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Executive Summary

This Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared for the submission of the UNDP project proposal “*maintaining the sustainability of oceanic living marine resources and the associated fishery through an ecosystem-based approach which further ensures food security and the economic well-being for the region’s SIDS”* to the GEF. The ESMF was prepared by Forum for Fisheries Agency (FFA) in close collaboration with the UNDP as the GEF Agency.

This ESMF has been prepared based on the social and environment screening procedure (UNDP’s SESP) that was completed as part of the project design phase, and consultations carried out on behalf of UNDP during the project preparation phase with the project partner and FFA’s member states; and other relevant project partners.

The ESMF has been developed on the basis of the project risk categorisation and to outline the processes that will be undertaken during the project inception/implementation phases for the additional assessment of potential impacts, and identification and development of appropriate risk management measures, consistent with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES).[[1]](#footnote-1) It contains measures and plans to avoid, and where avoidance is not possible, to reduce, mitigate and/or offset adverse risks and impacts. The ESMF specifies the most likely applicable social and environmental policies and requirements and how those requirements will be met through procedures for the screening, assessment, approval, mitigation, monitoring and reporting of social and environmental risks and impacts associated with the project activities.

The ESMF identifies the steps that will be followed during the inception/implementation phases for the completion of assessments and appropriate management plans as justified based on the results of the SESP for the moderate risks identified, including a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), Stakeholder Engagement Plan and the Gender Action Plan as well as an, effective project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).

The ESMF also details the roles and responsibilities for its implementation and includes a detailed budget and monitoring and evaluation plan, and guidelines for Terms of Reference to be used to guide the development of the required assessments and management plans, where applicable (see Annexes).

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) identified seven (7) potential social and environmental risks associated with this Project. Four (4) of these have been assessed as low risk, three (3) as moderate with the overall SESP risk categorization rating as “Moderate”.

**Moderate risks identified with the Project are:**

**Risk 1:** If technical assistance and policy advice does not sufficiently fill capacity gaps, then there is a possibility that in some cases some government bodies may have insufficient capacity to meet all of their obligations.

**Risk 5:** There is the possibility that the project will experience ineffective or incomplete stakeholder

engagement with relevant stakeholders including the local communities and women.

**Risk 7:** The project is operating in areas in which there are existing Gender imbalances that the project continues to address, these could be reproduced or exacerbated if not properly managed during project implementation.

**Low risks identified within the Project are:**

**Risk 2:** Project activities managed by FFA on behalf of member states have the potential to inadvertently cause harm to Protected Areas since the project will be implemented within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g., nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities.

**Risk 3:** During project implementation/management there is a potential risk of overexploitation of the marine resources particularly non-target species harmed by tuna-fishing.

**Risk 4:** Fishing activities and livelihood activities managed by FFA and implemented near/on shores could potentially cause/lead to economic changes within the local community and indigenous peoples whose livelihoods rely on fishing/fisheries.

**Risk 6:** The project has the potential to impact on the rights of indigenous peoples because project activities will engage with Indigenous communities and impact on their resources and livelihoods.

The project document includes the SESP template that details the specific environmental and social risks identified (See Annex 1). The risks apply only to project components 1, 2 and 3 (see ProDoc). This ESMF will be implemented by the FFA and overseen by monitored throughout the duration of the project.

**CONTENTS**

[Abbreviations and Acronyms 7](#_Toc77903640)

[1 Project Description 9](#_Toc77903641)

[1.1 Purpose and scope of this ESMF 9](#_Toc77903642)

[2 Description of the potential social and environmental impacts 11](#_Toc77903643)

[2.1 Potential Social and Environmental Positive Impacts: 11](#_Toc77903644)

[2.2 Potential Social and Environmental Negative Impacts: 11](#_Toc77903645)

[3 Legislation and Institutional Frameworks for environmental and social matters. 14](#_Toc77903646)

[3.1 National and International Legislation, Policies and Regulations of the 14 Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Please see Annex 3; 106 Pages 14](#_Toc77903647)

[3.2 UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards 14](#_Toc77903648)

[4 Procedures for Screening, Assessing and Managing Social and Environmental Impacts 16](#_Toc77903649)

[4.1 Procedures for Assessments and Management Plans 16](#_Toc77903650)

[4.2 Procedures for Screening 17](#_Toc77903651)

[4.3 Procedures for Unidentified/Emerging Risks 17](#_Toc77903652)

[4.4 Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic Response Integration 17](#_Toc77903653)

[5 Institutional Arrangement and Capacity Building 18](#_Toc77903654)

[5.1 Roles and responsibilities for implementing this ESMF 18](#_Toc77903655)

[5.2 Capacity Building 21](#_Toc77903656)

[6 Stakeholder Engagement Plan and information disclosure 22](#_Toc77903657)

[6.1 PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS 22](#_Toc77903658)

[6.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT - OBJECTIVE AND PRINCIPLES 22](#_Toc77903659)

[6.3 PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT: 23](#_Toc77903660)

[6.4 COMMUNICATION 23](#_Toc77903661)

[6.5 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TIMETABLE 24](#_Toc77903662)

[6.6 RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 25](#_Toc77903663)

[7 Grievance Redress Mechanism and Accountability 25](#_Toc77903664)

[7.1 UNDP’s Accountability Mechanisms 26](#_Toc77903665)

[7.2 MONITORING AND REPORTING 27](#_Toc77903666)

[7.3 Project-level Grievance Redress Mechanisms 27](#_Toc77903667)

[8 Budget for ESMF Implementation 28](#_Toc77903668)

[9 Monitoring and evaluation arrangements 28](#_Toc77903669)

