		
CL1	Without-project Climate Scenario	Required
CL2	Net Positive Climate Impacts	Required
CL3	Offsite Climate Impacts	Required
CL4	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required
GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional
<i>Community Section</i>		
CM1	Without-project Scenario for Communities	Required
CM2	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required
CM3	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required
CM4	Community Impact Monitoring	Required
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional

<i>Biodiversity Section</i>		
B1	Without-project Biodiversity Scenario	Required
B2	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Required
B3	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required
B4	Biodiversity Impacts Monitoring	Required
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional

6.1.1.1. Complementarities of CCB’s safeguard criteria/principles with the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards and the WB safeguards

According to CCBA the 3rd Edition, CCB Standards are aligned with UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards and help projects to demonstrate that they meet the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards in all aspects (refer to section **4.3.1.A of this document: a) up to g) of the** UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards). Moreover, the document entitled “*Safeguards in REDD+ and Forest Carbon Standards: A Review of Social, Environmental and Procedural Concepts and Application*” (CLIMATEFOCUS, May 2013), that deals with the assessment of how the CCB safeguard criteria/principles align with UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards, was reviewed. Accordingly, the CCB’s safeguard criteria/principles (Social, Environmental and Procedural criteria) that align strategically (at higher level) with the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards, and the WB safeguard policies were analyzed and discussed as follows.

Social criteria:

- a) Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC): this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards (**c and d**) and the WB OP 4.10 that refers to the right of indigenous communities to free, prior, and informed consultation, though the latter does not refer to consent. CCB standard (G5) also requires free, prior and informed consent to be obtained in instances where land rights will be affected or where resettlement will occur.
- b) Vulnerable Groups: this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard and the WB’s OP 4.10. The CCB standard (G3) also requires effective consultation in such a way that they must give a “gender and inter-generationally inclusive” design.
- c) Land Tenure and Resource Rights: this criterion is required under Safeguard (b) subsection ‘*Effective National Forest Governance Structures*’ of the UNFCCC REDD+

safeguard principle to which the REDD+ program/project has to comply in line with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments. The WB's OP 4.10 requires legal recognition be obtained for projects being implemented on lands belonging to Indigenous Peoples, and also in the WB OP 4.12 requires involuntarily resettled persons to be provided with "adequate" land tenure. The CCB standard (G5) also states that a mechanism must be developed to address unresolved issues related to land tenure. In cases where disputes exist, project developers must find a resolution before the start date of the project.

- d) **Avoided Resettlement:** this criterion is required in the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard principle³¹ that the REDD+ program/project has to comply with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments. The WB OP 4.12 requires that involuntary settlement is avoided or minimized, and where unfeasible, assistance is given to displaced persons to improve or restore their livelihoods. The CCB standard (G5) also specifies projects must not involve the involuntary resettlement of people or their livelihood activities. Where resettlement does occur with free, prior, and informed consent, adequate compensation must be provided.

Environmental criteria:

- a) **Mitigate negative environmental impacts:** this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (e), and the WB OP 4.01 requires undertaking an EIA so as to identify, avoid, and mitigate potential negative environmental impacts. OP 4.04 and OP 4.36 also outline mitigation of negative impacts including forest displacement, conversion, and degradation. Likewise, the CCB standard (B1), as a mitigation of negative environmental impacts, states that invasive species populations must not increase and the use of GMO's is prohibited.
- b) **Biodiversity and other ecosystem services:** this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (e) and the WB OP 4.01, OP 4.04 and OP 4.36 address the preservation of areas with high biodiversity value and promote the protection of environmental services.

³¹ See Part III. *Selected Monitoring, Reporting, Complaints and Grievance Mechanisms under International Law*, under which full subscription to 'The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights' was made to monitor that countries are complying with their international commitments.

The CCB standard (CM1) requires that the projected impacts on ecosystem services, including water and soil resources, must be documented against the project baseline. The net benefit must be found to be positive. The CCB standard (B1) also specifies that net biodiversity impacts must be positive and High Conservation Values within the project should be enhanced or maintained.

- c) Address risk of reversals and displacement of emissions: this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (**f and g**) and the WB Operating Procedures do not explicitly outline reversals and displacement. However, these could be covered in OP 4.01 and 4.36 of avoiding and mitigating potential negative environmental impacts. The CCB standard (CL2) also stipulates Offsite Climate Impacts, which requires leakage types to be identified and mitigated to the greatest extent possible. Unmitigated leakage should be subtracted from net carbon benefits.

Procedural criteria:

- a) Policies, Laws and Regulations: this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (**a**), and the WB OP4.36 requires projects to abide by international environmental agreements and forest certification systems to adhere to all relevant laws. The CCB standard (G5) requires projects to document all relevant local and national laws and international treaties and agreements and provide assurances on how these regulations will be adhered to.
- b) Stakeholder Participation: this criterion is required in UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (**d**), and the WB Operational Policies such as OP 4.10 and OP 4.12 require consultation for those facing involuntary resettlement, while OP 4.01 may necessitate public consultations depending on the severity of environmental impact of a project and OP 4.36 requires the meaningful participation of affected communities. In line with this, the CCB standard (G3) requires evidence that community members have been effectively consulted in the project design, allowing stakeholders to communicate their concerns and desired outcomes. Further, a mechanism must be devised to continue consultations throughout the lifetime of the project.
- c) Monitoring and Reporting - criterion is required in UNFCCC Decision 12/CP.17, and the WB OPs including, OP 4.12, OP 1.00, OP 4.20, OP 4.10, OP 4.04, OP 4.01, and OP 4.36

contain references to the development of monitoring and/or reporting systems depending on the context and scope of the project being implemented. In line with this, the CCB standards (CL3), (CM3), and (B3) require monitoring systems to be developed within 12 months of validation.

- d) **Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM):** this criterion is required in the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard (b) that the REDD+ program/project has to comply with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments. The WB OP 4.12 requires putting in place conflict resolution procedures and a mechanism to be created for resolving potential conflicts arising from displaced persons. Similarly, the CCB standard (G3) requires a formalized process for responding to grievances within 30 days, facilitated by an independent mediator.

6.1.1.2. Comparison of CCB standards with the GoE's safeguards requirements

- a) **Community/public consultation:** CCB standard (G5) requires free, prior and informed consent to be obtained in instances where land rights will be affected or where resettlement will occur. Community consultation process and its implementation has been stipulated and set as a requirement in various GoE's legal documents including FDRE Constitution, Article 43(2)³² and EIAP No. 299/2002.
- b) **Vulnerable Groups:** The CCB standard (G3) requires effective consultation in such a way that they must give a "gender and inter-generationally inclusive" design. The FDRE Constitution, Chapter Three: Fundamental Rights and Freedoms: Art.13-44 covers broader issues of fundamental rights and freedoms enshrined in the international conventions and agreements out of which several national level policies and legislations were issued. For instance, the *National Health Policy* Article 8 (1-4) identifies sections of the society that will be given special attention: (i) family, particularly women and children; (ii) those in the forefront of productivity; (iii) those hitherto most neglected regions and segments of the population including the majority of the rural population, pastoralists, the urban poor and national minorities; and (iv) victims of man-made and natural disasters. The people who had been less advantaged in the past are generally referred to as the 'underserved people' in the Ethiopian policy and development discourses are given special attention in development planning.

³² See also FDRE Constitution, Chapter Three: Fundamental Rights and Freedoms: Art.13-44.

- c) Land Tenure and Resource Rights: The CCB standard (G5.1) states that all Property Rights are recognized, respected, and supported. Article 40 of the FDRE Constitution provides that land is a common property of the Nations, Nationalities and the People of Ethiopia, and shall not be subjected to sale or to other means of transfer or exchange. Article 35 reiterates the principle of equality of access to *economic opportunities*, including the right to equality in employment-related matters.
- d) Avoided Resettlement: The CCB standard (G5.3) also specifies projects must not involve the involuntary resettlement of people or their livelihood activities. Where resettlement does occur with free, prior, and informed consent, adequate compensation must be provided. Article 44(2) of the FDRE Constitution provides for the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation including relocation with adequate state assistance for all persons who have been displaced, or whose livelihood has been adversely affected as a result of state programs. Subsequent Proclamations (No. 455/2005 and 456/2005) provided detail legislative articles on how the Constitutional rights of citizens are protected in the event of expropriation of landholdings for public purposes.
- e) Stakeholder Participation: In line with this, the CCB standard (G3) requires evidence that community members are effectively consulted in the project design, allowing stakeholders to communicate their concerns and desired outcomes. Further, a mechanism must be devised to continue consultations throughout the lifetime of the project. Article 43(2) of the FDRE Constitution provides for the right to participate in national development, particularly the right to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community.
- f) Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): In line with this the CCB standard (G3.8) clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with Communities and Other Stakeholders. ***Expropriation of Landholdings for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation*** Proclamation Proc. No.455/2005. Article 11 provides how grievances are handled and administrative organ to hear grievances both in rural and urban areas.
- g) Mitigate negative environmental impacts: The CCB standard (B1), as a mitigation of negative environmental impacts, states that invasive species populations must not increase and the use of GMO's is prohibited. The requirement for managing negative

adverse impacts that could emanate from project activities is stipulated in various GoE's legal documents including: EIAP No. 299/2002 and FDCUP No. 542/2007. These proclamations request for developing and implementing appropriate environmental and social management plan and furthermore forests to be managed and utilized in accordance with approved management plans.

- h) Biodiversity and other ecosystem services: The CCB standard (CM1) requires that the projected impacts on ecosystem services, including water and soil resources, must be documented against the project baseline. The net benefit must be found to be positive. Recognizing and maintaining the biodiversity and other ecosystem services in the development of any project have been stipulated and set as a requirement in various GoE's legal documents including EIA No. 299/2002, National Biodiversity Policy (NBP) 1998, FDCUP No. 542/2007, and the Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia (CSE, 1996).
- i) Policies, Laws and Regulations: The CCB standard (G5) requires projects to document all relevant local and national laws and international treaties and agreements and provide assurances on how these regulations will be adhered to. Proclamation No. 299/2002 specifies projects and activities that are required to pass through an environmental impact assessment (EIA) process and empowers competent authorities at Federal level (formerly EPA, now MEFCC) and Regional Environmental Protection Organs to review the EIA and either approve the project (with or without conditions) or reject it.

The above review shows that strategically or at a higher level, the CCBA standards are aligned with the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard, the WB operational policies and the GoE's environmental and social safeguard requirements. *However, since strategic or higher-level alignment does not necessarily mean project level operational compliance. In the sections that follow attempts are made to review project level procedural and operational compliance of the two REDD+ projects safeguards instruments with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's safeguards requirements.*

6.1.2. Project Level Review on Compliance Status of BMERP's Implementation with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's Safeguards Requirements

In the foregoing paragraphs, higher level compatibility analysis was made between CCB safeguards standards, which the BMERP used, and the requirements of the GoE's, the WB's and the UNFCCC's REDD+ safeguard requirements. In this section, an attempt is made to closely examine the extent to which the CCB safeguard standards the BMERP chose to guide both the design and implementation of its Project were used on the ground. The finding of the ESR shows that despite their compatibility with the aforementioned requirements, the CCB's safeguard criteria/principles, which the BMERP subscribed to, were not consistently used both at procedural and operational levels. The finding of the ESR in general revealed that BMERP has no safeguards instruments prepared for its implementation. Hence, safeguard instruments required by the GoE's, the WB's and the UNFCCC's REDD+ were not considered during preparation and implementation.

During the field visits, it was observed that the requirement expected to be met before the implementation of project activities such as screening, ESIA and ESMP were not considered on the ground. In other words, the required instruments were not prepared and used, which is contrary to the requirements set in the various safeguard standards reviewed above. In view of this, for instance, the following subprojects/project activities which are planned to be implemented in the 2nd phase of BMER project are likely to have significant adverse environmental consequences if no proper safeguard framework instruments have been put in place for the subprojects/project activities stated hereunder. Hence preparing and implementing site specific instruments for subprojects/project activities as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments is highly required.

- e. Agricultural intensification and provision of economic alternatives;
- f. Provision of alternative fuel wood and construction poles supply from newly established plantations on non-forest lands;
- g. Constructing 10 biogas plants; and
- h. Piloting timber harvesting.

Thus, practicing and documenting of the environmental assessment or ESIA processes (from eligibility, screening up to final approval, environmental license, as required); and upgrading the traditional conflict resolution mechanism used by the project to establish project based GRM are crucial for this project to be nested in the umbrella Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP). The details of the gaps observed are discussed in the following sub-sections.

6.1.2.1. Compliance Status of BMERP Implementation with the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards

1. Safeguard (a): requires actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and relevant international conventions. The BMERP was designed in such a way that actions of this project complement or is consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and legal framework using PFM and other forest management measures. Safeguard (b) - requires transparent and effective national forest governance structures considering national legislation and sovereignty. BMERP established partnership between OFWE and NGOs, Community consultations, formation of PFM cooperatives, and different structures of CBOs and *WAJIBs*.
2. Safeguard (c) - respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities. The project uses traditional systems of forest resources use, management and access which is acknowledged through PFM.
3. Safeguard (d) - requires creating an enabling environment for effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. Community consultations using FPIC as a tool was implemented throughout the project. Safeguard (e) - requires actions consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits. In line with this, BMER project was designed to achieve the forest protection and conservation of natural forests and biological diversity of this landscape using PFM and *WAJIB* structures as driving forces.
4. Safeguard (f) - requires that actions have to address the risks of reversals and for sustainable use of natural resources. In order to address the risk of permanence issue, the project has been implementing participatory forest management and created awareness on the social, environmental and economic benefits of sustainable forest management

5. Safeguard (g) - requires actions should reduce displacement of emission. The project has implemented leakage management system by establishing leakage belt.

6.1.2.2. Compliance Status of BMER Project Implementation with the WB Safeguards

1. Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01): This is an umbrella operational policy of the World Bank used encompassing the natural environment, human health and safety, social aspects, and trans-boundary and global environmental aspects. The policy objective is to ensure World Bank supported projects are environmentally and socially sound. The type of environmental assessment (EA) would depend on the nature, scale, and potential environmental impact of the proposed investments. In line with the World Bank operational policy requirements, the BMERP didn't carry out environmental assessment, as well as didn't use any World Bank safeguard tools to assess the impact of the BMERP development activities/subprojects.
2. Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04): requires promoting environmentally sustainable development by supporting the protection, conservation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of natural habitats and their function. The project/BMERP was designed in such a way that the forest habitat to be protected, conserved, maintained, and rehabilitated; the operation for forest (natural habitat) protection and conservation has been made in accordance with the project's designing procedure. Though the BMERP has not carried out environmental assessment, it has undertaken different conservation activities, including participatory forest management for sustainable management of natural forest and conservation of natural habitats. Therefore, Phase II should address this gap.
3. Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09) – Requires minimizing and managing the environmental and health risks associated with pesticide use and promote and support safe, effective, and environmentally sound pest management including the integrated pest management (IPM) techniques and encourage their use in the whole of the sectors concerned. In line with this requirement, the BMERP Phase I did not require integrated pest management plan as pesticides were not used. However, Phase II needs to comply with the OP/BP. 4.09 as there are activities related with agricultural intensification which potentially requires pesticides, among others.

