

Social Assessment

1 January 2018

CEPF Grant 103506

Myanmar Forest Association

*Community-based Conservation and Development in in Khanti and Pyin Bu Nge
Islands, Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar*

Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar

Grant Summary

1. Grantee organization : Myanmar Forest Association
2. Grant title: Community-based Conservation and Development in in Khanti and Pyin Bu Nge Islands, Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar
3. Grant number : 103506
4. Grant amount (US dollars): 80,949
5. Proposed dates of grant: 1 February 2018
6. Countries or territories where project will be undertaken: Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar
7. Date of preparation of this document: December 2017

8. Indigenous People affected: This section will describe the Indigenous People in the project area.

There are four local and ethnic communities including Bamar (Dawei who settles in Dawei region), Rakhine, Karen and Mon. These communities live in Khanti, Taung Khaung Laung, Ka La Ma Khaung, Pyin Gyi villages in Khanti Island and Maw Phya, U Yin Kan and Pyin Bu Nge in Pyin Bu Nge Island. Their main livelihoods are fishery, farming, home garden, grocery and casual labour.

Table of Indigenous and Native Peoples in Khanti and Pyin Bu Gyi Islands

Sr. No.	Name of Village	Local and Indigenous Peoples			
		Mon	Karen	Rakhine	Bamar (including Dawei)
1	Khanti	-	-	17	1626
2	Taung Khaung Laung	5	30	17	353
3	Ka Ka Ma Khaung	-	-	-	468
4	Pyin Gyi	1	-	-	696
5	Pyin Bu Nge	-	-	-	1336
6	Maw Phyar	-	30	10	250
7	U Yin Kan	-	-	-	197
Total		6	60	44	4926

Mon, Karen and Rakhine have settled in Khanti and Pyin Bu Nge islands but ratio of population is less than Bamar and Dawei. Majority of Rakhine have been migrated in these areas after Cyclone Nargis landed in Ayeayrwy Delta since 2008. Mon and Karen have settled for many decades ago together with Bamar and Dawei. Majority of community involve in fishery, some for farming, grocery shop, trading, gardening and some are casual laborers. Livelihood of Mon is farming, Karen communities rely on fishery and gardening and Rakhine communities depend on fishery and casual laborer.

9. Summary of the proposed project: This section will describe what you plan to do and how you plan to do it, with a particular focus on activities implemented in areas inhabited and/or used by Indigenous People.

The project will enhance the ability of MFA and communities on ecosystem conservation to carry out community-based conservation, improve community participation in conservation, improve livelihoods of communities and advocate involving government and other stakeholders to strengthen coordinated conservation efforts in Myanmar. Firstly an inception workshop will be conducted to inform the proposed works to local authority and relevant stakeholders. Trainings/workshop on CCCA, project cycle management, biodiversity assessment, livestock breeding and home garden will be conducted. Livestock particularly piglets and fruit tree seedlings will be provided for targeted

communities. Advocacy for involvement of government and other stakeholders will be undertaken to strengthen coordinated conservation efforts in Myanmar, as well as share knowledge and learning. Development intervention like capacity development, livelihood support and awareness on environment for community was in place in that area within a few years. There are no human settlements in mangrove areas so that no involuntary resettlement in this project.

10. Potential impacts: This section will assess expected project impacts (both positive and negative) on Indigenous People.

The project will support to improve capacities of MFA on ecosystem conservation, organizational and project management, and overall capacity to access more funding sources. Enhanced communities' ability to participate in conservation activities, demonstrated by conservation performance evaluation, including increased awareness and frequency of community patrolling and reduced reported occurrence of unlawful uses of mangrove forests. Advocate government policies to integrate community-based conservation in collaboration with three other local NGOs.

There are long-term and short-term impacts as follows:

Long-term impacts

1. Improved capacity of Myanmar Forest Association (MFA) in terms of ecosystem conservation, organizational and project management, and overall capacity to access more funding sources
2. Enhanced ability of seven communities on Khanti and Pyin Bu Nge islands in the Myeik Archipelago to participate in conservation activities, demonstrated by conservation performance evaluation, including increased frequency of community patrolling and reduced reported occurrence of logging and cutting of mangrove forests.
3. Social safeguards implemented, ensuring that no families are negatively impacted by conservation measures
4. The capacity of communities participating in mangrove conservation will be improved in 7 villages and each of the communities can manage 20 hectares as community mangrove protected area, will be expanded to 142 hectares.
5. Inform government policies to better integrate community-based conservation in collaboration with three other local NGOs.
6. By establishing the networking platform, conservation efforts will be further coordinated, exchanged and hence strengthened. Successful experiences of CCCA model could be further promoted through the platform in a larger scale, which will contribute to the conservation of other types of ecosystem and endangered species in Myanmar.

Short-term impacts

1. Enhanced experience of MFA on biodiversity of project area
2. Improved knowledge and awareness of communities on mangrove forests, environmental threats and the status of threatened species which did not realize and recognize before in the project area
3. Improved socioeconomic status of targeted communities by increasing income and reducing dependence on natural resources for at least 70 women and 70 men

11. Participatory preparation: This section will describe the participation of affected communities during the project design process (i.e. prior to submission of the full proposal), and explain how Free, Prior and Informed Consent was obtained.

With reference to the experience of previous Project Phase participatory approach has been applied through consultation with villagers, village elders and interested people. With the technical assistance of GEI Community Conservation Concession Approach (CCCA) has been practiced in that area. MFA Executive Committee Members visited and briefed on CCCA, conservation of mangrove forests, values of mangroves and linkages between mangroves and livelihoods to the community through consultation meetings as well as trainings and socio-economic assessment.