# 

# Abbreviations and Acronyms

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ABNJ | Area Beyond National Jurisdiction | MTR | Mid-Term Review |
| AI | Artificial intelligence | NCC | National Coordination Committee |
| AIS | Automatic Identification System | NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| CB&T | Capacity Building and Training | NPOA | National Plan of Action |
| CDS | Catch Documentation Scheme | NTMDP | National Tuna Management and Development Plan |
| CPUE | Catch Per Unit Effort | OAI | Office of Audit and Investigation |
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer | OFM | Oceanic Fisheries Management |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation | OFMP | Oceanic Fisheries Management Project |
| CC | Climate Change | OFP | Oceanic Fisheries Programme (of SPC) |
| CSIRO | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation | PCCOS | Pacific Community Centre for Ocean Sciences |
| CMM | Conservation and Management Measures | PCU | Project Coordination Unit |
| CCM | Contracting and Cooperating Members (to the WCPFC) | PEUMP | Pacific-European Union (EU) Marine Partnership |
| CBD | Convention of Biological Diversity | PEW, | Pew Charitable Trust |
| CO | Country Office | PIC9s) | Pacific Island Country(s) |
| DSA | Daily Subsistence Allowance | PIF | Project Identification Form |
| DWFN | Distant Water Fishing Nation(s) | PIMS | Programme Information and Management System |
| FAME | Division of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystem | PIOFMP2 | Pacific Island Oceanic Fisheries Management Project – 2 |
| ENSO | El Niño Southern Oscillation | PIR | Project Implementation Review |
| ER | Electronic Reporting | PITIA | Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association |
| EM | Electronic Monitoring | PNA | Partners to the Nauru Agreement |
| EU | European Union | PNAO | Partners to the Nauru Agreement Office |
| ERC | Evaluation Resources Centre | PNG | Papua New Guinea |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone | POPP | Programme and Operations Policies and Procedure |
| FSM | Federated States of Micronesia | PS | Purse Seine |
| FAD | Fish Aggregating Device | PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| FFA | Fisheries Forum Agency | PSM | Port State Measures |
| FIMS | Fisheries Information Management System | PSMA | Port State Measures Agreement |
| FAO, | Food and Agricultural Organisation (of the UN) | RFMO | Regional Fisheries Management Organisation |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility | RMI | Republic of the Marshall Islands |
| GFW | Global Fisheries Watch | SAP | Strategic Action Programme |
| GPS, | Global Positioning System | SBAA | Standard Basic Assistance Agreement |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Productive | SCCF | Special Climate Change Fund |
| HMTC | Harmonised Minimum Terms and Conditions | SDG | Sustainable Development Goal |
| HS | Harvest Strategy | SEA | Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse |
| HAS | Harvest Strategy Approach | SESP | Social and Environmental Screening Procedure |
| HSBI | High Seas Boarding and Inspection | SESA | Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment |
| HSBIP | High Seas Boarding and Inspection Programme | ESMF | Environmental and Social Management Framework |
| IUU | Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated | SIDS | Small Island Developing State |
| IPP | Indigenous Peoples Plan | LAP | Livelihood Action Plan |

# Project Description

*The*  ‘**Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Living Oceanic Resources by the Small Island Developing States of the Western and Central Pacific’** project formally adopted by signature of the relevant Forum Fisheries Committee Ministers from each of the Pacific SIDS in mid-2019 sets out to address the root causes of the threats and potential impacts as identified by the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and to translate the proposed subsequent Strategic Action Programme (SAP into an appropriate set of GEF Project Components.

The overall goal of the SAP is to *maintain the sustainability of oceanic living marine resources and the associated fishery through an ecosystem-based approach which further ensures food security and the economic well-being for the region’s SIDS*. One important issue that is expected to have a direct and significant impact on the highly migratory fish-stocks on which the Pacific SIDS depend is that of climate change. The SAP recognizes that the region is growing continually more concerned about the effects of climate change on the distribution and resilience of tuna stocks. This could have a number of socioeconomic impacts on the Pacific SIDS which are discussed in the SAP and in the text of the project’s ProDoc. One of the main concerns related to the impacts of climate change is the predicted changes in tuna stock range and migration patterns resulting from oceanic temperature and pH changes, and associated alterations in ecosystem physical parameters as well as food-chains. This would subsequently alter access to stocks in different areas of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) region. The SAP recognizes the need for some specific actions to be taken in this context.

In a Causal Chain Analysis undertaken by the TDA, a number of environmental and associated socioeconomic impacts have been identified which have defined the root causes of the following impacts and threats including;

1. Weaknesses in management and compliance, both ‘in-zone’ and on the high seas;
2. Impacts from climate change and associated concerns due to excessive carbon emissions and lack of adopted global mitigation procedures;
3. Inadequate application of ecosystem-based management;
4. Effects of coastal impacts on the offshore oceanic ecosystem; and,
5. Discharges and waste disposal at sea and from land-based sources.

The TDA and its Causal Chain Analysis formed the basis for this project. Therefore the primary aim of this UNDP/GEF Project is to support the FFA member countries in implementing the SAP.

## Purpose and scope of this ESMF

This Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared in support of the project proposal on “*Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the Living Marine Resources of the WCPFC”* within the GEF-financed *UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022* on Climate Change, Disaster Resilience and Environmental Protection developed together with the Forum Fisheries Agencies (FFA).

Even though the scope of this ESMF covers all project components, outcomes, outputs and activities, it is important to note that not all project activities have been defined at this stage of the project cycle. Therefore, to ensure compliance with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES), this ESMF has been prepared to set out the principles, rules, guidelines and procedures for screening, assessing, and managing the potential social and environmental impacts of the project as they are developed and designed .

The ESMF is a management tool to assist in managing potential adverse social and environmental impacts associated with project activities, in line with the requirements of UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards. This ESMF forms the basis upon which the implementing partner(s) will carry out the relevant site-specific assessments and develop/establish relevant management Plan(s), to ensure that significant adverse environmental and social impact mitigation and management measures are implemented and monitored as required. This ESMF identifies the steps for detailed SESAs of the project’s potential social and environmental risks, and for preparing and approving the required management plans for avoiding, and where avoidance is not possible, reducing, mitigating and managing the identified adverse impacts of this project.

It also sets out the additional safeguards measures that apply to the project during the inception phase, including but not limited to:

1. Conducting site-specific Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment(s) (SESA), targeted at impacts associated with “upstream” aspects of the project involving planning support, policy advice and reform, and/or capacity building.
2. Establishing and implementing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan(s).
3. Establishing and implementing the Gender Action Plan(s).
4. Based on the results of the SESA, the project will prepare any relevant management measures and/or plans to mitigate any potential social and environmental impacts of the project as per the SES. These measures should include robust stakeholder engagements; accessible and functional Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) to ensure that all relevant stakeholders have a means to communicate and that all grievances are addressed in a fair and just manner.

This ESMF will be publicly disclosed in line with UNDP’s Information Disclosure Policy and SES. Free, Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) will be applied for any identified activities which may have adverse impacts on indigenous groups, including but not limited to the implementation of the ESMF.

# Description of the potential social and environmental impacts

*(Both positive and negative, related to typology of likely activities, sub-projects, policies, and/or regulations to be supported during project implementation)*

## Potential Social and Environmental Positive Impacts:

As part of the preparatory activities for this project, a detailed review and consultation was undertaken with each participating Pacific SIDS to identify the national strategies and requirements related to the Project Objective and Components. As a result, each of the 14 Pacific SIDS has submitted a National Status and Needs Report (Annex 14, ProDoc). These reports have provided a snapshot of potential impacts that implementing this project will have on each of the participating member states.

**Positive Social Impacts:**

* The project will provide assistance in updating and aligning national legislation and regulations with regional and international obligations pursuant to relevant regional and global instruments and agreements which continue to evolve and adapt to emerging challenges.
* It will ensure food security for the region through a well-managed and sustainable fishery
* Additionally, the project will positively impact on the economic security of the region through maintaining and improving the value of living marine resources.

**Positive Environmental Impact :**

* The Project will help each Pacific SIDS to prepare and implement its National Plan of Action (NPOA) to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing.
* The Project will support cooperation on the management of fisheries resources that span wide areas, and are of economic and environmental concern to a number of nations by addressing a number of international commitments to the Sustainable Development Goals i.e., the United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, (“the Fish Stocks Agreement”).
* A long-term impact of this project will include developing and establishing a healthy, well-managed and valued ecosystem supporting the sustainable use of living marine resources which provide food and economic security, resilience and benefits to the Pacific SIDS in the WCPF Convention Area.