4. Forests (OP/BP 4.36) - requires the conservation of forest biodiversity, the sustainable management of forest areas, and the participation of local people particularly in the management of the surrounding forests. In line with this requirement, the project has been implementing participatory forest management (PFM) to conserve, develop, sustainably utilize and protect the forest by engaging the local community. However, the project didn't prepare and use site specific safeguards instruments to address environmental and social issues related with the implementation of participatory forest management and WAJIB.
5. Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37) - requires ensuring quality and safety in the design and construction of new dams and the rehabilitation of existing dams, and in carrying out activities that may be affected by an existing dam. The main objective of this operational policy is to protect people, property and the environment from the harmful effects of mis-operation or failure of dams and reservoirs. There was no any dam construction/rehabilitation during Phase I of the BMERP, but Phase II needs to trigger and comply with this Policy as agricultural intensification activities may require small dam construction/rehabilitation for small-scale irrigation activities.
6. OP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples (Underserved People's and Vulnerable Groups) - requires the government to engage in a process of free, prior and informed consultations with indigenous peoples, forest dependent communities. Bank considers the GoE's legal provisions and adopted the latter's policies, laws and regulations meant to address the social, economic and cultural marginalization of the communities broadly referred to as the 'underserved' in Ethiopia. The BMERP implemented the Free Prior Informed Consent throughout the project site and made underserved community members such as women as member of PFM cooperative leaders.
7. OP 4.12 Involuntary resettlement- requires that involuntary settlement is avoided or minimized, and where unfeasible, assistance is given to displaced persons to improve or restore their livelihoods. Even if the project has not undertaken any resettlement, this OP is triggered to meet the policy requirements on access to and use of natural resources including forest based and non-forest based resources. The respective subprojects/project activities have not prepared any mechanism to track issues related to OP 4.12.

8. OP 4.11 – Physical cultural resources - Aims to protect physical cultural resources. Though the BMERP is socially and environmentally friendly and unlikely to have significant adverse impact on the physical cultural resources, ritual sites of indigenous religions and cemeteries might be affected by the project. Nevertheless, it has not undertaken the required safeguard standard procedures.

6.1.2.3. Compliance Status of BMER Project Implementation with the GoE Safeguard Requirements

1. EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002 requires, projects where situated in environmentally sensitive areas such as land prone to erosion; desertification; and areas of archaeological interest, irrespective of the nature of the project to undertake a full or partial ESIA. Though this project is an environmentally and socially friendly project by its nature as indicated in the proclamation No. 299/2002, Article 2(2), when the Authority or the relevant regional environmental agency believes that the possible impacts of the project are insignificant, it may decide not to require the concerned Proponent to conduct environmental impact assessment. Even though, the implemented activity may not require conducting ESIA the project proponent and regulatory agency at regional and federal level need to full fill the procedural requirement of the country's ESIA guideline. However, in accordance with this requirement, action/decision was not taken by the Proponent and the federal/regional environmental agency. Thus, the project has not complied with the EIA Proclamation.
2. FDCU Proclamation No. 542/2007: requires forests to be managed and utilized in accordance with approved management plans; and forests have to be protected from fire, unauthorized settlement, deforestation, undertaking of mining and other similar activities. It also highlights the need for community participation and sharing from the benefits of sustainable forest management. Furthermore, it requires conditions have to be facilitated whereby inhabitants within a state forest shall continue living in the forest, while participating in the development and conservation of the forest, in a manner that shall not obstruct forest development. In line with this requirement, the project implemented sustainable forest management by employing participatory forest management. Thus, the project complies with the proclamation.
3. National Biodiversity Policy (*NBP* 1998): The policy provides a big framework and guidance towards effective conservation, rational development and sustainable utilization of the country's biodiversity. In line with this requirement, the project was implementing sustainable forest management giving emphasis to biodiversity conservation of the project area by using the international CCBA standard. Thus, this project fulfill the requirement of the national biodiversity policy of the country.

4. FDRE Constitution, Article 44 (2) - the right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation including relocation with adequate state assistance. Moreover, Proclamation No. 455/2005 (*Expropriation of Landholding for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation Proclamation*) provides for the expropriation of landholdings for public purposes and payment of compensation and establishes the legal principles and framework for expropriation and compensation. The finding shows that none of the project activities have so far necessitated involuntary resettlement, which would have entitled one to compensation provisions. Future project activities need to be evaluated for their potential impacts on the communities and the required safeguard standards should be strictly followed.
5. Article 43(2) of the FDRE Constitution - the right to participate in national development, particularly the right to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community. The BMERP has conducted community consultations and minutes recorded. Nevertheless, the documentation of the details of the processes followed were not sufficient.
6. Proc. No.455/2005 - GRM - Article 11 provides how grievances are handled and provides for administrative organs to hear grievances both in rural and urban areas. PFM Cooperative bylaws have provisions for the establishment of project based GRM. The project has been using indigenous conflict resolution mechanism and the project integrated the GRM in PFM. Nevertheless, no functioning project based GRM was reported during the fieldwork for this ESR.

Table III: Summary of project level review on compliance of BMER project implementation with the UNFCCC REDD+, the World Bank and the GoE's Safeguards Requirements

S. N	Safeguards standards	Pertinent requirements	BMER project	
			Procedural	Operational
I.	The GoE's Legal and Policy Requirements			
	EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002	Requires, projects where situated in environmentally sensitive areas, irrespective of the nature of the project to undertake a full or partial ESIA.	The Project has not complied with the EIA Proclamation, as environmental clearance letter was not issued by the federal/regional environmental agency.	It has also not complied operationally due to a failure to (i) carry out environmental assessment and (ii) get environmental clearance letter from the federal/regional environmental agency.
	FDCU Proclamation No. 542/2007	Requires forests to be managed and utilized in accordance with approved management plans. Require forests have to be protected; the need for community participation and sharing from the benefits of sustainable forest management, and creating conducive environment.	PFM and <i>WAJIB</i> structures have been using as driving force for this landscape forest development, conservation and sustainable utilization.	PFM is being practiced in the project areas for sustainable forest management.
	NBP 1998	Provides a big framework and guidance towards effective conservation, rational development and sustainable utilization of the country's biodiversity	This project was designed in such a way that effective conservation, rational development and sustainable utilization of the forested landscape of the project's area has to be realized.	The project used CCBA standard for sustainable conservation of biodiversity which goes in line with NBP 1998
	FDRE Constitution	Chapter Three: Fundamental Rights and Freedoms: Art.13-44	As a broader framework guided the project.	Complied with
	Article 40 of the FDRE Constitution	Land is a common property of the Nations, Nationalities and the People of Ethiopia, Article 35 reiterates the principle of equality of access to economic opportunities	PFM is installed by the project to provide access and economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits from the forest resource.	Complied with
	FDRE Constitution, Article 44(2) Proclamation no. 455/2005 and	The right to commensurate monetary or alternative means of compensation including relocation with adequate state assistance	No project activity necessitated involuntary resettlement.	Not applicable

	456/2005			
	Article 43(2) of the FDRE Constitution	The right to participate in national development, particularly the right to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community	FPIC was exercised and Consultations conducted and minutes recorded.	Nevertheless, the documentation of the details of the processes followed were not sufficient.
	Proc. No.455/2005.	GRM - Article 11 provides how grievances are handled and administrative organ to hear grievances both in rural and urban areas	Bylaws have provisions for the establishment of GRM	Traditional conflict resolution mechanisms were exercised, but project specific GRM has not been functional
II	WB Operational Policies			
	Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	It requires addressing environmental and social risks and enhancement of positive benefits using appropriate safeguard tools	The BMERP did not carry out environmental assessment to address environmental and social safeguards issues related with the Project. .	Not complied with, as site specific safeguards instrument(s) were not prepared and implemented.
	Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)	Requires promoting environmentally sustainable development by supporting the protection, conservation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of natural habitats and their functions	The project was designed and implemented in such a way that the forest habitat is being protected, conserved, maintained, and rehabilitated through establishing PFM groups and strengthen the existing PFM group and related institutional and capacity building/training actions. However, environmental assessment was not carried out to identify and address environmental and social issues <i>related with the implementation of PFM and WAJIB</i>	The BMERP has undertaken different conservation activities on the ground, including PFM, to conserve natural habitats, but related safeguards issues are not addressed using site specific safeguards plans.
	Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09)	Requires minimizing and manage the environmental and health risks associated with pesticide use and promote and support safe, effective, and environmentally sound pest management	Activities implemented by the BMERP Phase I didn't use pesticides; hence, integrated pest management plan was not required. However, Phase II requires IPM due to the newly incorporated agricultural	Phase I didn't use pesticides, but Phase II needs to comply with this Policy due to agricultural intensification, which potentially use pesticides to manage agricultural pests.

			intensification activities	
	Indigenous Peoples/Underserved and Vulnerable peoples (OP/BP 4.10)	Requires the government to engage in a process of free, prior and informed consultations with indigenous peoples.	The Bank takes the GoE's legal provisions and adopted the latter's policies, laws and regulations meant to address the social, economic and cultural marginalization of the communities broadly referred to as the 'underserved' in Ethiopia.	The BMERP implemented more stringent tool Free Prior Informed Consent throughout the project site and made underserved community members such as women as member of PFM cooperative leaders.
	Physical Cultural Resources (PCR) (OP/BP 4.11)	Aims to protect physical cultural resources ³³	BMERP didn't prepare and use EA/any mechanism to manage issues related to PCR.	Though the BMERP is generally environmentally friendly, it didn't use site specific safeguards instrument to address PCR issues on the ground if any.
	Forests (OP/BP 4.36)	Requires the conservation of forest biodiversity, the sustainable management of forest areas, and the participation of local people particularly in the management of the surrounding forests	PFM and WAJIB structures are being used as driving force for this landscape forest development, conservation and sustainable utilization. However, safeguards instruments were not prepared and used to address environmental & social issues related with <i>PFM and WAJIB systems</i> .	It didn't prepare and use site specific safeguards instruments <i>to address environmental and social issues related with the implementation of participatory forest management and WAJIB systems</i> .
	Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)	Requests to ensure quality and safety of dam projects and protecting people, property and the environment from the harmful effects of miss-operation or failure of dams and reservoirs.	There was no any dam rehabilitation/construction during Phase I of the BMERP period. But Phase II needs to trigger and comply with this Policy as agricultural	Phase I of the project activities was not related to dam construction. But, as stated before, Phase II needs to comply with OP/BP. 4.37.

³³Such as "movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, groups of structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archaeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, or other cultural significance. Physical cultural resources may be in urban or rural settings, and may be above or below ground, or under water" which could of cultural interest at the "local, provincial or national level, or within the international community". (Op 4.11, paragraph 1)

			intensification activities may require small dam construction/rehabilitation for small-scale irrigation activities	
III	UNFCCC			
	Safeguard (a)	Requires actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and relevant international conventions	The BMERP was designed in such a way that actions of this project complements or is consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and legal framework, the project using PFM and other forest management measures.	The project fulfill UNFCCC safeguard principle by implementing sustainable forest management system indicated in the national forest policy and strategy such as PFM and sustainable utilization of NTFP, among others.
	Safeguard (b)	Requires transparent and effective national forest governance structures considering national legislation and sovereignty	Partnership between OFWE and NGOs, community consultations, formation of PFM cooperatives, and different structures of CBOs and <i>WAJIBs</i> .	Complied with.
	Safeguard (c)	Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities	Traditional systems of forest resources use and management acknowledged through PFM and <i>WAJIBs</i> .	Complied with.
	Safeguard (d)	Requires creating an enabling environment for effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities;	The project used stringent FPIC tool to engage the local community	The project used Community consultations using FPIC as a tool throughout the project implementation
	Safeguard (e)	Requires that actions have to be consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity.	The BMERP was designed and implemented to achieve the forest protection and conservation of natural forests and biological diversity of this landscape using PFM and <i>WAJIB</i> structures as driving forces.	It complied with this safeguard principle.

	Safeguard (f)	Requires that actions have to address the risks of reversals.	In order to address the risk of permanence issue, the project has been implementing participatory forest management and created awareness on the social, environmental and economic benefits of sustainable forest management.	Sustainable forest management system installed and implemented by the project address the risks of reversals. Thus, it fulfills the requirement of this safeguard principle
	Safeguard (g)	Requires that actions have to reduce displacement of emission	The project has implemented leakage management system by establishing leakage belt.	To reduce emission displacement the project designed and implemented leakage management. Thus, it complies with this safeguard principle.

6.2. Review of Safeguard Procedures of the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project

The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project, which adopted the PFM strategy, is currently underway to finalize and reach the REDD+ initiative carbon stock market through ER approved by the MRV system. To meet the REDD+ project standard and to attain the internationally renowned verification level, the project has been striving its level best. So far, the project has been implementing the PFM guideline principles as a driving force/strategy to be explicitly approved as REDD+ project activity. The Participatory Forest Management (PFM) guidelines draw on 10 years of practical experiences of establishing PFM within the Non-Timber Forest Products-Participatory Forest Management (NTFP-PFM) Research and Development Project in the natural montane forests of South West Ethiopia. See PFM guidelines in the separately compiled document.

The national PFM guidelines explicitly state that the guidelines are generic ones and hence experimentation and adaptation is expected in any PFM implementation process. Accordingly, the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II project's PFM guidelines reflect the results of experimentation and are still harmonized in terms of concepts and principles with the national PFM guidelines, and follow similar, comparable process steps as can be seen in the table that follows.

Table IV: *Participatory Forest Management Guidelines employed in designing and implementation of REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project*

PFM Phases National Guidelines	PFM steps National Guidelines	PFM steps NTFP-PFM Guidelines
Phase 1. Mobilization	1. Getting started	1. Getting started
	2. Familiarization of PFM processes	
Phase 2. PFM planning process	3. Forest resource assessment and management planning.	2. Boundary negotiation and demarcation
	4. Organizing and legalizing CBOs	3. Facilitating forest management planning
		4. Organizing Community Based Institutions and internal regulations
Phase 3. Implementation phase		5. PFM agreement development, signing and awareness raising
	5. Capacity building and skills development	6. Forest management implementation and enterprise development
	6. Participatory monitoring and evaluation	7. Monitoring, evaluation and responsiveness.

The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project has not adopted or used any internationally accepted safeguard instruments used in different project level carbon standards such as VCS, CCBA and Plan VIVO³⁴ that are applicable for REDD+ projects. As it is known, PFM guidelines and principles can be used to make the forest to be managed in a sustainable way. This may help to align with UNFCCC safeguard principles – (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). However, PFM cannot fulfill all safeguard requirements of either of the three safeguard standards (GOE's, FCPF, UNFCCC) or others. In general, the finding of ESR revealed that, REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project has no safeguards instruments prepared for its implementation. Hence, the safeguard instruments required by the GoE's, the WB's and the UNFCCC's REDD+ were not considered in an organized form during implementation. Following this gap, some subprojects/project activities which are planned to be implemented in the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia phase II project are likely to have environmental and social risks and impacts. Therefore, the project needs to adopt and implement organized form of safeguard framework instruments (such as the OFLP safeguards instruments) for its subprojects/project activities.

Thus, to align with the WB funded umbrella OFLP, it is critically important for the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project to be guided by the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments. Hence, as a new entrant into the safeguard standard requirements of the GoE, the WB and the UNFCCC, the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project need to prepare and implement site specific instruments for its subprojects/project activity as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instrument.