The project staff from the first phase has visited each village and briefed about the CEPF project during the project preparation period as well as conducted consultation meetings briefing on proposed project activities, expansion of community conservation areas and refreshing CCCA approaches.

The project manager who has experience in that area and the native project field assistant conducted the consultation meetings on 31 December 2017, 1 to 3 January 2018 at each villages with Village Development Committee (VDC) members, village elders and villagers. The VDC consist of 5 to 7 members, 2 to 3 village elders and 3 to 5 villagers have participated in each village consultation meetings. During these meetings proposed project objectives and activities have been informed and discussed.

In Taung Khaung Laung and Maw Phyar villages the meetings were conducted participating representatives of Mon and Karen with the village leader and villagers. The proposed project objectives and activities are verbally informed during meetings with Myanmar language as a common language because Mon and Karen have settled for many decades ago together with Bamar and Dawei.

12. Mitigation strategies: This section will outline measures to avoid adverse impacts and provide culturally appropriate benefits.

The project manager who has experience in that area and the native project field assistant will facilitate the community and will undertake project activities. Occasionally the local authority and relevant government staff will be invited in training and workshop to relay messages on benefits of project and support technical assistance if necessary.

On the other hand as community has very limited awareness on linkages between environment and livelihood and values of ecosystem services some community would not be active in the first stage and will be participated in later part of the project period.

Conservation of mangrove forests will be improved sustainable resource use practices as well as livelihood of the community in long term. Even though there will be a few anticipate negative impacts in that area. Formerly community extracts fuel-wood for their requirement where mangrove forest are occurred. Some community especially who solely depend on their livelihood will be consulted to participate in forestry activities like establishment of nursery, nursery works and planting operations that would support for their livelihood. Changing of some community's habit will take time as cutting fuel-wood with prescribed method. Through consultations and training with the community will improve gradually the mindset and habit of the community.

13. Monitoring and evaluation: This section will explain how compliance with the safeguard policy on Indigenous Peoples will be monitored, and reported to CEPF and/or the Regional Implementation Team. Monitoring and evaluation methodologies should be adapted to the local context, indicators, and capacity.

During the village meetings, inception workshop and trainings compliance mechanism will be informed to the community as the address and telephone nos. of CEPF, MERN, Myeik District Forest Department (FD) and MFA Office. The monitoring and evaluation visit will be arranged consist of FD, MERN, MFA observing project activities, meeting with VDC, village elders and beneficiaries.

14. Grievance mechanism: All projects that trigger a safeguard are required to provide local communities and other interested stakeholders with means by which they may raise a grievance with the grantee, the relevant Regional Implementation Team, the CEPF Secretariat or the World Bank. Affected local communities should be informed of the objectives of the grant and the existence of a grievance mechanism. Contact information of the grantee, the Regional Implementation Team and the CEPF Grant Director should be made publicly available, through posters, signboards, public notices

or other appropriate means in local language(s). Grievances raised with the grantee should be communicated to the Regional Implementation Team and the CEPF Grant Director within 15 days, together with a proposed response. If the claimant is still not satisfied following the response, the grievance may be submitted directly to the CEPF Executive Director via the dedicated email account (cepfexecutive@conservation.org) or by mail. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response from the CEPF Secretariat, the grievance may be submitted to the World Bank at the local World Bank office. Please describe the grievance mechanism that you will use for your project, and how you will ensure that stakeholders are aware of it.

During the village meetings, inception workshop and trainings compliance mechanism will be informed to the community as the address and telephone nos. of CEPF, MERN, Myeik District Forest Department and MFA Office. The monitoring and evaluation visit will be arranged consist of FD, MERN, MFA observing project activities, meeting with VDC, village elders and beneficiaries.

Affected local communities shall be informed of the objectives of the grant and the existence of a grievance mechanism. Contact information of the RIT National Coordinator for Myanmar, Aung Thant Zin, MFA, the Myeik District Forest Department and the CEPF Grant Director shall be made publicly available, through posters, signboards, public notices in local language posted in village administration offices and public places like village bazaar. Grievances raised with the grantee should be communicated to the Regional Implementation Team and the CEPF Grant Director within 15 days, together with a proposed response.

The World Bank Myanmar
No 57, Pyay Road, (Corner of Shwe Hinthar Road)
61/2 Mile, Hlaing Township,
Yangon, Republic of the Union of Myanmar
Telephone: 95 1 654824
www.worldbank.org/myanmar
[www.facebook.com/
myanmar@worldbank.org](http://www.facebook.com/myanmar@worldbank.org)

If the claimant is not satisfied following the response, they may submit the grievance directly to the CEPF Executive Director at cepfexecutive@conservation.org or by surface mail. If the claimant is not satisfied with the response from the CEPF Executive Director, they may submit the grievance to the World Bank at the local World Bank office.

- 15. Budget:** This section will summarize dedicated costs related to compliance with the safeguard policy on Indigenous Peoples. These costs should be incorporated into the budget of the CEPF grant and/or covered by co-financing.

There is no specific budget for Social Assessment but it will be incorporated with consultation meeting, training and IEC materials in CEPF grant fund.

As mentioned in Section 13 mitigation measures for some indigenous families can participate in forestry activities like establishment of nursery, nursery works and planting operations that would support for their livelihood. Fund has been allocated for conservation, 14,476 USD and improved livelihoods for communities, 5,320 USD.