## Potential Social and Environmental Negative Impacts:

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) was used to identify potential social and environmental risks associated with this Project (refer to Annex 1). The screening highlighted the project intentions as related to mainstreaming human rights, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and accountability.

An impact risk assessment was undertaken using the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure to assess the impact and likelihood of project risks. As a result; a significance value of low or moderate was attributed to the potential impact of these risks. The SESP identified a total of seven (7) potential risks, of which four 94) have been assessed as low risks and three (3) as moderate risk, with the overall SESP risks categorizations rating as “Moderate”. The risks apply to project components 1, 2 and 3.

**Moderate Risk:**

Projects categorized as “moderate risk” are defined under UNDP’s SES as those; “*that include activities with potential adverse social and environmental risks and impacts, that are limited in scale, can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty, and can be addressed through application of standard best practice, mitigation measures and stakeholder engagement during Project implementation*”.

**Risk 1: If technical assistance and policy advice does not sufficiently fill capacity gaps, then there is a possibility that in some cases some government bodies may have insufficient capacity to meet all of their obligations.**

This risk is based on the context of limitations surrounding the capacity in some areas within the FFA’s member-states. The fisheries administrations of FFA members are characterised by stronger than average capacity against public sector benchmarks, nonetheless some jurisdictions within the region have corruption and public sector capacity indicators in the bottom quartile globally (WGS, World Bank, 2019). In these contexts there may at times be constraints on member-states abilities to meet all obligations as defined within project activities. This would naturally be true of any GEF project requiring capacity building. However, although the impact could be significant in the event of no improvements in capacity, the probability of this happening if quite moderately likely as the implementing partners have a solid track record of delivery within this context.

**Required Actions**:

* Prior to project activities related to policy development, training and capacity budling; the project is required to carry out a Social and Environmental Strategic Assessment (SESA) to ensure that all upstream impacts are carefully managed during project implementationn to ensure SES compliance.
* FFA will use its extensive experience in oceanic (primarily Tuna) fisheries management to integrate capacity-building experience and skills the fisheries departments/management in the participating member states. Capacity building and associated training initiatives will ensure continuous upgrading and expansion of skill-sets to ensure that duty bearers meet their obligations.
* The associated training and capacity building, has been integrated in all the four (4) components of the project to be established during project implementation and will be monitored through the Results and Monitoring Framework.

**Risk 5: There is the possibility that the project will experience ineffective or incomplete stakeholder engagement with relevant stakeholders including the local communities including local indigenous communities and women.**

Because of the varied range of stakeholders i.e., 14 Small-Island Developing States as well as the national fisheries associated management bodies in each member state; there is potential for limited robust engagement of stakeholders during/throughout project implementation. Moreover; with the limitations/restrictions surrounding travel to project sites due to COVID19; there is potential for some stakeholders to undermine remote engagement if/when required. As a result, the project’s screening found that the likelihood for the project to experience ineffective and/or incomplete stakeholder engagement with relevant stakeholders is moderate and therefore recommends the follow:

**Required Actions**

* FFA has established a proactive, comprehensive and functional Stakeholder Engagement Plan (See Section 6) that includes all relevant stakeholders including women, youth, marginalized communities and Indigenous Communities. Included in this ESMF the project has outlined procedures for ensuring effective stakeholder engagement during implementation; strong communication and awareness structures with decisions being seen to be ‘supported’ across the board.
* Additionally, the project will carry out a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment to towards ensuring stronger awareness and support at the national policy level to help create a consensus within FFA which can carry into WCPFC also.
* To ensure that all relevant stakeholders fully participate in the project the SES requires that the project develop a well-founded Grievance Redress Mechanism (See Section 7) to complement its stakeholder engagements and participation.

**Risk 7: The project is operating in areas in which there are existing Gender imbalances that the project continues to address, these could be reproduced or exacerbated if not properly managed during project implementation.**

Women and girls comprise about half of the population in Pacific Island countries. However, representation in leadership and decision making is low. For example, statistics suggest that less than 8% of women are in parliamentary positions[[2]](#footnote-2). Gender inequities in the Pacific Islands region are distinct. Women are vulnerable and are face risks associated with violence, lack of economic opportunities and limited access to health care and education[[3]](#footnote-3). One of the reasons for inequality comes from the traditional culture and social structure of each country. The capacity to achieve gender equality is not merely about changing laws, it is about social attitudes in which women are not regarded as equal and there is a struggle for women to face the challenges of both social and cultural complexities in each national setting. In the work-place, men out-number women by two to one. In the context of economic empowerment, if women had the same access to markets, credit and technology as men then the share of wealth for women would dramatically increase[[4]](#footnote-4).

**Required Actions:**

* The project is required to establish its Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming Action Plan (See Annex 2) that has been developed during the PPG phase. This plan provides an analysis of gender inequalities and gender-based violence in the 14 SIDs as well as procedures to ensure that gaps associated with gender inequality and women empowerment are not exacerbated during project implementation.
* The project requires that FFA utilize some of the existing structures it has in place that support Principle 3 Gender Equality and Women Empowerment. For example: Moana Voices; a program that is currently being led by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency with support from the GEF Oceanic Fisheries Management Project, OFMP2. This project aims to increase the participation of women in fisheries by raising the profile of fisheries as a potential career, as well as the profile of women already working in the sector. If/when implemented effectively; this program has the potential to close the gaps that have been identified as risks under gender inequality and women empowerment.

# Legislation and Institutional Frameworks for environmental and social matters.

## National and International Legislation, Policies and Regulations of the 14 Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Please see Annex 3; 106 Pages

## UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards

This ESMF has been prepared in line with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) Policy, which came into effect 1 January 2021. These standards underpin UNDP’s commitment to mainstream social and environmental sustainability in its programs and projects to support sustainable development and are an integral component of UNDP’s quality assurance and risk management approach to programming. Through the SES, UNDP meets the requirements of the GEF’s Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy.

The objectives of the UNDP SES are to:

* Strengthen the social and environmental outcomes of Programs and Projects;
* Avoid adverse impacts to people and the environment;
* Minimize, mitigate, and manage adverse impacts where avoidance is not possible;
* Strengthen UNDP and partner capacities for managing social and environmental risks;
* Ensure full and effective stakeholder engagement, including through a mechanism to respond to complaints from project-affected people.

In accordance with UNDP SES policy, the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) has been applied to the Project during the project development phase (both at PIF and PPG stages). In accordance with UNDP SES policy, a SES principle or standard is ‘triggered’ when a potential risk is

identified and assessed as having either a ‘moderate’ or ‘high’ risk-rating based on its probability of occurrence and extent of impact. Risks that are assessed as ‘low’ do not trigger the related principle or standard.

The screenings conducted during project development indicate that three (3) of the eight (8) social and environmental principles and standards have been triggered across the Project due to ‘moderate’ risks:

* **Principle 2: Human Rights** – to ensure the participation, benefit and mitigation of potential negative consequences of member states being unable to meet their obligations.
* **Principle 3: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** – to ensure the full participation of women in the project and counter any discrimination or patriarchal systems in target communities.
* **Principle 4: Accountability –** to ensure that project stakeholders are engaged in participation and decision -making; that the project is transparent concerning all its interventions; ensure that there are grievance redress mechanisms in place for stakeholders to communicate their concerns and have access to rights-compatible complaints and ensure that the project has effective ensuring effective monitoring and reporting structures regarding its implementation of social and environmental risk management measures.