Going forward, therefore, to fill the procedural and operational gaps of the two REDD+ projects, appropriate mitigation measures and specific action plans are proposed in *Chapter Nine* of this document.

³⁴The Plan VIVO standard has been applied on SW project that has been under implementation in SNNPR by the Ethio-wetlands Natural Resources Management Association. However, The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project which is being implemented in the 5 districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone (of the Oromia region) has not adopted or used any internationally accepted safeguard instruments or Plan VIVO.

7. Description of Potential and Actual Environmental and Social Impacts/Risks

This environmental and social review was undertaken in selected *woredas* of these two landscapes to identify both positive and negative impacts occurred in the two projects' forested landscape areas as a result of the two ongoing REDD+ projects and Non-REDD+ initiatives. Accordingly, from the field observation and public consultations made, both positive and negative impacts of these REDD+ projects and Non-REDD+ projects initiatives/activities inside and around these project areas have been observed (For detail information of BMER project and REJFMA-SW Ethiopia Phase II project and the sample *kebeles* and their socio-economic conditions, see Appendixes A and B, respectively)³⁵.

The cause and effect in different situation or process could be referred simultaneously. Hence to make this clear and to come up with proper enhancement measures for the registered positive impacts, to propose proper mitigation measure for identified negative impacts, and to propose corrective measures to be taken for factors contributing to these shortcomings, this chapter has been structured in four subchapters. These subchapters are: (i) actual and potential environmental and social impacts induced by the REDD+ projects activities; ii) actual and potential environmental and social impacts induced by the Non-REDD+ projects' activities and Community based activities/initiatives in or around the REDD+ projects areas; and(iii) actual and potential risks and challenges on overall forested landscapes project's management.

³⁵The reference is made to an Appendix, not an annex, and the former is part of the main document attached to the end of the main report to strengthen the data in the report and to provide detail information on each of the *kebeles* visited.

7.1. Actual and Potential Environmental and Social Impacts of the REDD+ projects

The major positive and negative impacts identified in the two ongoing projects are presented as follows:

1. Positive outcomes of the overall process

1. Strong sense of ownership and high commitment: members of the forest community are aware of and appreciate the all-rounded values of the forest ecosystem and committed to realize the sustainable management of their respective forest resources;
2. In some areas, there were reports that since the PFM cooperatives started involving in forest management, forests are regenerating and forest coverage has been increasing over the years as compared to pre-PFMs establishment period. In Chirri *Kebele* of Dallo Manna *Woreda*, it was reported that the forest density under their Birbirssa Forest Users Cooperative has increased by five hectares;
3. PFM cooperatives have systematically structured and well-functioning organs; functional working procedures, including bylaws, on sustainable use and forest management;
4. Emission reduction has been materialized and verified specially the BMER forested landscape (ready for Carbon market);
5. Degradation and deforestation rate has been decreased in these two REDD+ project areas;
6. Forest ecosystem values, functions and attributes are being highly appreciated by the community and these values function of the forest ecosystem have maintained in these two REDD+ project landscapes.

II. Actual and potential adverse environmental and social impacts induced by the REDD+ projects activities

The ESR team found no significant negative environmental and social impacts of the two REDD+ projects' activities. Though not significant, the summarized issues are stated below.

1. Membership fee and share contribution requirements limit membership to those who cannot afford to raise the required money;
2. The rigid carrying capacity principle of *WAJIBs* is challenged by population pressure and the need for more open forest users' associations specifically in the BMERP area;
3. Unmet/inflated expectation – people complain that they have waited for too long for the “REDD+ money” to come. Despite their immense contribution in awareness creation and conservation of forest resources, NGOs who have been running these projects are blamed for creating high expectation for financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative;
4. Women are less represented at the leadership positions among the *WAJIB* and PFM associations;
5. Lack of an inbuilt functional grievance redress mechanism but the BMER project is using local conflict resolution mechanisms like (*Jaarsummaa*);
6. Conflicts of interests were observed between PFM cooperative members and non-members over the use of forest resources; and
7. Potential agricultural intensification, including irrigation schemes, may cause wetland degradation or loss and pollution;

It should be noted that, as thoroughly discussed in Chapter Six, the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project did not consistently use the required safeguard instruments and the fact that the project did not have any negative environmental and social impact so far does not mean that the project is exempted from meeting any safeguard requirements. Therefore, to minimize the potential environmental and social risks and impacts of the project, s, the designing, planning and implementation of the project should follow the standard safeguard procedures.

Likewise, the subprojects of the 2nd phase of BMERP (e.g. agricultural intensification, piloting timber harvesting, etc.) are likely to have significant adverse environmental consequences if no proper safeguard framework instruments are put in place. Therefore, preparing and implementing site specific safeguards instruments (including pest management plan) for BMERP subprojects/project activities, as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments, is highly required.

7.2. Actual and potential environmental and social impacts of the *Non-REDD+ interventions*

1. Adverse impacts of Non-REDD+ interventions on forest resource of the REDD+ projects

1. Some activities at community level and government infrastructure development have been the causes for forest degradation of these landscapes. These negative impacts were observed in almost all sampled PFMs and WAJIBs subjected for this ESR. Even though the use of fuel wood from the forest is common in all forest groups, the WAJIBs Dodola *Woreda* are highly involved in the sale of fire wood.
2. The other activity that has been experienced in almost all forest groups is dry season grazing in the forest areas. Since members of the WAJIBs in Dodola *Woreda* are living in and totally dependent in the forest areas, the degree of the impact on the forest resource is higher than other groups such as PFMs.
3. The traditional free grazing in the forest area and collecting firewood for sale are the major causes of forest degradation by trampling/hampering the regeneration capacity, and by having access to cut/disturb underneath shrubs subsequently.
4. Especially in the newly established PFMs in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project and in some of BMER project such as Garambamo *Kebele* of Nansabo *Woreda*, changing the demarcated forest area to farmland has been reported.
5. Moreover, capital investment projects (e.g., infrastructure development) spearheaded by the government (regional and/*woredas*) will have negative impact on these forest landscapes (e.g., the road project planned to connect Adaba and Angetu and which is

under construction crosses the virgin forest of BMER) unless proper ESIA procedures have been followed prior to the commencement of the proposed projects.

6. In the middle of the BMNP near Senate, a quarry site is used as a borrow-pit for a road project apparently being constructed in one of the near-by cities, Goba or Robe.

2. Potential impacts of Non-REDD+ projects' activities on different ecosystems (forest, riverine or wetland) Degradation of these REDD+ projects

1. This potential impact is predicted in most of forest groups of the REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project landscape where there is a high demand and potential for irrigation schemes (GoE and other actors). On the one hand, construction facilities for the irrigation scheme can cause direct habitat destruction (such as wetland and forest habitat), on the other, following these development structures, increasing demand for additional arable land and using agrochemicals will also contribute to degradation of natural habitat.
2. Furthermore, high agricultural extension practices (using agrochemicals including pesticides), offsite of the forest area and near natural forest, have been experienced in most forest groups of the BMER landscape and rarely in the RJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project landscape. For instance, in sample *kebeles* of Wajitushabe and Buuraa Addeelle of the BMER landscape, where controlled trophy hunting is being practiced, using such agrochemicals will have an impact on the natural habitat of the wildlife. This forest area associated with these forest groups is the belt and corridor for movement of wildlife which is linked with Bale Mountains National Park.

3. Impacts of Non-REDD+ projects' activities as a source of pollutant (agrochemicals) on forest resource (habitat) of these REDD+ projects area

- Pollution is also expected in most of the forest groups of BMER landscape where agricultural extension service has been widely practiced and highly appreciated. If this activity continues without precautionary measures and not followed by a proper pest management framework/procedure, it could be a source of pollution for the forest ecosystem and other habitats, e.g., death for non-targets such as bee colonies, pollution

source for wildlife that have been using these areas as a corridor, and risk to human health and safety.

4. Health and Safety Issues emanated from Non-REDD+ project in these REDD+ projects area

- Among most of the forest groups of the landscapes subjected for this ESR, the risk on health and safety of human beings was reported because of traditional beekeeping which involves hanging beehives on very tall trees and harvesting honey from the hives mounting the trees at night. Death and permanent disabilities have been reported from such traditional activities in some forest groups of the BMER and few RJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project landscapes.

5. Resource use conflict³⁶

1. This social impact has been reported in almost all communities visited for this ESR. To mention some, between members and non-members of the PFM cooperatives on forest resource utilization and access.

7.3. Actual and potential risks and challenges of the forested landscapes projects

Investment pressure: It was reported that investment pressure has been increasing in some part of the BMER forested landscape area. The request for the coffee plantation investment in the designated forest area is becoming high. Accordingly, attempts for realizing this demand have been made, for instance, in Dodola *Woreda* PFMs' areas. One of the reasons given for unlawful request for investment land to succeed is lack of coordination and integration among sectoral offices from the *woreda* up to regional level. It is also important to note that attempts to acquire designated forestland for investment are intertwined with lack of good governance, rent-seeking

³⁶ For a detailed discussion on related matters, see section 5.7 of this report.

and corruption embedded in the structure of governance, which make the operation of the project more challenging.³⁷

Illegal logging and pouching: As a challenge, illegal logging and pouching have been reported. Though illegal, these acts are rarely matched with commensurate corrective measures (of course because of corruption in the system of justice and lack of capacity on the part of OFWE). This in turn, encourages more illegal logging and pouching.

Forest fire hazard: Though forest fire incidents were rare in the past few years among the study communities, when it occurs the probable causes include misuse of fire during hanging beehives and harvesting honey in traditional beekeeping; misuse of fire in the forest area, such as smoking; and fire from residential houses located inside or near the forest.

Planting exotic and fast-growing tree spp.: The tendency to plant fast growing tree species has been growing in most of the forest landscapes/project areas. In the project areas, the demand for fast growing plantation trees are growing because of the immediate economic return (by selling it) and making it as an alternative livelihoods support strategy. Moreover, OFWE is also growing these fast-growing exotic tree *spp.* such as *Eucalyptus* and *Gravillia* for sale and to fill the gap on the demand and supply of firewood and construction materials.

Firewood sale: Fuel wood sale is not only common, but also a means of survival for many families in the Bale/Arsi *kebeles* visited for this study. Due to deterioration of economic conditions, the widespread practice of sale of firewood can poses a challenge to the overall goal of the REDD+ project. This, therefore, necessitates the designing, planning and implementation of alternative livelihood support strategies that fit the peculiar situation and potential of the community members.

³⁷ For more discussion on this and illegal logging and corruption, see section 8.2 of this report.

8. Institutional Arrangement and Gaps

8.1. Institutional Arrangement

The two REDD+ projects covered in this ESR follow similar principles, namely Participatory Forest Management (PFM) in using forest community as principal managers and users of forest resources. They both organize forest users' community based organizations (CBO) called Joint Forest management (JFM) cooperatives. The JFM CBOs, after getting certificate of formal institution from the Oromia Regional State Cooperative Promotion Agency, sign a forest management agreement with the Oromia Forest & Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE)³⁸ to jointly manage the forest in their territory/*kebele*.

About the institutional arrangements the two projects put in place, there are some variations. In the BMERP the project proponent was "the Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE)," (Project doc. P. 33). The project document also states the roles of other entities involved in the project, namely Farm Africa and SOS-Sahel Ethiopia³⁹, as "supporting the government and the local communities, Joint Forest Management (JFM) cooperatives, in the implementation of the project activities, particularly in capacity building of both institutions".

REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II project document for the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora zone mentions OFWE as a partner along with the forest communities, Oromia cooperative agency, other local government offices and the private sector, while EWNRA remains the responsible organization for the implementation of the proposed project. The project document states that EWNRA will

³⁸ OFWE is an autonomous fully government-owned enterprise, established with regulation number 122/2009 issued in July 2009. It "owns concession for all of the forests and regionally administered wildlife related conservation area in Oromia State. The concession area of OFWE covers a total of 367,700 Km². OFWE's mission is to undertake conservation, sustainable development and utilization of the forest and wildlife resources in its concessions through community participation; ensure supply of forest products markets and services to domestic and international markets by enhancing forest industry; and subsequently contribute to the regional and national socio-economic development endeavors." (project doc. P.33)

³⁹ The two NGOs have also "been key organizations for development of the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ project (from Feasibility study through PDD development)". (ibid)

establish new Field Office⁴⁰, like other intervention *woredas such as Nono Selle*, in Becho, Didu and Halu *Woredas* for effective field implementation of the project.

OFWE, which owns concessions over forests in Oromia, through a memorandum of understanding (MoU) signed with the PFM cooperatives, discharges its mandate of ensuring “conservation, sustainable development and the use of forest and wildlife resources in its concessions”. In areas where it has been successfully implemented, PFM has generated real improvements in forest conditions, as well as the economic well-being of the communities living in and around the forests. Recognizing the effectiveness of PFM federal and regional governments formalized the approach by integrating it into forest governing policies. The federal forest proclamation (Proclamation no, 542/2007) and proclamations of three regional states (Oromia, Benishangul-Gumuz and Southern Nations, Nationalities and People) recognize PFM as the pillar of sustainable forest management. In fact, Oromia regional state is an exemplary in this respect by adopting early and issuing the first ever forest proclamation that recognized communities’ right of managing and benefiting from the forests. (MBERP, doc. p.33).

Regarding safeguards, the key responsible parties, including the safeguards team composition, for implementing the ESR’s actions (including site-specific safeguards instruments) for the two REDD+ Projects at the different administrative levels are given below.

Institutions	Accountabilities
Federal Level	
MEFCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jointly with concerned stakeholders, oversees and monitors the implementations of the ESR and gives recommendations/guidance to address gaps, if any. Through the National REDD+ Secretariat, provides guidance and technical support to OEFCCA/ORCU to carry out safeguards activities as per the findings of the ESR of the two REDD+ projects. Liaises with EWCA and other relevant stakeholders as needed. <i>Safeguards staff.</i> Generally, safeguards due diligence will be coordinated by an environmental safeguards specialist and a social development specialist. These two safeguards specialists are part of the key technical staff at the REDD+ Secretariat and work closely with ORCU safeguards specialists to ensure safeguards instruments are implemented and monitored.

⁴⁰The field office with joint involvement of the above listed key stakeholders will be responsible for the overall implementation of the project with a technical backstop support from the Ethio-wetlands and Natural Resource Association, Head office.

Institutions	Accountabilities
EWCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for managing the Bale Mountains National Park; hence, coordinates on issues of mutual concern, including, resettlement, PFM, A/R, and so on.
Regional State Level (Oromia)	
OEFCCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leads and coordinate the implementation of the ESR findings through ORCU, the implementing unit for OFLP (P156475) at regional, zonal, woreda, and kebele levels. Provides strategic and technical guidance to ORCU to ensure coordination among concerned stakeholders for the ESR implementation. <i>Safeguards staff.</i> The regional environmental impact assessment (EIA) experts of OEFCCA are responsible to oversee and ensure safeguards due diligence in the region.
ORCU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the OFLP (P156475) implementing unit within OEFCCA, coordinates and manages the implementation of the ESR of the two REDD+ projects Carries out and consolidates safeguards implementation and reporting (assisted by OEFCCA). Sub-state ORCU OFLP team engages with woreda- and kebele-level officials (woreda administrators and experts, DAs) and other actors to coordinate the ESR actions implementation on the ground. <i>Safeguards staff.</i> At the regional state level, as part of ORCU, there are two key technical staff responsible for environmental and social safeguards due diligence. These two-technical staff will also provide technical support and training on the implementation of the recommended safeguards actions, among others.
OFWE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jointly with those concerned (such as OEFCCA, ORCU, Farm Africa, Ethio-Wetlands), implements the ESR of the two REDD+ projects Monitors and reports to ORCU on the ESR implementation.
NGOs (Farm Africa; Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the support and guidance of OEFCCA/ORCU and those concerned, play key role in the overall implementation of the ESR planned actions. Report to OEFCCA/ORCU and those concerned on the ESR implementation. Through their branch offices at woreda levels, provide support to woreda government sector offices and WAJIBs and PFM associations on the implementation of the two REDD+ projects. <i>Safeguards staff.</i> Assign/hire a safeguards specialist to timely implement the recommended safeguards actions as per the ESR of the two REDD+ projects.
Zonal/sub-state level	
ZoEFCCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides administrative and technical support to respective WoEFCCs. Closely works with OEFCCA, ORCU, Farm Africa, Ethio-Wetlands and those concerned on ensuring the safeguards due diligence as per the ESR findings <i>Safeguards staff.</i> Environmental Impacts Assessment (EIA) experts of ZoEFCCA will be responsible for ensuring safeguards due diligence and providing technical support at the sub-state levels. Also, leads and administers the three OFLP lead facilitators, 38 OFLP woreda coordinators, and six OFLP safeguards coordinators—all part of ORCU staff. The six OFLP safeguards coordinators responsible for providing safeguards capacity building, including training and awareness, and technical support on safeguards implementation, monitoring, and documentation. They also provide regular zonal reports to the ORCU and safeguards specialists.
Woreda Level	
Woreda administration office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highest government administrative body at the woreda level providing political leadership support to projects/initiatives (including the two REDD+ projects) through coordinating woreda-level sectoral development activities. Ensures achievements of projects/ initiatives (including the two REDD+ projects) through providing timely administrative and technical support, among others.

Institutions	Accountabilities
WoEFCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides technical assistance to woreda sector offices and communities on safeguards matters, supports site monitoring, and ensures local ownership of safeguards instruments, and proper safeguards documentation through woreda EIA experts and OFLP woreda coordinators. Facilitates coordination of safeguards-related activities horizontally at the woreda level and with other relevant bureaus/institutions; and trains woreda level experts on the safeguard requirements. <i>Safeguards staff</i>. EIA experts are responsible for ensuring safeguards due diligence at woreda level
Kebele level (Kebele is the smallest administrative unit in Ethiopia)	
Kebele administration office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the oversight of the relevant sector woreda offices, coordinates the work of the DAs in agriculture, water, household energy, and forests, in implementing and monitoring OFLP activities as well as the ESR findings at the smallest administrative level. <i>Development agents</i> at the kebele level assist WAJIBS and PFM associations in implementing the ESR actions on the ground. They will screen subprojects of the two REDD+ projects against the eligibility criteria and send screening results to the respective WoEFCCs, as per the OFLP safeguards instruments.
Community-level user association (e.g. WAJIBs & PFM cooperatives)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively participates in implementing the ESR actions of the two REDD+ projects, including setting of functional GRM for the two REDD+ projects at the kebele level. Participates in monitoring the implementation of the ESR actions.

Since the two projects under ESR are REDD+ projects, they have multiple stakeholders from Federal to local grassroots level. At the federal level the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MoANR), the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC) and the national REDD secretariat housed in the MEFCC including its various committees at national and regional levels. In practice, however, the respective NGOs and the PFM cooperatives are the ones at the forefront of the project implementation. The gaps in institutional capacity will be discussed below.

8.2. Institutional Capacity Gaps

Emphasizing the huge potential of the forest in the visited *woreda*, experts and the officials consulted during the field visits complain that there is not enough human resource, number and mix of expertise to tap on this huge potential in a sustainable way.

For instance, one *woreda* official said that in the past forest was kept by the people because they used to get content with what they had and there was no population pressure in the area. Now, things have changed, namely people aspire to improve their life, and population pressure is

starting to be felt which might soon challenge the principle upon which sustainable use and conservation was based.

Experts acknowledge that there is lack of resources to ensure the protection of the natural forest. These include human resources, particularly experts on forestry and natural resources management, logistics such as vehicle and infrastructure (e.g., roads and electricity). For instance, OFWE⁴¹ branch and district level experts indicated that there is shortage of experts, both in terms of number and the mix of expertise required to facilitate, coordinate and monitor the activities of PFM cooperatives and resources such as a vehicle to effectively run the day to day operational activities of the project. Coordination and timely communication problem at the Head Office level, especially with various branches, was reported by some of the branches visited. At the Branch level there is no structure with a Box on social and environmental safeguards.

Participatory forest management cooperatives (called CBOs in BMER project and Forest Users' Associations in REDD+ project in Ilu Abba Bora) reported lack of support from the government structures when illegal loggers are caught red-handed in the forest. OFWE structures at Zonal and District levels recognize that they are not giving the support required to Forest Users' Associations and this is primarily because of lack of budget and staff. This is particularly the case at the district level where one expert is responsible to support Forest Users' associations in three or four *woredas*, several such associations in one *woreda*. Responsible institution in the project sites does not allocate a budget for the follow-up/back-stopping and support activities to Forest Users' Associations once they are established and signed an agreement with the responsible institution and this, in their view, was a major challenge which needs to be addressed.

OFWE's structure is different from that of OEFCCA, where the Branch level is the higher level, beneath which are the district and sub-district offices (there are eight branch offices in OFWE concession areas, one branch office may contain four to six district offices, but one district office

⁴¹Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE) was the implementing agency of the REDD+ projects until the establishment of Oromia Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority in July 2016.

may cover two to seven *woredas*. In OFWE concession areas, there are nearly 130 *woredas* in total.

OFWE does not have a *woreda* level structure. OFWE allocates staff to *woredas* that have plantations as they make profit. In the *woredas* and zones where OFWE has offices, Office of Agriculture expects OFWE to handle forest related issues even though OFWE does not have both the structure and the staff at the *woreda* level, leave alone a staff at the *kebele* level.

8.3. The New Institutional Arrangement and Its Implication

As a strategic multi-sectoral Government program utilizing diverse financing sources and partner support to scale up action, OFLP's institutional arrangement is anchored in the following principles: (a) the institutional setup relies on existing federal and state government structures; (b) clear institutional roles, responsibilities, and procedures based on existing institutional mandates; (c) extensive multi-sectoral coordination on planning and implementing related projects, activities, and policies critical for the OFLP's success; and (d) coordinating and leveraging selected relevant initiatives (financed by the Bank and/or others).

The OFLP implementation arrangements, led in Oromia National Regional State by the new Oromia Forest, Environment and Climate Change Authority (OEFCCA) established in July 2016⁴², include relevant institutions at the national, state, and sub-state levels with specific accountabilities and decision-making roles based on existing mandates. While Oromia REDD Coordination Unit (ORCU) reports administratively to the OEFCCA, the Authority officially mandated to oversee the forest sector in Oromia, it seeks strategic and tactical guidance from the Oromia Regional State Vice President, given the multi-sector nature of OFLP and land use challenges in the regional state.

The ORCU and OEFCCA will be supported by the MEFCC which will carry out a fiduciary oversight role through its National REDD+ Secretariat, and the regional state's multi-sector REDD+ Steering Committee and Technical Working Group will provide strategic guidance and technical inputs, respectively, to guide OFLP implementation. The OEFCCA and sector bureaus

⁴² Proclamation 199/2016 on July20, 2016.

including the Bureau of Agriculture and Natural Resources (BoANR), Bureau of Water, Minerals and Energy (BoWME), Bureau of Rural Land Administration and Use (BoRLAU) and OFWE will implement and coordinate activities on the ground through their decentralized staff. For example, OEFCCA, BoANR, and BoRLAU have field staff, *woreda* experts, and *kebele* development agents (DAs) (extensionists) who cover forest, agriculture, water, and household energy. However, OEFCCA will, in the near-term, rely on Development Agents (DAs) under the authority of the BoANR to implement investment activities on the ground until OEFCCA has its own core of DAs in place. OFLP safeguards coordinators will be placed at Zonal level to oversee the safeguards work of the OFLP *woreda* coordinators and to ensure that environmental and social safeguards are implemented according to the OFLP environmental and social safeguards instruments.

The OFWE remains a key implementing partner in OFLP. Unlike other sector Bureaus, OFWE does not follow the zonal and *woreda* structure and instead follows its own district structure based on its forest concessions. However, owing to its experience with implementing PFM, preparing OFLP, hosting ORCU for the past two years, managing plantations and large natural forest concessions where carbon-rich high forest and deforestation hotspots are located, OFWE will continue as a key implementing partner in OFLP. Moreover, given its dual public and private mandates, OFWE is cultivating private sector relationships.

The final OFLP project appraisal document offers a long list of key stakeholders, with a wide range of experience, organizational capacity, focus areas (e.g., water, forest, climate, conservation, etc.), and legal mandates, and different levels of organizations, community, private, non-governmental, and government structures from the federal to the *kebele* levels. The coordinated efforts of all of this will make the current institutional arrangement and implementation structure of OFLP a plausible good start. One should not, however, lose sight of the challenges ahead when individual institutional interests override that of a collective responsibility as was observed during the fieldwork for the this ESR and well noted in the OFLP final project appraisal document when it states, “institutional capacity is slowly being strengthened; some of the main challenges include weak multi-sector coordination, overlapping mandates, and inadequate staffing at all levels” (P.18-19).

9. Conclusions, Recommendations and the Way Forward

9.1. Conclusions

This ESR study was conducted in two ongoing REDD+ projects. As discussed in the foregoing chapters of this report, the two REDD+ projects have significant social and environmental footprints, which include, among others, the following key issues:

1. Strong sense of ownership and commitment developed among the forest dependent communities;
2. Forest coverage has been increasing over the years as compared to pre-PFM cooperative establishment period.
3. PFM cooperatives have systematically structured and well-functioning organs; functional working procedures, including bylaws, on sustainable use and forest management;
4. Forest degradation and deforestation has decreased in these two REDD+ project areas;
5. In BMER project, emission reduction has been materialized and verified, i.e., ready for Carbon market; and
6. Forest ecosystem values, functions and attributes are being highly appreciated by the community.

These are clear indications that the two REDD+ projects have broad community support in spite of some gaps observed both during preparation of the project documents and implementation of the project activities.

The findings of the Review show that the BMER project used CCB standards as safeguards principles/instruments at a higher level during project design. However, as discussed in Chapter six of this document, gaps that need actions were identified for the implementation phase. The REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project used PFM guidelines and principles to make the forest to be managed in a sustainable way. However, it has not yet adopted or used any internationally accepted safeguard instruments used in different project level carbon standards such as VCS, CCBA and Plan VIVO that are applicable for REDD+ projects.

Notwithstanding the benefits of the PFM cooperatives, sustainability of forest protection might be threatened (e.g., by illegal logging, forest clearing for cultivation, civil unrest) unless it is strengthened using the already started livelihood improvement activities by focusing and engaging forest dependent communities, especially the poor and unemployed youth, through livelihood diversification mechanisms.

PFM cooperative registration fees, share contribution requirements and strict application of *WAJIB* principles were observed as factors restricting access to cooperatives and this involves the risk of further marginalizing the vulnerable members of the communities. The two REDD+ projects lacked a *functioning* inbuilt grievance redress mechanism but the BMER project is using local conflict resolution mechanisms like (*Jaarsummaa*) and integrated GRM in the PFM.

There was transparent and honest discussion and negotiation with the community on issues of entitlements, duties and responsibilities of each project partner/stakeholder.

Unrealized emission reduction payment has caused a lot of frustration among the forest dependent communities and might have adverse effect on the sustainable use of forest resources. Illegal logging and lack of good governance (e.g., corruption) in the local level administration and law-enforcement organs pose serious threat to the attainment of project goals and sustainable use of forest resources.

Lack of market outlet for the forest based resources (e.g., coffee, honey, spices, other NTFP) forces forest dependent communities either to sell their produce at throw away price at the local market or venture into unpredictable price speculation long after the harvest.

Therefore, there is a need for some mitigation measures and actions that need to be taken on safeguard issues/gaps, other risks and challenges of the two REDD+ projects for them to be aligned with the umbrella *Oromia Forested Landscape Program (OFLP)*. In view of this, this chapter will focus mainly on how best to address these gaps.

Furthermore, as discussed in the previous chapters of this report, various actual and potential impacts, risks and challenges that emanate from non-REDD+ projects could hinder the effectiveness of the management of these REDD+ projects. Therefore, to address the gaps

identified on the safeguard requirements of the two REDD+ projects, appropriate mitigation or supportive measures are proposed for those impacts likely to emanate from non-REDD+ projects' activities in or around the REDD+ project areas. For external factors that cause risks and challenges, appropriate recommendations and the way forward are proposed for the effective and sustainable management of these projects.

It is believed, if the proposed action points are implemented and recommendations are heeded to, the projects will help attain their goals more sustainably and the gaps observed in safeguards procedures will be addressed.

9.2. Recommendations to Address REDD+ Projects Compliance gap

It is important to adopt and implement OFLP's safeguard framework instruments for these two REDD+ projects' activities/subprojects. More specifically, establish proper and effective environmental and social monitoring systems and establish inbuilt grievance redress mechanism (GRM) based on the OFLP requirement (the OFLP's ESMF). Hence, the following actions are proposed. For the specific Action Plan Matrix, see **Table V. A** for BMER project and **Table V.B** for REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project.

1. Distribute hard copies of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SE(SA), and PF documents for the 16 (11 in BMER+ and 5 in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project) REDD+ *woredas* (REDD+ Hosting/focal offices) and *woreda* administration offices;
2. Undertake a one day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA for all REDD+ *woreda* administrators, three officials from each *woreda* (*woreda* administrator, *Woreda* Rural Land Administration and Use Office Head and REDD+ focal IA head);
3. Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF,SA, PF and SESA, particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for all REDD+ *woredas*/members of REDD+ technical committee (three experts from each *woreda*);
4. Cascading these trainings to all *woreda* IAs, DAs (10 participants from each *woreda* and two days training program);

5. Conduct one day training on ESIA tools for the 16 REDD+ *woredas* (especially, eligibility and screening checklist) at cooperative level, one person each from the 114 (64 from BMERP and 50 REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project) cooperatives/CBOs;
6. Establish a functional Environmental and Social Management (ESM) system through training on ESMF, Resettlement Management System (RMS) and SAs and establish the Environmental and Social Safeguard units at project level in both projects.
7. To address problems related to GRM: (i) translate GRM (Annex 11 of OFLP ESMF) into Afan Oromo and distribute to 114 cooperatives; (ii) conduct one day training on GRM for 16 REDD+ *woredas* at each cooperative level, one person each from the 114 cooperatives/CBOs; and (iii) establish GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level where they never existed or strengthen their capacity through awareness raising and training where they existed but were not functional;
8. To overcome access restriction caused by rigid *WAJIB* principles, restructure the 68 *WAJIBs* in BMERP area following the cooperative principles of voluntary membership of the residents of a *kebele* as per the legal provisions rather than sticking to the carrying capacity of the land principle, i.e., 12 hectares per household as was the case when *WAJIBs* were established in the early 2000s. *WAJIB* collective/group membership into PFM cooperatives be replaced by individual membership. Since pressure is very high on *WAJIB* members from non-members, through continuous consultation, a workable modality on the uses of forest and *WAJIB* resources could be negotiated. Establish a Task Force composed of relevant stakeholders to accomplish this task.
9. Poor households who could not join PFM cooperatives due to inability to pay the registration fee should be supported through flexible local level solutions such as means-test-based exemption of registration fee; allowing them sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; by keeping the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and by introducing installment based

payment. PFM cooperative members who cannot raise the required share contribution payment to join Forest Users Service Cooperatives should be supported through lower share contributions to be paid on installment basis. The specific details of these proposals can be worked out through discussions and negotiations at each PFM cooperative level since ‘one size fits all’ proposal cannot be made from the outset.