# Procedures for Screening, Assessing and Managing Social and Environmental Impacts

## Procedures for Assessments and Management Plans

This ESMF has been developed as part of UNDP’s due diligence process in the project cycle, following the screening of the UNDP-supported **Mainstreaming climate change and ecosystem-based approaches into the sustainable management of the highly migratory fish stocks of the West and Central Pacific Ocean** project with the SESP template. Based on the project risk categorization and the specific risks, the following procedures for screening, assessing and managing those risks must be undertaken during implementation, as follows.

1. **Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA):**  In accordance with UNDP’s SES policy, the project must carry out site-specific SESAs during the project inception phase to assess risks associated with policy support-related activities. These assessments will be conducted to identify potential adverse impacts during policy development; trainings and capacity building workshops and any identified adverse impacts resulting from the SESAs will be subject to further study and stakeholder consultation to identify and where possible quantify the magnitude and severity of such impacts on policy, training and capacity building. Conducting site-specific SESAs, is targeted at impacts associated with “upstream” aspects and based on the results of the SESA, the project will prepare any relevant/required management measures and/or plans to mitigate any potential social and environmental impacts of the project as per the SES.
2. **Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP):** Additionally, the project will implement a functional and robust Stakeholder Engagement Plan to ensure that consultations with all relevant stakeholders are carried out prior to all project activities and that a functional and accessible **Grievance Redressal Mechanisms (GRMs)** is in place for the stakeholders to raise any/all grievances that may arise from the project.
3. **Gender Analysis and Action Plan**: The Gender Action Plan (GAP) will provide a set of avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and institutional measures with an implementation plan to achieve the desired social and environmental sustainability outcomes. This plan must be implemented and updated throughout project implementation to ensure that all risks associated with Principle 3 Gender equality and Women Empowerment are further assessed and that the appropriate management measures are established to ensure SES compliance.The measures will be adopted and integrated into the project activities, monitoring and reporting framework and budget, and captured in a revised SESP. The GAP will take into account the requirements and measures under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, as required. Additionally, the plan will take into consideration any limitations regarding the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and make operational recommendations regarding the alignment of the Project with site-specific national guidelines and policies, and review cycles within the Project regarding those recommendations.

Further information on stand-alone management plans can be found on the UNDP website at: [https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES\_Toolkit/SitePages/Guidance%20and%20Templates.aspx,](about:blank) and the annexes of this framework include sample terms of references for the Project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (Annex II) and Social and Environmental Safeguards Officer (Annex VI), as well as an outlines of the ESIA (Annex III), ESMP (Annex IV) and Indigenous People’s Plan (Annex V).

**The above assessments and management plans must be prepared and mitigation measures in place, per those plans, prior to the initiation of any project activity that may cause any impacts, in particular any actions that may lead to or cause physical or economic displacement, and impacts on indigenous peoples.**

## Procedures for Screening

During implementation, this Project will be re-screened using the UNDP SESP at regular intervals during project implementation, when determined necessary by the Project Manager, the Project’s Social and Environment Safeguards Officer, the Project Steering Committee, or UNDP; as outlined in the resulting management plan(s); and/or when project circumstances change in a substantive or relevant way. Ideally, the SESP (and associated project’s Risk Log) should be reviewed ahead of each PIR, and at least ahead of the Midterm Review and Terminal Evaluations. Re-screening may also be required the course of carrying out required risk assessments or development of stand-alone management plans.

## Procedures for Unidentified/Emerging Risks

Since project activities have not yet been fully defined and considering that impacts from restrictions associated with COVID-19 global pandemic including but not limited to economic, health and travel impacts, Project risks may emerge during implementation after the SESAs have been conducted and completed.

The Emergent Risk section of annual project implementation reports (PIRs) will highlight any/all newly identified risks and ensure that the appropriate measures are in place to mitigate and/or manage these risks. Additionally, the quarterly reports and the mid-term review (MTR) will also ensure that re-screening is conducted to capture any risks that may arise during project implementation. Any additional risks identified will be added to monitoring, and mitigation measures designed by the Project Management Unit (PMU) and consultants as required, in discussion with the Project Steering Committee and UNDP Country Office.

## Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic Response Integration

The project is considering that the continual spread/development of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) global pandemic will affect Project, operations and activities during 2021 and 2022. This pandemic has the potential to pose significant effects on the project particularly with regards to international and national movement; economic, social impacts and on the health and safety of oceanic fisheries management.

Since the pandemic remains a risk in the Small Island Developing States, the project must be proactive ensure preparedness, including assessing transmission risks during the course of project implementation and potential direct impacts from the pandemic, and develop management plans for COVID-19. Measures may include reducing exposure and transmission by reducing travel, adhering to safety protocols, increasing remote working practices, and limiting direct Project interventions in communities while risks remain high.



Additionally, the Project should:

* Align and coordinate with Member States related to the COVID-19 pandemic where appropriate;
* Assist in communicating official information regarding the pandemic to all its stakeholders;
* Ensure staff are prepared and trained to carry out their work safely in the Project office(s), with partners and communities, including provision of equipment where it can reduce risks, increasing opportunities for remote work where required and ensuring national quarantine and isolation recommendations are adhered to;
* Ensure all community engagement should follow minimum protocols to curtail risk of infection within and between communities;
* Regularly monitor the implementation and effectiveness of measures undertaken by the Project.

Due the fluid situation around the pandemic, risks and recommendations will be assessed and reviewed by the Project Steering Committee on a bi-monthly basis during the pandemic

# Institutional Arrangement and Capacity Building

## Roles and responsibilities for implementing this ESMF

The roles and responsibilities of project staff and associated agencies in the implementation of this ESMF is as follows. This ESMF does not cover the roles and responsibilities associated with implementation of the subsequent ESMP(s) and/or stand-alone management plans; those will be defined prior to Project implementation at the project inception phase, as required per this ESMF.

**Implementing Partner:**

The Implementing Partner for this project is the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). FFA is responsible for:

* Ensuring that the required assessments mentioned in Section 3.2. above are developed, disclosed for public consultation and approved, and management measures are adopted and integrated during project implementation;
* Project planning, coordination, management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting.
* Reporting, fairly and accurately, on project progress against agreed work plans in accordance with the reporting schedule and required formats;
* Maintaining documentation and evidence that describes the proper and prudent use of project resources in conformity to the signed Project Document and in accordance with applicable regulations and procedures (e.g., SES);
* Ensuring all requirements of UNDP’s SES and national regulatory/policy frameworks and relevant international standards have been addressed (e.g., mitigation of identified adverse social and environmental impacts);
* Procurement of goods and services, including human resources required to ensure compliance with this ESMF;

**Project stakeholders and target groups:**

The principal target groups for this project are the Pacific SIDS themselves and all of the inhabitants engaged in oceanic fisheries within these islands. Despite the tuna fishery within the WCPO maintain sustainability for the last few years there is a risk of over-fishing from DWFNs both within the EEZs and adjacent to them. The project aims to secure a better balance of management for and by the SIDS over their fisheries to avoid their marginalization in this management process. Annex 14 provides detail of the fisheries management status for all of the 14 Pacific SIDS as well as information on the incremental actions and priority assistance needs.