10. Strengthen and conduct continuous consultation with the local communities to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through an honest, transparent and realistic discussion with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. More specifically, strengthen and conduct continuous consultation workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 11 REDD+ *woredas* at cooperative level, two persons each from the 64 cooperatives.
11. Strengthening of the already started livelihood improvement activities by focusing and engaging forest dependent communities, especially the poor and unemployed youth, through livelihood diversification mechanisms. To address institutional coordination gaps, OEFCCA needs to take full responsibility and revitalize the *woreda* level structures (institutional platform) to ensure all environmental and social safeguards issues of these projects are addressed. Moreover, *Woreda* Steering and Technical Committees (the latter chaired by OEFCCA) *need to be* strengthened and periodically review their performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.
12. To address the potential environmental and social impacts that will emanate from the projects’ activities/subprojects, prepare and implement site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plans) for its subprojects/project activity as per the OFLP’s safeguard framework instruments.
13. Conduct annual Environmental and Social Performance Monitoring/Review to ensure the implementation of the proposed action points.

Table V.A: Summary of the Mitigation Measures (Action required) for BMER Project

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1	One of the instruments (procedures) of the Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard requirements, and the GoE's EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002 requirement has not been addressed or considered	Distribute hard copy of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA documents for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (REDD+ Hosting offices) and <i>woreda</i> administration office	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	8,228.00
		Undertake a one-day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF and the social safeguard guidelines for all REDD+ <i>woreda</i> administrators, 3 officials from each <i>woreda</i> (<i>Woreda</i> administrator, <i>Woreda</i> office of Rural Land Administration & Use Head and REDD+ focal IA head) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 3 days x 500 birr/day = 49500.00 Transport/fuel: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 150 birr/round trip= 4950.00 Total= 54450.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	54,450.00
		Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF, PF and SES. Particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for 11 <i>woredas/zones</i> IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda/zone</i>) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 5 days x 300 birr/day = 49500.00 Transport: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 100 birr/round trip= 3300.00 Total= 52800.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	52,800.00
		Cascade these trainings to 11 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and one-day training program) 11 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 3 days x 300 birr/day = 99000.00 Transport: 11 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 100 birr/round trip=	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	110,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		11000.00 Total= 110000.00			
		Conduct one-day training on the important ESIA tools for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (especially, eligibility and screen checklist) at cooperative level, two persons from each cooperative of a total of 64 cooperatives. 64 cooperatives x 2 people x 3 days x 150 birr/day = 57600.00 Transport: 64 cooperatives x 2 people x 100 birr/round trip= 12800.00 Total= 70400.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	70,400.00
		Establish at project level a functional fully responsible Environmental and Social safeguard unit by assigning and/or hiring a professional environment and social safeguard specialist.	OEFCFA/ORCU in collaboration with Farm Africa SOS-Sahel Ethiopia with	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	Salary as per the organization's scale
S. Total					295,878.00
Operation cost⁴³					50,000.00
G. Total					345,878.00
2	The existing PFM structure does not have an inbuilt grievance Redress mechanism (GRM)	Translate GRM (Annex 11 of ESMF) into Afan Oromo and distribute for 64 cooperatives	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	656.00
		Conduct one-day training on GRM as provided for in the OFLP ESMF (see Annex 11) for 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, one person from each cooperative of a	OEFCFA, ORCU		35,200.00

⁴³ Facilitation cost involves administrative expenses such as per diem for trainers, fuel, secretarial and stationery.

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		total of 64 cooperatives.			
		Strengthen or establish inbuilt GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level as per the provisions of the OFLP ESMF and ensure they are functional. Activities include: awareness raising, training and refresher workshop. (64 PFM coop x 5 members of <i>Gumii Hayyoota</i> x 5 days/year x 150 Birr/day)	Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	2 nd quarter 2011 EFY	240,000.00
3	WAJIB structure is not open for new membership	Conduct a two-day awareness raising and consensus building workshop for the 68 WAJIBs having an average of 30 members.	OEFCFA, ORCU, with the support of Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	122,400.00
		Establish a task force composed of relevant stakeholders to restructure the 68 WAJIBs into PFM cooperatives. Proposed stakeholders: Woreda administrator; WOEFCCA; WRLAUO; OFWE district office Head; Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Representative; PFM Coop. and WAJIB to be represented by one person each (5 <i>kebeles</i> x 2 days each x 7 people x 200 Birr/person/day) = 14,000.00 Consultation with WAJIB members: 68 WAJIBs x 30 HHs/WAJIB x 150 Birr/day/person x 2 days = 612,000.00 Transport of the Task Force members: 5 <i>kebeles</i> x 2 days x 7 people x 100 birr/day=7,000.00	OEFCFA and OFWE in collaboration with Farm Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	1 st & 2 nd quarters of the 2011 EFY	663,000.00
4	Registration fee & share contribution	Through community consultation and negotiations, introduce means-test-based exemption of registration fee;	OEFCFA, ORCU in collaboration with Farm	1 st & 2 nd quarters of 2011	120,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
	requirement as barriers to PFM cooperative membership	allowing them to sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; keep the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and introduce installment based payment. Introduce a lower share contribution requirement and ensure they are paid on an installment basis.	Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	EFY	
5	Over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative	Conduct a one-day workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, two persons each from the 64 cooperatives. (64x2x150=19,200.00)	OEFCCA, ORCU with the support of Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	19,200.00
		Since addressing this problem requires continuous engagement, conduct honest, transparent and realistic discussions with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. The guiding principle should be “ <i>never promise what you cannot deliver!</i> ” <i>Lump sum budget allocated to conduct series of meetings and community consultations.</i>	OEFCCA, ORCU with the support of Farm Africa, SOS- Sahel Ethiopia	2 nd & 3 rd quarters of 2011 EFY	200,000.00
6	Gap in strengthening livelihood options/activities for unemployed youth and vulnerable peoples	Customize livelihood needs assessment as per the OFLP livelihoods activities and implement it through strengthening the ongoing livelihood activities, with a focus on the unemployed youth and vulnerable peoples.	OEFCCA, ORCU, with OEFCCA/OFWE	Assessment: 1 st quarter of 2011 EFY Strengthen livelihoods activities: at least throughout	500,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
				the project life	
7	Institutional coordination and capacity/coordination gaps	<p>OEFCCA needs to take full responsibility to ensure through its <i>woreda</i> level structure that all environmental and social safeguards issues of these projects are addressed.</p> <p>Use institutional platform to address the gaps. <i>Woreda</i> Steering committee and technical committees need to be strengthened and periodically review their performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.</p> <p>OEFCCA should play its roles as a leader of the Technical Committee.</p>	OEFCCA, through its <i>woreda</i> structures	At least throughout the project life	Regular budget
8	Environmental & social management gaps	Prepare and implement site specific instruments (including integrated pest management plan) for its subprojects/project activity as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments.	OEFCCA/ORCU in collaboration with Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	Throughout the project life	Regular budget
9	Environmental and Social Performance Monitoring/Review	OFLP and partners need to conduct environmental and social monitoring to ensure the implementation of the proposed action points	ORCU & Partners	Every year	1,000,000
				Sub Total	2,900,456.00
				Operation cost	100,000.00
				G. Total	3,000,456.00

Table V.B: Summary of the Mitigation Measures (Action required) for REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1.	One of the instruments (procedures) of the Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguard requirements, and the GoE's EIA Proclamation No. 299/2002 requirement has not been addressed or considered	Distribute hard copy of the OFLP's ESMF, RPF, SA, PF and SESA documents for 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (REDD+ focal offices)	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	2420.00
		Undertake one-day sensitization workshop on OFLP's ESMF and the social safeguard guidelines for all REDD+ <i>woreda</i> administrators, 3 officials from each <i>woreda</i> (<i>Woreda</i> administrator, <i>Woreda</i> office of Rural Land Administration & Use Head and REDD+ focal IA head) 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 3 days x 500 birr/day = 22500.00 Transport/fuel: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 150 birr/round trip= 2250.00 Total= 24750.00	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	24,750.00
		Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on the ESMF, RPF, PF and SESA. Particularly on the ESIA steps and procedures for 5woredas/zones IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda/zone</i>); 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 5 days x 300 birr/day = 22500.00 Transport: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 3 people x 100 birr/round trip= 1500.00 Total= 24000.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	24,000.00
		Cascade these trainings to 5woreda IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and 2 days training program) 5 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 3 days x 300 birr/day = 45000.00 Transport: 5 <i>woreda</i> x 10 people x 100 birr/round trip= 5000.00	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	50,000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
		Total= 50000.00			
		<p>Conduct one-day training on the important ESIA tools for 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (especially, eligibility and screen checklist) at cooperative level, one person each from the total of 50 cooperatives.</p> <p>50 cooperatives x 2 people x 3 days x 150 birr/day = 45000.00 Transport: 50 cooperatives x 2 people x 100 birr/round trip= 10000.00 Total= 55000.00</p>	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	55,000.00
		Establish at project level a functional fully responsible Environmental and Social safeguard unit by assigning and/or hiring a professional environment and social safeguard specialist.	OEFCFA/ORCU in collaboration with Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association	1 st quarter of 2010 EFY	Salary as per the organization's scale
		Sub Total			156,170.00
		Operation cost			25000.00
		Grand Total			181,170.00
2	The existing PFM structure does not have an inbuilt grievance Redress mechanism (GRM)	Translate GRM (Annex 11 of ESMF) into Afan Oromo and distribute for 50 cooperatives	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	600.00
		Conduct one-day training on GRM as provided for in the OFLP ESMF (see Annex 11) for 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, one person each from the total of 50 cooperatives.	OEFCFA, ORCU	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	27500.00
		Functionalize GRM structure at each PFM cooperative level as per the provisions of the OFLP ESMF and ensure they are functional.	EWNRA with the support of OEFCFA/ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA	1 st quarter 2011 EFY	55000.00

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
3	Registration fee & share contribution requirement as barriers to PFM cooperative membership	Through community consultation and negotiations, introduce means-test-based exemption of registration fee; allowing them to sell firewood from dead trees to raise the required registration fee; keep the registration fee as low as the poorest of the poor can afford; and introduce installment based payment. Introduce a lower share contribution requirement and ensure they are paid on an installment basis.	OEFCFA, ORCU in collaboration with EWNRA	2 nd quarter 2011 EFY	100,000.00
4	Over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative (address this points with GRM)	Conduct one-day workshop to manage over-expectation of financial and non-financial support from REDD+ initiative through open and serious discussion with the community of 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> at cooperative level, 2 persons each from the 50 cooperatives. (50x2x150=15,000.00)	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of EWNRA	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	15,000.00
		Since addressing this problem requires continuous engagement, conduct honest, transparent and realistic discussions with the forest dependent communities on what benefits they could accrue from participation in the project. The guiding principle should be “ <i>never promise what you cannot deliver!</i> ” <i>Lump sum budget allocated to conduct series of meetings and community consultations.</i>	OEFCFA, ORCU in collaboration with Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	100,000.00
5	Lack of livelihood options for unemployed youth and vulnerable peoples	Carry out a livelihood needs assessment as per the OFLP livelihoods needs assessment and implement it through strengthening the ongoing livelihood activities, with a focus on the unemployed youth and underserved community members	OEFCFA, ORCU, by hiring a consultant	Assessment: 1 st quarter of 2011 EFY Strengthen livelihoods diversifications: at least	The cost for this activity is covered in BMERP Action number 6 above.

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
				throughout the project life.	
6	Institutional coordination and capacity/coordination gaps	<p>OEFDCA needs to take full responsibility to ensure through its <i>woreda</i> level structure that all environmental and social safeguards issues of these projects are addressed.</p> <p>Use institutional platform to address the gaps. <i>Woreda</i> Steering committee and technical committees need to be strengthened and periodically review their performances in light of their respective sectoral mandates.</p> <p>OEFDCA should play its roles as a leader of the Technical Committee.</p>	OEFDCA, through its <i>woreda</i> structures	At least throughout the project life	Regular budget
7	Environmental & social management gaps	Prepare and implement site specific instruments (including pest management plan as needed) for its subprojects/project activity as per the OFLP's safeguard framework instruments.	Ethio-wetland and Natural Resource Association in collaboration with OEFDCA/ORCU	Throughout the project life	Regular budget
8	Environmental and Social Performance Monitoring/Review	OFLP and partners need to conduct environmental and social monitoring to ensure the implementation of the proposed action points	ORCU & Partners	Every year	750,000.00
				Sub Total	1,048,100.00
				Operation cost	50,000.00
				Grand Total	1,098,100.00

9.3. Proposed Mitigation Measures for Non-REDD+ initiatives

This section deals mainly with measures that need to be taken to address the impacts of non-REDD+ projects implemented in and around the REDD+ projects covered in this ESR. As discussed earlier, these are non-REDD+ development or investment projects and should not have been the focus of this ESR. However, they are being implemented either within the two REDD+ project areas or in the surrounding areas, and have significant impacts and risks to the two REDD+ projects' development goals. In light of this, the following recommendations are suggested to curb the negative impacts of such projects and mitigate their potential risks to the two REDD+ projects. For the action plan Matrix, see *Tables VI. A and VI. B*.

A. Training, awareness raising and research

- i. Conduct TOT and promote an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques, especially promote the indigenous pest management knowledge in these landscapes as deemed necessary;
- ii. Conduct awareness raising programs on pesticide handling, application and necessary precautionary measures to be taken so as to protect human health, the forest ecosystem and fragile habitats;
- iii. Reinforce effort made before on managing of unintended fire hazards by conducting awareness raising programs for the members of forest management groups;
- iv. Avoid the risk of death and disability caused by falling from trees while hanging beehives or harvesting honey (esp. in BMER project areas) through experience sharing, promotion of modern bee-keeping (backyard practice);
- v. Involve the law-enforcement organs of the *woredas* (the police, attorneys and judges) in the capacity building programs of these REDD+ projects so that they could understand project goals and be part of the core stakeholders of these unique forest landscapes; and
- vi. Develop, adopt, promote and practice sustainable livestock development in these landscapes, especially development of sustainable feeding strategy that could change the traditional way of dry season free grazing within the forest.

B. Provision of material and equipment

- i. Provision and promoting of an alternative fuel energy technology for domestic use;
and
- ii. Reinforcing provision of firefighting equipment that will be used centrally, at least at cooperatives level; especially for those cooperatives who lost these equipment as a result of the recent political unrest (e.g., Adaba – Dodola areas of BMER project).