The project will work with a range of stakeholders including FFA, WCPFC, PNA, Pacific SIDS government representatives, NGOs, private sector, and academic and research institutions (see descriptions under Section IV – Results and Partnerships), with the aim of strengthening management approaches in line with an ecosystem-based management strategy that embraces adaptive management toward climate change and other potential impacts on migratory fish stocks and subsequently the socioeconomic well-being of the Pacific SIDS. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) will define the actual process and the mechanisms for partners and stakeholders to engage in the decision-making and management proceedings within the project. Annex 9 defines the SEP. The main objective of the SEP is to ensure that the interests and priorities of the different stakeholder groups and sectors are taken into account during relevant phases of project development and implementation. Specific objectives of the plan include:

* Informing stakeholders to ensure a common understanding of the intended project goals and approaches.
* Generating project buy-in and appropriation by targeted partners and beneficiaries.
* Identification of priority interventions and adequate strategies to successfully achieve the intended outcomes of the project.
* Identification of opportunities for synergies and partnerships, including co-financing and institutional cooperation.
* Validation of the intervention strategy and targets by its key stakeholders.
* Facilitation of participatory M&E and feedback mechanisms.
* Establishment of grievance mechanisms.

**UNDP:**

UNDP is accountable to the GEF for the implementation of this project. This includes oversight of project execution to ensure that the project is being carried out in accordance with agreed standards and provisions. UNDP is responsible for delivering GEF project cycle management services comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation. UNDP is also responsible for the Project Assurance role of the Project Steering Committee. UNDP’s role includes the following:

* Provide oversight on all matters related to safeguards;
* Inform all the stakeholders and right-holders involved in, or potentially impacted, positively or negatively, by the GEF-financed projects, about the UNDP’s corporate Accountability Mechanism (described below);
* Ensure that the Compliance Review and the Stakeholder Response Mechanisms are operational during the lifetime of the projects;
* Ensure adherence to the SES for project activities implemented using funds channelled through UNDP’s accounts, and undertake appropriate measures to address any shortcomings;
* Verify and document that all UNDP SES requirements have been addressed;
* Provide technical guidance on implementation of this ESMF and administrative assistance in recruiting and contracting expert safeguards services (as required), and monitor adherence of each project to the ESMF and UNDP policies and procedures.

**Project Management Office:**

* Supervise and manage implementation of measures defined in this ESMF;
* Assign specific responsibilities for implementation of this ESMF, including monitoring, and community consultations on the draft management plans to a staff member(s) of the PMO;
* Maintain relevant records associated with management of environmental and social risks, including updated SESPs, impact assessments, a log of grievances together with documentation of management measures implemented;
* Report to the Implementing Partner, the Project Steering Committee, and UNDP CO on the implementation of the ESMF;
* Ensure that all service providers are informed of their responsibilities for the day-to-day compliance with the ESMF.

As noted above, the projects’ subsequent ESMPsand stand-alone management plan**s** as required**,** will describe the roles and responsibilities in the implementation of those plans. Those new roles and responsibilities will be assessed and integrated, as appropriate, as part of the participatory decision making and implementation proceedings of the project.

**Project Organisation Structure**

**Project Board/Steering Committee**

**Beneficiary Representatives**

***National Focal Points (Head of Fisheries Administrations)* in the 14 Pacific SIDS**

**Project Executive**

***FFA Director General***

**Development Partners**

*UNDP, the Pacific Community, the Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement, World Wildlife Fund and PITIA.*

**Project Coordination Unit**

**=**

CTA/Project Coordinator

Fisheries Management Advisor

Finance & Admin Officer

M&E Specialist

**UNDP Project Assurance**

**Implementing Partner**

Forum Fisheries Agency

**WWF**

Consultants

Supply Chain Mapping

Processing Traceability

Reporting/Outreach

Agency Liaison

Transhipment Framework Revision

Review of Compliance – Mar. Poll.

**SPC (Pacific Community)**

Sen. Fisheries Scientist

Data Systems Analyst

**PNAO**

Fisheries Management Coordinator (part-time)

**Figure: Proposed GEF FFA Project governance structure**

**Project Steering Committee:**

The Project Steering Committee, provides strategic guidance to implementation of the project including oversight for safeguards and the implementation of this ESMF. It is also responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Steering Committee decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition.

Specific responsibilities of the Project Steering Committee include:

* Provide overall guidance and direction to the project, ensuring it remains within any specified constraints;
* Address project issues as raised by the project manager;
* Provide guidance on new project risks, and agree on possible mitigation and management actions to address specific risks;
* Agree on project manager’s tolerances as required, within the parameters set by UNDP-GEF, and provide direction and advice for exceptional situations when the project manager’s tolerances are exceeded;
* Advise on major and minor amendments to the project within the parameters set by UNDP-GEF;
* Ensure coordination with various government agencies and their participation in project activities;
* Review combined delivery reports prior to certification by the implementing partner;
* Address project-level grievances;
* Review the final project report package during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.
* Monitor implementation of this ESMF and compliance with national and international regulations, and UNDP social and environmental standards;
* Decision making for the adoption of necessary measures including full integration of management measures within project Outputs and annual work plans;
* Establish and support GRM mechanism to address any grievances.

The composition of the Project Steering Committee must include the following roles:

1. Heads of National Fisheries Administrations
2. FFA Deputy Director, Director of Fisheries Development, Director of Fisheries Operations
3. Project Chief Technical Adviser, Project Fisheries Management Adviser, FFA Project Administration and Finance Officer
4. Representatives of Project Partners – SPC, PNAO, WWF, PITIA
5. Ad-hoc inputs from Project Technical Consultants as required to address specific agenda items

The proposed membership of the Project Steering Committee taking into account the above requirements is shown in **Table 1** below. Observers may be invited to participate in meetings of the Project Steering Committee.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1. Project Steering Committee Membership**  Chair: The Chair of the PSC will be the Chair of the Forum Fisheries Committee  Vice chairs: The Vice Chair of the PSC will be the Deputy Director of FFA  Members: The Members of the PSC will be the Heads of National Fisheries Administrations and representative of project partners |

## Capacity Building

Specialists with relevant expertise in social and environmental safeguards will be engaged to support the completion of the targeted assessment(s) on Social and Environmental Strategic Assessments; stand-alone plans where necessary i.e., economic displacement and livelihoods and those targeting Indigenous Communities and if found to be required to develop/establish the subsequent Environmental and Social Management Plan (s) (ESMP (s). Specialists will also be recruited to carry out the relevant trainings, induction session (s) for Project Management Units (and implementing partners, as needed) on safeguards responsibilities and approaches.

The UNDP-GEF Unit will provide advice to project teams as needed to support the implementation of this ESMF and the preparation, implementation and monitoring of social and environmental management plans/measures.