Table VI.A: Summary of the Mitigation measures for non-REDD+ Projects' activities undertaken in the BMERP area

S/N	Identified Risk/Challenges	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1	Low level awareness on pesticide handling & application and necessary precautionary measures to be taken	Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on pesticide handling, application, precautionary measures to be taken and IPM plan preparation for 11 <i>woredas</i> /zones IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda</i> /zone)	OEFCOA, ORCU with the support of Oromia BoA	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	76,800.00
		Cascade these trainings to 11 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and 1 days training program)	OEFCOA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	145,600.00
2	Fire hazard risk	Conduct a one-day refreshment training on forest fire management for 64 cooperatives (2 persons from each)	ZoEFCCA/WoEFCCA and Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	70,400.00
		Provision of 100 firefighting equipment (an ordinary spade type equipment), especially for those cooperatives who lost these equipment as a result of the recent political unrest (e.g., Adaba-Dodola areas of BMER project)	OEFCOA, ORCU and Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	10000.00
3	High dependence on forest wood for domestic use/sale	Provision of additional 1000 alternative fuel energy equipment and promotion of this technology for domestic use.	OEFCOA, ORCU and Farm Africa/SOS-Sahel Ethiopia	Starting from 2011 to 2012 EFY	108,000.00
4	Risk of falling from top tree branches during traditional tree harvesting (especially	Conduct Farmer to farmer experience sharing (30 farmers drawn from BMER project cooperatives) for 1 day will learn Safeway of honey harvesting experienced in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project forest honey producer	OEFCOA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	24,000.00

	in BMER project area) Resulting Death and being permanent physical injury	Promotion of modern bee-keeping (backyard practice), to support the traditional forest honey production, by piloting it on 11 <i>woredas</i> of 1 representative cooperative that has involved in forest honey production. Provide 50 modern beehive for each cooperative.	OEFCFA, ORCU and Farm Africa/SOS- Sahel Ethiopia	Starting from 2 nd quarter of 2011 to 2012 EFY	200,000.00
5	Weak legal enforcement on sustainable forest management endeavors	Conducting one-day refreshment training on forest management and governance for law-enforcement organs of the 11 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (the police, attorneys and judges), three participants from each <i>woreda</i> .	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	79,200.00
6	Forest degradation as a result of free and uncontrolled dry season free grazing in the forest area	Undertake research that will result in developing, adopting, promoting and practicing sustainable livestock development in BMER project landscapes (sustainable feeding strategy that could support the traditional way of dry season free grazing within the forest)	OEFCFA, ORCU with support of Oromia BOA and Consultant	Starting from 3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	200,000.00
		Conduct 2 days training of trainers (TOT) on developing, adopting, promoting and practicing sustainable livestock development in these landscapes, for 11 <i>woredas/zones</i> IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woredas/zones</i>)	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of Oromia BoA	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	62,400.00
		Cascading these trainings for 1 day to 11 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (20 participants from each <i>woreda</i>)	OEFCFA, ORCU, OBOA with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	4 th quarter of 2011 EFY	320000.00
				S. Total	1,296,400.00
				Operation cost	100,000.00
				Grand Total	1,396,400.00

Table VI.B: Summary of the Mitigation measures for non-REDD+ projects' activities undertaken in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II Project area

S/N	Identified Gap	Proposed Mitigation Measures and Recommendations for Corrective Actions	Responsible body	Time Duration/	Cost in EBR
1	Low level of awareness on pesticide handling & application and necessary precautionary measures to be taken	Conduct three days training of trainers (TOT) on pesticide handling, application, precautionary measures to be taken and IPM plan preparation for 5 <i>woredas/zones</i> IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda/zone</i>)	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of Oromia BoA	1st quarter of 2011 EFY	24,000.00
		Cascading these trainings to 5 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (10 participants from each <i>woreda</i> and 1 days training program)	OEFCFA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	1 st quarter of 2011 EFY	50,000.00
2	Risk of fire hazard	Conducting one-day refreshment training on forest fire management for 50 cooperatives (2 persons from each)	ZoEFCCA/WoEFCCA and Ethio-wetland Natural Resource Association (EWNRA)	2 nd quarter of 2011 EFY	55,000.00
3	High dependence on forest wood for domestic use/sale	Provision of 500 alternative fuel energy equipment and promotion of this technology for domestic use	OEFCFA, ORCU and Ethio-wetland Natural Resource Association (EWNRA)	Starting from 2011 to 2012 EFY	54,000.00
4	Risk of falling and fire incidence	Promotion of modern bee-keeping (backyard practice), to support the traditional forest honey production, by piloting it on 5 <i>woredas</i> of 1 representative cooperative that has involved in forest honey production. Provide 50 modern beehive for each cooperative	OEFCFA, ORCU and Ethio-Wetland Natural Resource Association (EWNRA)	Starting from 2 nd quarter of 2011 to 2012 EFY	62,500.00

5	Weak legal enforcement on sustainable forest management endeavors	Conducting one-day refreshment training on forest management and governance for law-enforcement organs of the 5 REDD+ <i>woredas</i> (the police, attorneys and judges), three participants from each <i>woreda</i>	OEFCCA, ORCU with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	22,500.00
6	Forest degradation as a result of free and uncontrolled dry season free grazing in the forest area	Undertake research that will result in developing, adopting, promoting and practicing sustainable livestock development in REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II project landscapes (sustainable feeding strategy that could support the traditional way of dry season free grazing within the forest)	OEFCCA, ORCU with support of Oromia BOA and Consultant	Starting from 3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	200,000.00
		Conduct 2 days training of trainers (TOT) on developing, adopting, promoting and practicing sustainable livestock development in these landscapes, for 5 <i>woredas/zones</i> IAs/members of REDD+ technical committee (3 experts from each <i>woreda/zone</i>)	OEFCCA, ORCU with the support of Oromia BoA	3 rd quarter of 2011 EFY	19,500.00
		Cascading these trainings for 1 day to 5 <i>woreda</i> IAs, DAs (20 participants from each <i>woreda</i>)	OEFCCA, ORCU, OBOA with the support of ZoEFCCA and WoEFCCA as required and TOT participants	4 th quarter of 2011 EFY	100,000.00
				S. Total	587,500.00
				Operation cost	60,000.00
				Grand Total	647,500.00

9.4. The Way forward on external factors impacting the REDD+ projects goals

A. High level commitment

- i. Create high level commitment, at least at the two REDD+ projects' *woreda* administration levels, to own the implementation of OFLP safeguard frameworks (ESMF, SA, RPF and the C&P). The challenge to coordinate the activities of different sectors to attain the desired development objectives of the program was well noted and appropriate mechanism to address it devised in the OFLP. The PAD under paragraph 66 reads "the substantial risk is partly because of the fact that deforestation is driven primarily by the land use behavior of millions of smallholders, various sectors and stakeholders, and variables (such as other land use related projects) outside the direct influence of OFLP financing. The risk mitigation strategy includes the establishment of a government ***coordination platform***, supported by the grant, for convening and leveraging other investments and projects to contribute to achievement of the ERs that are accounted under the ERPA at the level of the state-wide jurisdiction. This coordination will occur at all administrative levels of government and will be led by the Regional State executive and relevant sector heads. See institutional risks below for more details." (p.24). This will help ensure the coordination and integration of sectoral offices of the *woreda* in screening, undertaking ESIA, implementation and monitoring of project activities and mitigation of the negative impacts.
- ii. Create conducive environment that the *woreda* administrations be committed that their own capital investment projects (non-REDD+) undertaken in these landscapes follow appropriate ESIA procedures as specified in the OFLP's ESMF requirements.
- iii. Establish at least at *woreda* level, hazard prevention and preparedness mechanism to ensure the prevention of forest fire hazard in these landscapes.
- iv. Address the problems of lack of good governance (e.g., corruption in law-enforcement organs and other sector offices) to prevent illegal logging and allocation of designated forestlands for private investment.
- v. Organize unemployed youth in associations and provide training, capital and working places so that they will have sustainable means of livelihood.

B. Livelihood diversification and youth unemployment

- i. Diversify livelihood support mechanisms to reduce dependence on natural forest, with a focus on the vulnerable groups; the poor, female-headed households, migrant laborers, unemployed youth, and landless people whose livelihoods depend on selling firewood and charcoal;
- ii. Value chain development: Work to link the local producers to markets – negotiate with the companies to offer reasonably fair price to encourage farmers to sell their products fresh and also assist and train farmers to use their income to diversify livelihood strategies. The challenges include: lack of market information and access, equipment and skills for processing, and lack of organization of the producers.;
- iii. The project should involve the youth (most of them unemployed) in the overall management of the forest and ensure that they benefit from the income generation scheme of the two projects and OFLP. The *woreda* administrations have to support these efforts by implementing effective Small and Micro Enterprises (SME) focusing on women and youth to reduce pressure on forest resources.

C. Institutional capacity and basic services

- i. OFWE should strengthen its branch and district offices in human resource, logistics and budget allocation irrespective of the profit-making status of those branches and districts;
- ii. OEFCCA needs to play its strategically located pivotal role in harnessing the synergetic endeavor of all stakeholders to advance the mission for which it was set up and realize specific project goals;
- iii. OEFCCA needs to ensure that all projects proposed to be implemented in the forested landscapes pass through rigorous ESIA procedures; and
- iv. OEFCCA should coordinate with pertinent sector offices to enhance the provision of basic services such as education, health, safe water, electricity and access road since absence of these services is the major driver of poverty, which in turn negatively impacts on sustainable use of natural forest resources and the wellbeing of the communities.

D. Immediate actions that need to be taken

- i. Take appropriate measures to minimize the negative environmental impact of the Adaba - Angetu road project which is under construction crossing the virgin forest of BMEP; and
- ii. Close the quarry site currently in use in the middle of the Bale Mountains National Park (near Senete) and ensure the responsible body fully rehabilitates the site to its original status.

References

Abdurahiman Kubsa, Asfaw Mariame, Girma Amante, Hans-J Lipp and Tsegaye Tadesse. *Wajib: An Alternative Forest Conservation Approach for Ethiopia's Forests*. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/ARTICLE/WFC/XII/0145-C2.HTM>, accessed 22/03/2017 @6:55pm

Aanaa Dallo Manna, *Dambi Ittiin Bulmaataa Waldaa Hojjii Gamtaa Kununsaa fi Ittifayyadama Qabeenya. Ummamaa*. Muddee, 2001.

CCBA. 2013. *Climate, Community & Biodiversity Standards Third Edition*. CCBA, Arlington, VA, USA. December, 2013. At: www.climate-standards.org

CCB Verification Statement BALE MOUNTAINS ECO-REGION REDD+ PROJECT. FIRST MONITORING PERIOD: 01 JAN 2012 TO 31 DEC 2015 REPORT NO. 10205SH-2.

Client Earth and UK Aid, 2013. *Guide to Understanding and Implementing the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards, A Review of Relevant International Law*. pp. 17-19

Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA). BMNP Interim Settlement and Natural Resource Management Strategy. October 2015

EWNRA, 2016. *REDD+ Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Ababora Zone (Ale, Becho, Diddu, Halu and Nono-Selle), Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project* (A Project Proposal)

Farm Africa and SOS Sahel Ethiopia, (nd). *Bale Eco-region REDD+ Pilot Project Phase II*

FDRE, (nd) Oromia Forested Landscape Program Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) (Revised Final Draft). Addis Ababa.

FDRE, (2011). *Ethiopia's Climate-Resilient Green Economy*. Green Economy Strategy. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

FDRE, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2011b). *Readiness Preparation Proposal*. Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank.

FDRE, Forest Proclamation (Proclamation No, 542/2007)

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Carbon Fund. World Bank Safeguard Policies and the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards. August 28, 2013, 3 pps.

Frankfurt Zoological Society, (nd). Bale Mountains National park, general Management Plan (2017-2027).

<http://www.worldbank.org/GRS>.

Ministry of Environment and Forest, the National REDD+ Secretariat and Oromia REDD+ Coordination Unit, 2015. *Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA)* For the Implementation of REDD+ in Ethiopia INCLUDING THE OROMIA FORESTED LANDSCAPE PROGRAM (OFLP) SOCIAL ASSESSMENT (SA). Addis Ababa.

Ministry of Environment and Forest (nd). *Oromia Forested Landscape Program Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)* (Revised Final Draft). <https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/Ethiopia%20ESMF.pdf>.

MEFCC and OEFCCA. *OROMIA FORESTED LANDSCAPE PROGRAM (OFLP) PROCESS FRAMEWORK (PF)*. Updated February 2017. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/584341468032335835/pdf/SFG1421-REVISED-RP-P156475-Box402888B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-2-14-2017.pdf>

MEFCC and OEFCCA. *OROMIA FORESTED LANDSCAPE PROGRAM (OFLP) RESETTLEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK (RPF)*. Updated February 2017. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/640141468032723277/pdf/SFG1420-REVISED-RP-P151294-Box402888B-PUBLIC-Disclosed-2-14-2017.pdf>

NTFP South-West Ethiopia, Participatory Forest Management Guidelines, pp. 5-6.

OFWE, *Oromia Forested Landscape Program Process Framework*, October, 2015.

Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE), Farm Africa and SOS Sahel Ethiopia, 2014. *Bale Mountains Eco-region Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Project- ETHIOPIA*. VCS + CCBA standards. Addis Ababa.

Oromia Regional State, *Forest Proclamation* (No.72/2003).

Oromia, Environment, Forest and Climate Change Authority. Proclamation 199/2016 on July 20, 2016

Proforest, *Briefing on complementarities with other REDD+ Social and Environmental safeguards mechanisms*. October 2010, pp. 1-8

REDD+ SES Version 2, 10th September 2012, <http://www.redd-standards.org>

Stephanie Roe, Charlotte Streck, Luke Pritchard and John Costenbader. Safeguards in REDD+ and Forest Carbon Standards: *A Review of Social, Environmental and Procedural Concepts and Application*. CLIMATEFOCUS, May 2013.

UN, 1992. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. New York

Uncovsky, S. 1998. *Model Calculation of Minimum Forest area per Household*. IFMP, Dodola, Ethiopia.

World Bank, 2017. *PROJECT APPRAISAL DOCUMENT FOR THE OROMIA NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE FORESTED LANDSCAPE PROJECT*. Addis Ababa

WB, Operational Manual for OP 4.36 – Forests, April 2013, 4.

Temesgen, Zelalem, Peter O'Hara & Johan Helland, Mid-Term and End Review of Piloting REDD+ in the Bale Eco-Region of Ethiopia: Strengthening Community and Regional Level Capacity for Natural Resource Governance – Project ETH-12/0022 (2012-2015). Chr. Michelsen Institute, Review Report.

Appendix A: Bale Mountains Eco-region Reduction of Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Project

Bird's eye view of the Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project

The Bale Mountains Eco-region REDD+ Project (BMERP), which lies between 50°22'–80°08'N and 38°41'– 40°44'E in Oromia Regional State, comprises sixteen *Woredas* namely Agarfa, Dinsho, Adaba, Dodola, Goba, Sinana, Gololcha, Gasera, Dallo Manna, Kokosa, Berber, Hareenna Buluk, Nensebo, Mada Walabu, Goro and Guradhamole. In these *woredas* there are six priority forest areas (PFAs): Aloshe Batu, Goro Bale, Harana Kokosa, Menna Angetu, Kubayu, and Adaba Dodola, which in total are 566,258 ha including the forests in the Bale Mountains National Park or 480,910 ha without the park forests. The BMER presents very interesting physiographic attributes.