The Project Steering Committee will have the final responsibility for the integration of ESMP/stand-alone management plan(s) in the execution of the project. The integration of those plans will need to consider particular institutional needs within the implementation framework for application of the ESMP, including a review of the required budget allocations for each measure, as well as the authority and capability of institutions at different administrative levels (e.g., local, regional, and national), and their capacity to manage and monitor ESMP implementation. Where necessary, capacity building and technical assistance activities will be included to enable proper implementation of the ESMP.

# Stakeholder Engagement Plan and information disclosure

Project Outputs will be an operational Stakeholder and Partnership Engagement Strategy adopting partnerships with NGOs, private sector and international-recognised institutions and technical bodies that can provide support for monitoring and compliance, scientific studies and research related to ecosystem-based management and climate change impacts, and broad training in such areas as fisheries management and MCS. Furthermore, as part of an Outcome addressing Knowledge Management, Communication and Awareness. The Project will involve engagements and participation of WCPFC stakeholders as well as those of the global community in fostering and promoting collaborative mechanisms with LMEs, Regional Seas Conventions and Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) in order to better manage and sustain an overall healthy ecosystem and to catalyse cooperative sustainable fisheries management.

## PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS

The project will work with a range of stakeholders including FFA, WCPFC, SPC, PNA, Pacific SIDS government representatives, NGOs, private sector, and academic and research institutions, with the aim of strengthening management approaches in line with an ecosystem-based management strategy that embraces adaptive management toward climate change and other potential impacts on migratory fish stocks and subsequently the socioeconomic well-being of the SIDS. Partnerships are listed in that Section above which provides a list of the main partners and stakeholders in the Project.

## STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT - OBJECTIVE AND PRINCIPLES

The main objective of the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) is to ensure that the interests and priorities of the different stakeholder groups and sectors are taken into account during relevant phases of project development and implementation. Specific objectives of the plan include:

* + Informing stakeholders to ensure a common understanding of the intended project goals and approaches.
  + Generating project buy-in and appropriation by targeted partners and beneficiaries.
  + Identification of priority interventions and adequate strategies to successfully achieve the intended outcomes of the project.
  + Identification of opportunities for synergies and partnerships, including co-financing and institutional cooperation.
  + Validation of the intervention strategy and targets by its key stakeholders.
  + Facilitation of participatory M&E and feedback mechanisms.
  + Establishment of grievance mechanisms.

The stakeholder engagement plan will be implemented according to five basic principles that will ensure its effectiveness and inclusiveness:

**I). Participation:** Open representation and participation of stakeholders will be facilitated at all levels, from Government to local community members.

**II). Gender equity:** Project design and implementation will be responsive to gender-sensitive considerations including the specific capacities and needs of women, the youth and marginalized/vulnerable groups.

**III). Respect for cultural diversity**: Project design and implementation will respect existing customs, traditions, and forms of organization and decision-making.

**IV). Communication and transparency:** Care will be taken to design and implement a communication strategy that guides messages coherently to specific stakeholder groups and audiences targeted by the project. Adequate communication will help avoid unrealistic/false expectations or erroneous interpretations between actors. Information will be provided transparently, without marginalizing any stakeholder groups.

**V). Partnerships and synergies:** Continuous efforts will be made to ensure mapping of other interventions with similar objectives as the project, or initiatives that are related to the same thematic scope as the project. Opportunities will be explored to establish synergies that can help to maximize project impact and avoid duplication of efforts.

## PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT:

To ensure full engagement and participation of all relevant stakeholders, the project will employ the following methodologies:

* **Project Steering Committee**: Meetings of the PSC will be organized on a regular basis to ensure relevant partners remain actively engaged in monitoring progress and steering the implementation of project activities towards its intended outcomes.
* **Workshops**: Workshops will be used to inform and actively engage larger groups of stakeholders in consultation processes, generating buy-in and sharing knowledge.
* **Strategic / informal meetings**: Meetings will be held bilaterally or with groups with the purpose to inform stakeholders and/or obtain agreement on issues of importance for successful project implementation. Group meetings will also form an important means of communication at the community level.
* **Liaisons**: representatives of regional governments and district councils, community leaders, elders, religious leaders, etc. may be used as liaisons, for instance between beneficiaries and other project partners.
* **Expert consultations**: Recognized experts in thematic areas will consult and inform stakeholders on strategic aspects of the project.
* **Exchange visits**: Project partners and beneficiaries at the national level may be selected to participate in visits to other countries in order to exchange knowledge and learn from good practices and successful approaches implemented elsewhere that could be replicated in the project sites.

The project will develop a communication strategy that will take into consideration the stakeholder engagement plan and can be adapted depending on the stage of the project, and in response to feedback from stakeholders, as well as the grievance mechanism which will be shared with all stakeholders.

Full and transparent stakeholder involvement in Project activities and in delivery of its objectives will be encouraged and supported. This included the understanding that all stakeholders should have access to the knowledge needed for them to support, understand and contribute to the review, monitoring and effectiveness of regulations and management initiatives.

## COMMUNICATION

In addition to the above-mentioned engagement tools, the project will develop a communication strategy that will take into consideration the stakeholder engagement plan and can be adapted depending on the stage of the project, and in response to feedback from stakeholders, as well as the grievance mechanism.

Contents and format of information dissemination will be specifically adapted to targeted audiences, their educational background, cultural contexts, and languages, in order to obtain the highest possible levels of understanding and buy-in, including through the following mechanisms:

* **Brochures/flyers/newsletters**: Printed materials will be used for sharing project summaries and knowledge products with national stakeholders (Government staff, communities around targeted sites).
* **Radio, TV, newspapers, press releases**: The media will be used to reach broader stakeholder groups in the WCPO, mobilize support and raise awareness on project activities and relevant environmental topics.
* **Exhibitions**: Posters, photos, banners, and/or short (20 min) videos may be produced for display in national and international fora and fairs.
* **Policy briefs**: To inform decision makers on recommendations, lessons learned and good practices resulting from project implementation and enable replication/upscaling, policy briefs may be developed for sharing with Government stakeholders.
* **Progress reports**: Reports produced as part of M&E processes (e.g., UNDP GEF PIR) will be shared with the Steering Committee, UNDP, donor(s), as well as other relevant stakeholders (as appropriate).
* **Online media**: The project will share progress updates and good practices to the general public through online media, including a Project Website with links into and from the websites of FFA, WCPFC, SPC, Pacific SIDS partner ministries as well as platforms such as IW: LEARN[[5]](#footnote-5), UNDP EXPOSURE[[6]](#footnote-6), FAO, etc. Posts may include stories, photographs, photo-blogs, short video’s etc. To reach national and global audiences, the project could also consider establishing accounts on social media including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and YouTube.

The above mechanisms will form part of an overall Project Communication Strategy to developed as part of **Component 4 - Output 4.1.4: Develop and adopt a Communications Strategy for regular updating and dissemination of Project achievements and deliverables and to encourage feedback into Project Output and Activities from stakeholders as part of the Project’s adaptive management strategy.** This will help to support full engagement with the project stakeholders so as to raise awareness of Project aims and achievements and to better understand and capture the needs and requirements of the various stakeholders.

## STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TIMETABLE

**Table 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **FREQUENCY OR EXPECTED ‘DUE BY’ DATE (FROM PROJECT COMMENCEMENT) FORWARD)** |
|  | |
| Inception Phase and Workshop with stakeholder attendance | Once – beginning of Project |
| Meetings of Project Steering Committee | At least every 4-6 months during life of Project |
| Development and Adoption of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy | Inception plus 4 months |
| Grievance Mechanisms established as part of the SEP | From inception of the project – 5 months |
| Development and Adoption of a Communications and Awareness Strategy | Inception |
| All Communications and Outreach Platforms in place (website, media reports, frequent Policy Briefings, etc.) | Inception – 3 months |
| Open *ad hoc* Stakeholder Meetings | As required |
| Formal Stakeholder Consultation Workshops | Every 3-6 months during project implementation |
| Stakeholder engagement through capacity enhancement and technical support. | As required by the Project Management Unit |
| Project monitoring with participation of stakeholders (including monitoring of project safeguards and risks) | At PSC meetings, PIR, Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation of project |

## RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Project Management Unit at FFA will be responsible for implementing the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and achieving its objectives. He/she will mobilise the project team and partners to conduct specified stakeholder engagement activities and manage the grievance mechanism, according to the objectives and principles of the plan.

The Project will set aside resources for effective stakeholder engagement thorough its annual workplan and budget review and adoption and through approval by the Steering Committee.

# Grievance Redress Mechanism and Accountability

Across FFA member countries there are existing well established internal consultative processes and mechanisms for stakeholder engagement with national fisheries administrations. The scope of this includes the opportunity to raise any matters of concern or grievance relating to any aspect of project delivery. In case any grievances exist among project beneficiaries, stakeholders or partners, the concerns will initially be addressed to the executive of the national fisheries administrations. If the grievance cannot be resolved at the national level, the matters of concern and then be directed to the Project Management Unit, along with the necessary background information and a summary of the process to date to allow for assessment of the cause of the grievance and identify possible solutions and mitigation.

National administrations are in regular contact with the FFA Secretariat and project management personnel via a range of mechanisms including email, virtual meetings, direct telephone or skype or associated voice communication and, pre and post COVID 19, by regular face to face forums and meeting. This ensures multiple mechanisms are available to communicate issues and concerns and discuss and progress mitigation strategies and solutions.

If the PMU based on its assessment of the seriousness and complexity of the problem is not able to provide a solution, the grievance may be escalated to the relevant (Government) partners and/or the Project Steering Committee. The PSC may decide to organise an *ad hoc* meeting in order to address the issue, or, if appropriate depending on the urgency, park the issue until the next planned regular meeting.

All grievances should be adequately documented and flagged by the PMU, including the causes, responses, and outcomes of actions taken to address the problem. The UNDP Country Office responsible for the Project in Fiji as well as the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor should be notified immediately in case of grievances that may directly/indirectly hamper project implementation and/or (potentially) affect the reputation of the organisation.

Discussions with project stakeholders, including local communities at project sites, commenced during the project development phase. A list of the stakeholders engaged in these consultations has been Annexed to the Project Documents. The project also has an individual Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan, which is annexed to the Project Documents. These Plans will be followed to ensure that stakeholders are engaged in project implementation and particularly in the further assessment of social and environmental impacts and the development of appropriate management measures. Project Stakeholder Engagement Plans will be updated during project implementation based on the assessments and management plans conducted in line with this ESMF, as needed.

Potentially affected stakeholders will be engaged during the implementation of this ESMF. This will include FPIC consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Minorities if applicable.

As part of the stakeholder engagement process, UNDP’s SES require that project stakeholders have access to relevant information. Specifically, the SES (SES, Policy Delivery Process, para. 21) stipulates that, among other disclosures specified by UNDP’s policies and procedures, UNDP will ensure that the following information be made available:

* Stakeholder engagement plans and summary reports of stakeholder consultations
* Social and environmental screening reports with project documentation
* Draft social and environmental assessments, including any draft management plans
* Final social and environmental assessments and associated management plans
* Any required social and environmental monitoring reports.

As outlined in the SES and UNDP’s Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), the type and timing of assessments and management plans vary depending of the level of social and environmental risk associated with a project as well as timing of the social and environmental assessment.

This ESMF (and the project SESP) will be disclosed via the FFA website in accordance with UNDP SES policy. The subsequent project assessments and management plan (s) will also be publicly disclosed via the FFA website once drafted, and finalized and adopted only after the required time period for disclosure has elapsed.

These requirements for stakeholder engagement and disclosure will be adhered to during the implementation of this ESMF, and the subsequent implementation of the resulting management plans.

## UNDP’s Accountability Mechanisms

UNDP’s SES recognize that even with strong planning and stakeholder engagement, unanticipated issues can still arise. Therefore, the SES are underpinned by an Accountability Mechanism with two key components:

* 1. A Social and Environmental Compliance Review Unit (SECU) to respond to claims that UNDP is not in compliance with applicable environmental and social policies; and
  2. A Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) that ensures individuals, peoples, and communities affected by projects have access to appropriate grievance resolution procedures for hearing and addressing project-related complaints and disputes.

UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism is available to all of UNDP’s project stakeholders. The Social and Environmental Compliance Unit (SECU) investigates concerns about non-compliance with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards and Screening Procedure raised by project-affected stakeholders and recommends measures to address findings of non-compliance.

The Stakeholder Response Mechanism helps project-affected stakeholders, UNDP’s partners (governments, NGOs, businesses) and others jointly address grievances or disputes related to the social and/or environmental impacts of UNDP-supported projects.

Further information, including how to submit a request to SECU or SRM, is found on the UNDP website at: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/secu-srm/>

SECU investigates concerns about non-compliance with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards and Screening Procedure raised by project-affected stakeholders and recommends measures to address findings of non-compliance. The Stakeholder Response Mechanism helps project-affected stakeholders, UNDP’s partners (governments, NGOs, businesses) and others jointly address grievances or disputes related to the social and/or environmental impacts of UNDP-supported projects.

Existing national and sector forums may also provide important opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on project implementation. Utilization of existing structures and processes to engage stakeholders is encouraged, as this may provide opportunities for issues to be raised before they develop into more significant grievances. However, such fora would not substitute for specific project grievance redress mechanisms (GRM[[7]](#footnote-7)) that may be required.

Accessibility is a key principle for any accountability mechanism. Since accessibility starts with awareness raising, the PM will need to take responsibility for ensuring that project-affected people and communities are informed of UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism and the GRM. The stakeholder engagement process provides a key entry point to do this awareness raising and ensure that information about UNDP’s Accountability Mechanism is made available to all project beneficiaries and partners. Communication materials are available in the online SES Toolkit[[8]](#footnote-8) to support this effort.

## MONITORING AND REPORTING

Participatory project monitoring and evaluation is a key part of the results-based management (RBM) approach practiced by UNDP and GEF for all projects. Similarly, stakeholder engagement activities will be integrated in the M&E processes for this project to provide sufficient information for adaptive management decision-making. Beneficiaries and project partners will be encouraged to participate in different steps of the process, including design and verification of the logical framework and its indicators, tracking tools, reviews, field visits for monitoring progress, etc. The project will also ensure to regularly disseminate progress reports to relevant stakeholders for inputs, reviews, feedback and information sharing purposes.

The project will use standard UNDP approaches and procedures for M&E processes (see Monitoring and Evaluation Plan section for details).

## Project-level Grievance Redress Mechanisms

Across FFA member countries there are already very well established internal consultative processes and mechanisms for stakeholder engagement with national fisheries administrations. The scope of this includes the opportunity to raise any matters of concern or grievance relating to any aspect of project delivery. In case any grievances exist among project beneficiaries, stakeholders or partners, the concerns will initially be addressed to the executive of the national fisheries administrations. If the grievance cannot be resolved at the national level, the matters of concern and then be directed to the Project Management Unit, along with the necessary background information and a summary of the process to date to allow for assessment of the cause of the grievance and identify possible solutions and mitigation.

National administrations are in regular contact with the FFA Secretariat and project management personnel via a range of mechanisms including email, virtual meetings, direct telephone or skype or associated voice communication and, pre and post COVID 19, by regular face to face forums and meeting. This ensures multiple mechanisms are available to communicate issues and concerns and discuss and progress mitigation strategies and solutions.

If the PMU based on its assessment of the seriousness and complexity of the problem is not able to provide a solution, the grievance may be escalated to the relevant (Government) partners and/or the Project Steering Committee. The PSC may decide to organise an *ad hoc* meeting in order to address the issue, or, if appropriate depending on the urgency, park the issue until the next planned regular meeting.

All grievances should be adequately documented and flagged by the PMU, including the causes, responses, and outcomes of actions taken to address the problem. The UNDP Country Office responsible for the Project in Fiji as well as the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor should be notified immediately in case of grievances that may directly/indirectly hamper project implementation and/or (potentially) affect the reputation of the organisation.

# Budget for ESMF Implementation

Funding for implementation of the ESMF is included in the Project budget. The estimated costs are indicated in Table 4 below. Costs associated with the time of Project Management Unit Staff coordinating the implementation of this ESMF or UNDP support are not shown.

**Table 3: Breakdown of project level costs for ESMF implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| International consultant(s), safeguards Assessments (SESA) | 21,000 |
| National consultant(s), safeguards | 15,000 |
| Local consultant, gender specialist (part time) | 15,000 |
| Travel expenses for consultations | 8,150 |
| Audio-visual & print production expenses | 1,500 |

# Monitoring and evaluation arrangements

Reporting on progress and issues in the implementation of this ESMF will be documented in the project quarterly reports and annual project implementation reports (PIRs). Until the relevant assessments and management plans have been established, UNDP BRH will be responsible for compiling reports on the implementation of this ESMF, for reporting to the Project Steering Committee. Key issues will be presented to the Project Steering Committee during each committee meeting.

Implementation of the subsequent management plans will be the responsibility for the individual project management teams, and other partners as agreed upon and described in those future plans.

The ESMF monitoring and evaluation plan is outlined below in **Table 4**.

**Table 4: ESMF M&E plan and estimated budget**

| **Monitoring Activity & Relevant Projects** | **Description** | **Frequency / Timeframe** | **Expected Action** | **Roles and Responsibilities** | **Cost (per project, excl. staff time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Track progress of ESMF implementation | Implementation of this ESMF coordinated for the project, and with results reported to the Project Steering Committee on an annual basis | Quarterly | Required ESMF steps are completed in a timely manner. | Project Manager, with support from and Project M&E/Safeguards Officers | None |
| Development of site -specific SESAs | Carried out in a participatory manner, in-depth analysis of potential social and environmental impacts, as well as identification / validation of mitigation measures, drafted in participatory manner | Quarters 1 and 2 of project implementation | Risks and potential impacts are assessed with support of external consultants and participation of project team and stakeholders; management actions identified and incorporated into project implementation strategies. | External service providers (environmental and social)  With guidance from UNDP BRH, Project Manager, and Project M&E/Safeguards Officers | 21,000 |
| Implementation of mitigation measures and monitoring of potential impacts identified in targeted assessment(s) and per the this ESMF | Permanent and participatory implementation and monitoring of impacts and mitigation measures, to be prepared together with targeted assessment) | Continuous, once relevant assessments have been carried out and the IPP developed/established. | Implementation of ESMF; participatory monitoring of assessment findings (i.e., identifying indicators, monitoring potential impacts and risks); integration of stand-alone management plans into project implementation strategies. Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant (tendered to national institute, local consultant, CSO or service provider) | Project Manager, M&E/Safeguards Officer, Pilot Coordinators, oversight by UNDP BRH, PSC | TBD, based on assessment. |
| Development of SESA and Indigenous Peoples Plan. | Carried out in a participatory manner, targeted analysis of potential environmental and social impacts associated with upstream impacts/ enhanced management, as well as identification / validation of mitigation measures, drafted in participatory manner | Quarters 1 and 2 of project implementation | Potential impacts related to economic displacement for Indigenous Communities are assessed with support of external consultants and participation of project team and stakeholders; targeted assessment report completed; if justified based on findings of targeted assessment, an Indigenous Peoples Plan will be developed; management actions will be identified and incorporated into project implementation strategies. | External service providers (environmental and social)  With guidance from UNDP BRH, Project Manager, and Project M&E/Safeguards Officer |  |
| Implementation of management measures and monitoring of potential impacts identified in SESA | Permanent and participatory implementation and monitoring of management measures, in accordance with findings of SESA | Continuous, once assessment is complete and management plan is in place | Implementation of stand-alone management plans; participatory monitoring; integration of management plans into project implementation strategies | Project Manager, oversight by UNDP BRH | TBD, based on assessment |
| Learning | Knowledge, good practices and lessons learned regarding social and environmental risk management will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project. | Continuous, once assessment is complete and management plan is in place | Relevant lessons are captured by the project teams and used to inform management decisions. | FFA Project Managers | None |
| Annual project quality assurance | The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP’s quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project | Annually | Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed and used to inform decisions to improve project performance | UNDP BRH, Program Manager, with support from Project M&E/Safeguards Officers | None |
| Review and make course corrections | Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making | At least annually | Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the Project Management Team and used to make course corrections | FFA Project Managers | None |
| Annual project implementation reports | As part of progress report to be presented to the Project Management Unit and key stakeholders, analysis, updating and recommendations for risk management will be included | Annually | Updates on progress of ESMF will be reported in the project’s annual PIRs. A summary of the avoidance and mitigation of potential social and environmental impacts will be included in the program annual report, sharing best practices and lessons learned across the program. | UNDP BRH, FFA Project Manager | None |
| Project review | The Project Management Unit will consider updated analysis of risks and recommended risk mitigation measures at all meetings | At least annually | Any risks and/ or impacts that are not adequately addressed by national mechanisms or project team will be discussed in project steering committee. Recommendations will be made, discussed and agreed upon. | Project Management Unit,  Project Manager | None |
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