Despite the size of its priority forest areas (PFAs), the eco-region is inhabited by about 1.6 million people (urban and rural combined).⁴⁴ Even though there is significant potential to improve the management of the eco-region to sustain and enhance conservation and the livelihoods of the local community and beyond, the eco-region is facing pressure that is growing over time. The pressure it is experiencing currently will challenge the long term sustainable conservation of this globally unique ecosystem and its biodiversity resources.

Hence, the BMERP has come into existence, which is under implementation since January 1, 2012 with a project lifetime of 20 years. This project was designed to support improved management of the eco-region and its biodiversity for multiple benefits that include climate, community and biodiversity outcomes. The BMERP has endeavored to improve government and community partnerships on the one hand and facilitate the development of community based local institution on the other to result in an improved forest ecosystem and landscape management in the Bale eco-region (BER). Accordingly, about 64 local PFM cooperatives have been established and their capacities being strengthened.

⁴⁴Moreover, it is estimated around 12 million people both in the eco-region and beyond within Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya directly and indirectly depend on several ecosystem services of the forests of the Bale eco-region. Particularly, rural people in the eco-region are directly dependent on the forest and other natural resources of the area.

A.1. Dallo Manna Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Dallo Manna, one of the REDD+ initiative *woredas*, is one of the administrative territories of Bale zone with an area of 4833 km² (483,300ha). According to Finance and Economic Development Office of the *Woreda*, the total population of the *woreda* in 2008 E. C was 112,360 (Male – 57,116; Female 55,244; Urban – 14853 and rural – 97507). Sedentary agriculture is dominantly practiced in the highland and semi-highland areas of the *woreda*, whereas animal rearing (pastoral way of life) is practiced in the lowland areas. With the two major cropping seasons, *Maher* (March to August) and *Belg* (September, October and November), cereals, pulses, oilseeds, fruits, vegetables and spices are grown in the district.

Out of the 14 *kebeles* of the *woreda*, PFM Cooperatives or Community Based Organizations (CBOs) as they are formally called, are organized in 8 with a total membership of 3739 households.

Table1: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebeles of Dallo Manna Woreda

Profile of Chirri, Waabaro and Burqitu Kebeles						
Kebele/ Cooperative	Number of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Chirri	1600	380	1	4	4744	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, sorghum, <i>teff</i>, barely, chick pea, and sesame.Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support.					Forest coffee
						Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Dry season free grazing
Other ecosystem functions and services including firewood and construction materials for own use						
Waabaro	Number of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
	683	117	1	4	5966	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, maize, sorghum, <i>teff</i>, barely, chick pea, and sesame.Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support.					Forest coffee
						Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Dry season free grazing
						Other ecosystem functions and services including firewood and construction materials for own use
Firewood						
Burqitu	Number of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
	252	64	1	4	1874	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					Forest coffee
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, maize, sorghum, <i>teff</i>, barely,					Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Dry season grazing
					Other ecosystem functions and services	

	chick pea, and sesame. • Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support.	including firewood and construction materials for own use Firewood
--	---	---

A.2. Hareenna Buluq Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Hareenna Buluq, another REDD+ initiative *woreda* in Bale Zone has 14 *kebeles* with 12,377 registered households and a total population of 101, 356 (male: 49,529; female: 51,822; urban: 11,570; rural: 89,786) in 2008 E. C. With more a pastoralist mode of life, it has a small amount of intensively cultivated land and two main cropping seasons, *Meher* (March to August) and *Belg* (September, October and November). Out of the 14 *kebeles* of the *woreda*, PFM cooperatives or CBOs are organized in 12 with a total household membership of 3839 households. Land use pattern in the *woreda* is follows: forest – 127,651.45 km²; cultivable – 15,301km²; grazing land – 3714.5km²; others – 79,733.05km².

Table 3: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebeles of Haranna Buluq Woreda

Profile of Shawe and Sodduwalmal Kebeles						
Kebele/ Cooperative	Number of HHs		No. of Cooperative s	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Shawe	716	460	1	5	5250	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include <i>teff</i>, wheat, barely, maize, sorghum, finger millet, oats, and pulses (lentils, horse bean, chick peas, field peas, haricot bean), oil seeds, fruits and vegetables. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 					Forest coffee
						Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Dry season grazing
						Other ecosystem functions and services including firewood and construction materials for own use
Sodduwalmal	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperative s	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
	587	51	1	4	5014	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include <i>teff</i>, wheat, barely, maize, sorghum, finger millet, oats, and pulses (lentils, horse bean, chick peas, field peas, haricot bean), oil seeds, fruits and vegetables. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 	Forest coffee
		Forest beekeeping (honey production)
		Dry season free grazing
		Other ecosystem functions and services including firewood and construction materials for own use

A.3. Goba Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Goba Woreda is one among the eleven REDD+ initiative *woredas* covered in this environmental and social review study. According to the data obtained from the *woreda* Finance and Economic Development Office, Goba Woreda has a total population of 51,624 in the EFY 2008. In the *woreda*, population is unevenly distributed with the majority (96%) living in rural areas and engaged in agricultural activity, namely farming and rearing animals.

For this study, Wajitushabe *Kebele* was selected as a sample from Goba Woreda. The *kebele* has a total of 500 households, of which 287 are members of the Participatory Forest management Cooperative or CBOs. The main crops produced in *Wajitushabe* include cereals (barely, wheat, oats), pulses (horse beans, chick peas), vegetables and oil seeds. They also produce honey and keep livestock.

The PPMC in Wajitushabe *Kebele* was formed in 2005 E. C with 60 interested members and since then grew to a membership of 287 households.

Table 5: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebele of Goba Woreda

<i>Profile of Wajitushabe Kebeles</i>						
<i>Kebele/</i> Cooperative	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Wajitushabe	270	17	1	3	1599	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include wheat, barley, <i>teff</i>, horse beans, cabbage, and oats. 					Beekeeping
						Dry season grazing
						Firewood and construction materials for own use
						Controlled/trophy hunting
						Charcoal (low income households produce charcoal from dead trees) – both for own use and sale

A.4. Dodola Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Dodola *Woreda* is one of the REDD+ initiative *woredas* in West Arsi Zone, one of the few pioneer *woredas* in PFM program. According the data obtained from the *Woreda* Finance and economic Development Office, Dodola has 35,557 ha of demarcated forestland; 13,580 ha. non-demarcated and over 2000 ha. of unspecified forest area. It also has a huge livestock population, with 11,000 heads of cattle, 14,000 goats and 12,000 sheep; with two main cropping seasons, *Meher* (March to August) and *Belg* (September, October and November) the people grow cereals (*teff*, wheat, barley and maize), pulses (horse bean, field peas, haricot bean, chick peas,) and vegetables and oil seeds.

From Dodola *woreda*, three *kebeles* with a long history of Participatory Forest management (PFM) were selected for this environmental and social review study. These include, Buura Addeelle, Berisa and Deneba *kebeles*.

Table 7: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebeles of Dodola Woreda

Profile of Buuraa Addeelle, Barisa and Deneba Kebeles						
Kebele/ Cooperative	No. of HHs		No. Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Buuraa Addeelle	424	132	2	22	9578	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the kebeleand the major crops produced include wheat, barley, teff, horse beans, cabbage, and oats.					Dry season grazing area
						Regulated use of construction materials both for own use and for sale
						Firewood
Controlled/trophy hunting						
Barisa	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
	137	21	1	6	2645	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the kebeleand the major crops produced include wheat, barley, teff, horse beans, cabbage, and oats.					Dry season grazing area
Regulated use of construction materials both for own use and for sale						
Firewood						

						Dry season grazing area
Kebele/ Cooperative	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Deneba	238	65	1	11	4141	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include wheat, barley, <i>teff</i>, horse beans, cabbage, and oats. 					Dry season grazing area
						Regulated use of construction materials both for own use and for sale
						Firewood

A.5. Nansabo Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Nansabo⁴⁵, another REDD+ initiative *woreda*, is one of the administrative territories of West Arsi zone with an area of 1,803.09 km². According to the 2007 national census report the *woreda* had a total population of 138,569 of whom 68,592 were male and 69,977 female. 95% of its population live in rural areas with agriculture (rearing animals and crop production) being its mainstay. With two main cropping seasons, *Meher* (March to August) and *Belg* (September, October and November) the people grow cereals (*teff*, wheat, barley, maize and sorghum), pulses (horse bean, field peas, haricot bean, chick peas,) and vegetables and oil seeds. Nansabo has over 140,000 hectares (77.83%) of forest land.

Table 9: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebele of Nansabo Woreda

Profile of Garambamo Kebeles						
Kebele/ Cooperative	Members of HH		No. Cooperative s	No. Blocks	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Garambamo	560	120	1	3	12145	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					Beekeeping

⁴⁵[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nensebo_\(woreda\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nensebo_(woreda)) accessed: March.03.2017@5:35pm

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include wheat, barley, <i>teff</i>, horse beans, cabbage, and oats. 	Dry season grazing area
		Controlled use of construction materials both for own use and for sale
		Firewood

Appendix B: REDD+ JFM in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II

A/ Description of the project (REDD+) *woredas*

The recently emerging project, called “REDD+ Joint Forest Management in the five districts of Ilu Abba Bora Zone (Ale, Becho, Diddu, Halu and Nono-Selle), Oromia Regional State, South-West Ethiopia - Phase II (REJFMA-SW Ethiopia II) Project”, has come into effect since January 1st, 2016 and has a 5 years lifetime (up to December 31st, 2020). The project has been implemented in the five forested *woredas* and aims to address the prevailing and emerging challenges through enhancing sustainable forest resources management actions. The project will use Joint Forest Management (JFM) approach as vehicle for REDD+ implementations that will help to scale-up the on-going application of JFM linked REDD+ approach to neighboring forested *woredas*.

The Project Area

The proposed project area constitutes five districts. The districts are among the highly forested areas of the Zone as well as within the whole Oromia Region. It maintains the highest montane rainforest cover in Oromia Region as well as within the country. Despite this potential, the districts have not received sufficient attention in terms of forest management and development except some JFM interventions in parts of the *woredas* by Farm-Africa, OFWE joint interventions, and the current involvement of EWNRA in a couple of *woredas*. Number of coops & areas of forest under JFM in each *woreda* by scaling-up project (Farm-Africa & OFWE) are presented below:

Table 11: JFM undertaken by Farm Africa and SOS Sahel Ethiopia/Farm Africa and SOS-Sahel Ethiopia and SOS Sahel Ethiopia and OFWE, distribution in each of intervention *woredas*

No.	Woreda name	#	# forest blocks	Forest area	Implementing
-----	-------------	---	-----------------	-------------	--------------

		<i>cooperative</i>			<i>organization</i>
1	Ale	4	9	6,886	Farm-Africa
2	Becho	6	17	16,399.7	Farm-Africa/EWNRA
3	Didu	33	8	7,883.91	Farm-Africa
4	Selle-Nono	8	118	21,574.74	EWNRA, OFWE
5	Halu	No JFM	No JFM	No JFM	No JFM

Source: OFWE Illu Ababora Branch, 2016.

The intervention *woredas* encompasses various types of forest vegetation for instance (Friis, 1992) identifies three types of vegetation that included **Afromontane rain forest, transitional rain forest, riverine and riparian forest**. The floristic composition of each of the vegetation type is dependent on altitude and geographical location.

Thick natural forests occupy most parts of Nono-Selle *Woreda*; the other *woredas* also poses significant forest coverage although it is shrinking from time to time due to anthropogenic factors. There are large and small animals of varied species in the districts. Locally recognized wildlife includes Elephant, Lion, Buffalo, Leopard, Bush Buck, Bush Duiker, Bush Pig, Civet-cat, common Jackal, Pig, Hyena, Warthog Rabbit, Columbus Monkey, Porcupines and African Tiger.

Population and Socio economic condition of the districts

Based on figures given from the respective *woredas* agricultural office in 2015, the five proposed *woredas* have got total households size of 20,995 (18587male and 2047 female headed HHs) with a total population size 127,642 people. According to secondary data obtained from Illu Ababora Zone Agriculture and Natural Resource Office, the project intervention *woredas* are among one of the more densely forested areas, have a population of 108,000 altogether. The average land holding per household in the five *woredas* ranges from 3.5 to 5 hectares. In Nono Selle and Becho *woredas* majority of the land is under natural forest endowed with forest coffee and other NTFPs which are contributing to the livelihoods of the communities in the areas.

The production system in the project areas is characterized by mixed crop-livestock production system. As the report shows, natural forest constitutes large portion of the land cover (47%) and about 16% of the area is under annual crops followed by woodland savanna which covers 10%. Crop farming such as maize, sorghum, wheat, barley and millet from cereals, *teff* from grains and field peas, horse beans, *Neug*, Linseed and Rapeseed from pulses are the important crops grown in the *woredas*. In case of Nono Selle *Woreda*, forest coffee, forest beekeeping and other NTFPs have significant contribution to household income. The most known perennials in the *woredas* are coffee, chat and *enset*. Coffee and chat are cash crops sold to make cash income out of it. *Enset* is a crop which is harvested at any time and consumed and source of income in some *woredas* such as Nono Selle.

B/ Profile of sampled *woreda* and *kebeles*

B. 1. Nono Selle Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Nono Selle is one of the REDD+ initiative *woredas* located in Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia, in southwestern Ethiopia. According to the data obtained from the *Woreda* Finance and economic Development Office, in 2005 E. C., Nono Selle has a total population of 34,043 (male: 16,643; female: 17,410), of which 86% live in rural areas. People earn their livelihood from mixed farming, with coffee and honey as main sources of cash for most of the households in the rural areas.

Nono Selle *Woreda*, with good PFM experience since 2013, was selected for this environmental and social review study. Among 19 *kebeles* (having 45 PFM blocs), Gemechisa and Kupi *Kebeles* (having 6 PFM blocs) have been chosen and covered as a sample site for the overall study.

Table 12: Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebele Nono Selle Woreda

Profile of Gemechisa and Kupi Kebeles						
Kebele/ Cooperative	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Gemechisa	214	20	1	3	6250	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, sorghum, barley and various grains are the important crops grown in the <i>kebele</i>. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 					Forest coffee (major one)
						Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Spice collection
						Dry season free grazing
Kupi	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				

	243	13	1	3	13862	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, sorghum, barley and various grains are the important crops grown in the <i>kebele</i>. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 					Forest honey production (a major one)
						Forest coffee
						Spice collection
						Dry season grazing
						Other ecosystem functions and services including regulated use of firewood and construction materials for own use

B. 2. Becho Woreda (demography, land use and vegetation cover)

Becho *Woreda*, also located in Ilu Abba Bora Zone, Oromia, in southwestern Ethiopia, is the late comer both to PFM program and REDD+ initiative. According to the data obtained from the *Woreda* Finance and economic Development Office, Becho has a total population of 50,060 (male: 25,615; female: 24,445), of which 91% live in rural areas. People earn their livelihood from mixed farming, with coffee and honey as main sources of cash for most of the households in the rural areas.

From Becho *Woreda*, among 6 *kebeles* (with 18 PFM blocs), Gemechisa and Gorbi (with two CBOs and 6 PFM blocs) have been chosen and covered as a sample sites for the overall study. In these *kebeles* the establishment of 6 PFM blocs are underway (newly emerging PFMs), with some major activities being accomplished and others, such as awareness raising, forest boundary demarcation and membership registration are undergoing activities, with a vision of legal registration of the associations.

Table 14: *Profile of the PFM Cooperatives/CBOs in the sample Kebele of Becho Woreda*

Profile of Gemechisa and Gorbi Kebeles

<i>Kebele/</i> Cooperative	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
Gemechisa	467	70	1	3	INA	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, sorghum, barley and various grains are the important crops grown in the <i>kebele</i>. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 					Forest coffee
						Forest beekeeping (honey production)
						Spice collection (have limited experience)
						Dry season free grazing
						Other ecosystem functions and services including regulated use of firewood and construction materials for own use
Gorbi	No. of HHs		No. of Cooperatives	No. of Blocs	Forest coverage (ha)	Major benefits from the PFM/ forest resource (off farm activities)
	M	F				
	222	26	1	3	INA	
	Agricultural practices in this kebele					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed farming (crop production and animal rearing) characterizes the <i>kebele</i> and the major crops produced include maize, sorghum, barley and various grains are the important crops grown in the <i>kebele</i>. Coffee and honey are the other two major sources of livelihood support. 					Forest honey production
						Forest coffee
						Spice collection (have limited experience)
						Dry season free grazing
						Other ecosystem functions and services including regulated use of firewood and construction materials for own use

Annexes

Annex I: List of persons/Agencies to be interviewed or discussed with, documents and reports to be reviewed:

1. List of persons/Agencies to be interviewed

- SC and TC of the REDD+ projects
- DAs and Project beneficiaries
- Regional and Federal safeguard specialist or focal persons of the REDD+ projects
- Regional and *woreda* EPLAUA
- Zonal REDD+ Project offices and Zonal implementing agencies
- Regional and *woreda* Implementing Agencies
- Ethio-wetland and respective project and field offices
- Farm Africa/SOS Sahel and respective project and field offices
- Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC)
- OFLP CU
- OFWE

2. List of documents and reports to be reviewed

- National and Regional Environmental Protection Policies and Regulations
- World Bank Environmental Safeguard policies
- Project documents of the two REDD+ projects subjected for environmental and social review
- OFLP ESMF: October 14, 2015 (FDRE)
- OFLP SESA/SDP: October 16, 2015 (FDRE)
- OFLP RPF: October 16, 2015 (FDRE)
- OFLP PF: October 22, 2015 (FDRE)
- PAD on a proposed grant to FDRE for the OFLP
- Projects feasibility study document
- Projects' activities/initiatives' screening process document
- Projects' activities/initiatives' ESMP preparation process document
- Projects' activities/initiatives' ESMP implementation and reporting
- Quarter year and annual reports regarding the implementation of the ESMF
- Institution arrangement/organogram and mandates of project implementers

Annex II: Key Issues/topics and Guiding Questions

Key Issues/topics	Guiding Questions
<p>Broader Context:</p> <p><i>Social, environmental and demographic characteristics</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data on the social, environmental and demographic characteristics of the communities (demography, i.e., number of households, male-female and child-headed households; socioeconomic and cultural features, customary social institutions, inter-group relationships, presence and functions of public, private and civil society institutions, and profile of stakeholders in the selected <i>woreda</i> and communities. - Data on voluntary mass/community mobilization [Probe for the contexts in which such a mobilization takes place as existing cultural practice and if this was used for project activities] - Who are the most vulnerable and underserved groups in the project <i>woreda</i>? [Probe for the poor; the poorest of the poor; women and children; the elderly; the disabled; female-headed households; polygamous families; PLHIV; outcast and underserved occupational groups] - Bio-physical description of community
<p>Legal and policy framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data on compliance with the GoE (relevant environmental and social safeguards guidelines, regulations and policy documents), World Bank safeguard requirements and UNFCCC safeguards principles - Data on gaps in safeguards instruments used by the REDD+ initiatives against the GoE and the WB's requirements; <p>What are the gaps in the existing frameworks used by the REDD+ initiatives? What are the potential risks this may present to achieve the objectives of the safeguard requirements?</p>
<p>Land use, loss and resettlement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What happens when private or communal land is needed for a project? What is the process? - What happens when private or communal land is donated or given up for project? What is the process? - How can this process be improved? - How do you complain if you need to? - What risk mitigation/minimization measures have been devised to deal with adverse impacts? - What consequences are anticipated to affect the local population (Probe for: displacement, loss of land and other assets, loss of sacred/religious sites and places of cultural importance)? - What compensation/resettlement measures are designed in case of these consequences? - The Review will understand how resettlement is happening within the Program. At <i>woreda</i> level, researcher will be walked through the process of communal and private resettlement and land loss and discuss the implementation of the Voluntary Asset Loss form. The Review must explain why the PFM/JFM must trigger this policy in the future. Consultants will ask communities about how they feel about such asset loss or resettlement and what suggestions that would give for improvement. It will be important to capture experiences,

	<p>alternatives, advantages, disadvantages, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of cultivatable land? - Loss of traditional livelihood strategies? - Loss of grazing land and other resource (i.e. water)
<i>Impact of project activities on biodiversity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land rehabilitation - Afforestation - Reforestation - Presence of sensitive ecosystem
<i>Conflict of Interest and social cohesion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any known conflicts of interests arising among different groups in relation to project that may affect program implementation? If yes, what possible mechanisms can be used to address the problem? - Are there any known conflicts of interests arising among the different groups that have been instigated directly or indirectly by the introduction and implementation of the two projects? How have these happened? Between clans or between residents and migrants. - Has social cohesion between the different community groups in the project areas (agricultural, pastoral, and agro-pastoral) been further strengthened or undermined as a result of the introduction and implementation of the project? If yes, how so? If no, how so? - To what extent and in what ways has the traditional institutions of self/mutual help been impacted upon (positive or negative) by the project?
<i>Impacts to the environment and the communities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What livelihood improvement activities were done as part of the project components? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ How were they planned and implemented? ▶ What were their impacts on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ environment? ✚ communities (as collectives and as individuals)? - What agricultural production enhancement activities were done as part of the project components? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ How were they planned and implemented? ▶ What were their impacts on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ environment? ✚ On the communities (as collectives and as individuals)?
<i>Traditional/Local institutions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What farmer/pastoral organizations exist in the community/<i>kebele</i>? Do they exercise collective power to negotiate or influence the program towards their needs and interests? If yes, in what ways? - What traditional institutions of land, forest, water and rangeland resource management exist in the community/<i>kebele</i>? How do these contribute to the program? How does the program make use of such structures? - What traditional forest and other natural resource-related dispute settlement institutions/mechanisms exist in the <i>kebele</i>/community? How do you see their role in addressing complaints that might arise in relation to the program (in the event of land acquisition, competition over the use of resources, i.e., water, pasture, border disputes, etc.)?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What traditional forest use and conservation knowledge and practice exist in your <i>kebele</i>? How does the program utilize such resources? - What traditional institutions/self-help groups/mutual aid associations/and work parties exist and function in your community with direct or indirect role/involvement in the program? In what ways do they affect the program (Probe for possible positive and negative impact)? - What traditional institutions/structures (e.g., clan or class) exist and function in your community with direct or indirect role/involvement in the program? In what ways do they affect the program (Probe for possible positive and negative impact, e.g., <i>inclusion or exclusion errors</i>)? - How do Participatory Forest Management (PFM) or Joint Forest Management (JFM) cooperatives function in your community? How do they relate to the traditional/indigenous institutions of resource use and management?
Beneficiary selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are you aware of the criteria for inclusion in the project? - Are you satisfied with the process of inclusion and exclusion? Are the poorest included? How about the mode of livelihood (e.g., agriculturalists, agro-pastoralists, pastoralists, etc.)? - Do you think it works well? - How can it be better suited to your community? Your group? YOU? - What do you think about the involvement of the traditional leaders and groups? - How can it be improved?
Environment and social impacts and risks of the ongoing REDD+ Project initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map potential and actual environmental and social risks of the ongoing REDD+ initiatives; and the strategies employed to address those (including observation); - Identify the socio-cultural and economic features of the existing land tenure system and acquisition impacts; - Review existing conflict resolution mechanisms and safeguards information dissemination process of the ongoing REDD+ projects. - Are benefits negotiated? If yes, please describe and see reflections on how to manage expectations. What is the level of expectation? - What is the level of consultation in the design and implementation of the ongoing projects?
Community consultation and participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review the nature of stakeholder engagement (communities, groups, or individuals, and with civil society) and relevance of the method used for consultation and participation, in particular with local communities, in REDD+ actions commensurate with the risks and impacts - Consult with relevant stakeholders on the OFLP objective and ensure broader community support - Undertake meaningful consultation with the affected underserved groups and vulnerable peoples in a culturally appropriate and inclusive manner and propose mitigation options.
Grievance Redress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a grievance redress mechanism put in place as part of the REDD+ project? - If yes, how does it work? Is it effective? - What are the strengths and weaknesses/constraints of the grievance procedure? - Can you suggest how it can be improved?
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In particular ways are women benefiting from the project? (Is there affirmative action?) - Is there a commitment on the part of the implementers, especially DAs to support women?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in decision making and leadership? - Participation and use of grievance redress mechanisms? - Are there project activities in which women participate, which are likely to be incompatible with their domestic and child care responsibilities?
<i>Lessons Learned</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the challenges and lessons learned from the implementation of the previous or current phases of the project to date? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Community participation ▶ Planning ▶ Implementation ▶ Conflict handling/grievance redress mechanisms ▶ Benefit sharing mechanisms
<i>Institutional Arrangement and Capacity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify required technical assistance that might be needed by the REDD+ initiative projects; - Provide recommendations for addressing the identified capacity gaps to support implementation of the projects and define the necessary budget and - Assess the institutional capacity and commitment of OFWE and other proponents to take corrective actions prepared, consulted up on and disclosed consistent with the World Bank safeguard requirements for the OFLP. - What level of capacity and facilities exist in grassroots government structures to support program implementation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ What are the main capacity problems that limit/constrain program implementation? (Probe for issues such as lack of knowledge and skill, low salary and other benefit schemes resulting in high staff turn-over, etc.) ✚ What were the challenges in implementing project activities? ✚ Institutional arrangement: Are they effective and is it according to the PIM (if there is one)?
<i>Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What type of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system is in place? What are the strengths and constraints of the M&E system? - Are weekly site inspections performed, recorded? - What mechanisms exist for obtaining feedback from the grassroots communities on the benefits and drawbacks of the program?

Annex III: Document verification & field observation checklist to be filled at kebele & woreda level

Project Name: Woreda: Kebele: Name of PFM/JFM Cooperatives:

1.	Project appraisal, screening, and reviewing process of the Project's activities/initiatives													
	Projects' activity/initiatives appraisal process: *community participation in the planning process													
	Projects' activities screened		Reviewed		Reviewed by whom and when		Decision made to undertake			Reviewed and approved by and when		Which environmental safeguards will be triggered?		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Who	Date and reference no.	No need further EA	ESMP	Full ESIA	Who	Date and reference no.			
2.	Existing and Potential impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and implementation of the ESMP and/or ESIA													
	Existing and Potential Impacts				Proposed Mitigation measures			Implementation of the mitigation measure (ESMP & ESIA)				Field observation & comments made		
	During construction phase of the project's activity/initiatives				Construction phase			implementat ion		By whom and when				
								Yes	No	who	Date & reference no			

	During operation phase of the project's activity/initiatives	Operation phase							
3	Monitoring, Reporting and Best practices registered of the implementation of ESMP								
	Monitoring	Monitored by whom and when	Best practices registered:					Field observation & comments made	

	Yes	No	Who	Date & reference no.			
4	Institutional and capacity need assessment at lower level (Cooperatives, <i>kebele</i> and <i>woreda</i> level)						
	Institutional capacity at Cooperative, <i>kebele</i> and <i>woreda</i> level and gaps and needs identified						Field observation & Comments made
	Existing capacity				Gaps identified		
	No of focal persons at <i>woreda</i>	No of trainings at <i>woreda</i>	No of focal persons at <i>kebele</i> and Cooperative level	No of trainings at <i>kebele</i> and Cooperative level			
5	Actual Role of lower level administration (<i>kebeles</i> /Cooperatives, and <i>Woreda</i>) in implementing project activities and ESMF						
	Cooperative & <i>kebele</i> level implementation			Woreda level implementation		Comments made	
	Overall project activities	ESMF		Overall project activities	ESMF		
6	Proposed corrective actions:						

Annex IV: Institutional & capacity need assessment at higher & project levels in implementing environmental & social safeguard instruments (OFWE, OFLP CU, Project offices & field offices)

1	Institutional and capacity need assessment at higher level and project level (OFWE, OFLP CU, Project offices and field offices)						
	Institutional capacity at higher level and project level (OFWE, OFLP CU, Project offices and field offices) and gaps and needs identified						Field observation & Comments made
	Existing capacity and availability of logistics for mobility to field of the focal persons, their work space availability to discharge their duty, availability of appropriate documents like the ESMF, regulation, planning formats, and etc				Gaps identified at all level		
	No of focal persons at OFWE, OFLP CU	No and level of trainings at OFWE, OFLP CU	No of focal persons at Project offices and field offices	No of trainings at Project offices and field offices	Gaps identified	Possible corrective measures	

2	Actual Role of higher level and project level (OFWE, OFLP CU, Project offices and field offices) in implementing project activities and ESMF						
	OFWE and OFLP CU level implementation			Project offices and field offices level implementation			Comments made
	Overall project activities	ESMF		Overall project activities	ESMF		
3	Proposed corrective actions:						

Annex V. Environmental and Social Review/Auditing Guiding Questions for Government Officials and Social group (PAP and Beneficiaries)

For Governmental Officials

- What types of REDD+ Project' activities/initiatives are implemented in your *woreda*/region?
- Did these Project's activities/initiatives result significant environmental and social impacts during the whole project cycle? If yes, which one and what are the impacts? List out all significant impacts.
- What measures did you take to avoid or mitigate these impacts?
- In your Region, *woreda*, and *kebele*, have you REDD+ project's activities/initiatives located in or near to environmentally sensitive areas (such as parks, wildlife reserve areas & its buffer zone, priority forest area, and wetland ecosystem)?
- What measures did you take these REDD+ project's activities/initiatives not to be situated in such environmentally sensitive areas?
- Have you REDD+ project's activities/initiatives which have been using pesticide and other agrochemicals?
- What measures did you take to avoid or mitigate impacts emanated from these pesticide and agrochemicals?
- Have you REDD+ project's activities/initiatives which have been dealing on infrastructure development such as rural road construction, market centre construction and mini dam construction or irrigation water diversion schemes.

Social group (Beneficiaries)

- What role do you have for this project?
- What does this project mean to you?
- Did you well informed about this project before the commencement of the project at your locality? If yes, how did you have been informed?
- Did you participate in the planning and execution of subproject development at your locality?
- How did you participate?
- Did you encounter for some environmental and social problem during the construction and operational phase of project's activities/initiatives at your locality?
- What do you understand this project at your locality means towards environmental and socioeconomic issues?
- Do you have any other suggestion regarding this project at your locality?

Annex VI: Community Consultation Attendance Sheets

Separately attached.

Annex VII: List of Stakeholders Validation Workshop Participants

Separately attached.

Annex VIII: CCB Verification Statement BALE MOUNTAINS ECO-REGION REDD+ PROJECT

Separately attached.