

Environment & Social Framework for IPF Operations

Good Practice Note

Managing the Risks of Projects Involving Protected and Conserved Areas

Annex IV

The following annex is part of the GPN on Managing the Risks of Projects Involving Protected and Conserved Areas. For ease of use, it will be uploaded as a separate file and will have links provided to it in the full text of the GPN, which will also be available online at the following URL:

<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/345f6737b55b565433d838862b5d56f9-0290012026/original/pca-gpn-with-annexes-i-iii.pdf>

Annex IV. Illustrative Degrees of Risk for Each Issue

The following annex is part of the Good Practice Note on Managing the Risks of Projects Involving Protected and Conserved Areas, which is accessible at the following URL:

<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/345f6737b55b565433d838862b5d56f9-0290012026/original/pca-gpn-with-annexes-i-iii.pdf>

Table IV.1 below provides examples of lower- and higher-risk situations for each issue in the GPN. Risk determination is context- and project-specific. This table should therefore be used only for illustrative purposes. It may inform but does not replace the exercise of Bank judgment in setting the Environmental and Social Risk Classification under the Environmental and Social Framework (ESF).

Higher-risk situations may be managed thanks to robust mitigation measures and Borrower capacity, such that the proposed activities would be consistent with Bank policies and within the scope of the Bank's risk appetite. In addition, as usual, the degree of risk and adequacy of mitigation measures should be reassessed periodically during project implementation in accordance with adaptive management.

Table IV.1 Degrees of Risk for Each Issue			
	Less Risk	→	More Risk
Issue 1: Protected and Conserved Area (PCA) and Project Boundaries	Clear delimitation of PCA boundaries in government records and project documents. Boundaries widely understood and accepted by local stakeholders. No history of disputes evident from government and stakeholder consultations.	<p>PCA or project boundaries not yet set or known.</p> <p>Past but no active disputes or prevailing tensions around the creation of the PCA and land use.</p> <p>Proposed new boundaries for PCA with the potential to impact nearby communities.</p>	No clear documented boundaries of the PCA and/or villages in or near the PCA. Overlapping and contradictory legal designations of the land in or near PCA and rules governing access and use of natural resources. Ongoing or legacy disputes around the creation of the PCA and land use.
Issue 2: Relevant Institutions	<p>Full understanding of entities operating in the project area. Clear and distinct roles and responsibilities. Role of each entity under the project spelled out in project documents and supported by agreements and funding.</p> <p>Recognition within national system of customary institutions and decision-making processes of Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities (IPs/SSAHUTLCs).</p>	<p>Limited articulation or coordination between government authorities and customary or traditional authorities and systems for decision-making.</p> <p>Uneven power dynamics among entities and stakeholders.</p> <p>Track record partially known or mixed.</p>	<p>Multiple institutions with overlapping authority operating in project area. Unclear roles, reduced capacity, limited funding among them. Lack of effective communication and coordination mechanisms across relevant institutions, including customary institutions of IPs/SSAHUTLCs.</p> <p>Track record of agencies unknown or problematic. Project implementation dependent on entities other than Bank counterparts.</p> <p>Imbalanced or conflictive power dynamics among entities and stakeholders.</p>

Table IV.1 Degrees of Risk for Each Issue

	Less Risk	—————→	More Risk
	<p>Balanced power dynamics among entities and stakeholders.</p> <p>Known and acceptable track record of relevant institutions.</p> <p>Government commitment to inclusive PCA governance.</p>		<p>No government commitment to inclusive PCA governance.</p>
Issue 3: Relevant Laws, Rules, and Operating Procedures	<p>Clear land ownership and use records across project area. Minimal overlapping or conflicting land laws and jurisdictions. No or few disputes surrounding land rights and access.</p> <p>No project support for PCA rules enforcement. No other PCA rules enforcement agencies operating in the project area. Systems in place to recognize and support the role of IPs/SSAHUTLCs in PCA management.</p>	<p>No obvious conflict over land ownership, and potential to formalize ownership and use rights across project area. Limited overlapping or conflicting land laws and jurisdictions with commitment to resolve outstanding issues. Sound channels to resolve any disputes surrounding land rights and access.</p> <p>Project supporting PCA management but not rules enforcement. PCA rules enforcement entities operating in the project area have Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) consistent with Good International Industry Practices.</p> <p>Limited role or embedded restrictions in rights and access for IPs/SSAHUTLCs co-management.</p>	<p>Project support for PCA rules enforcement. History of tensions or conflicts involving ownership or use of land or PCA rules enforcement entities.</p> <p>Overlapping or conflicting land laws and jurisdictions.</p> <p>Weak resolution channels and commitment to address legal/regulatory gaps.</p> <p>Project-supported PCA rules enforcement entity unwilling to share information. SOPs significantly deviate from Good International Industry Practice. Severe restrictions and limitations on customary landholders and/or IPs/SSAHUTLCs' continued access and/or role in co-management.</p>
Issue 4: Access Restrictions	<p>No new access restrictions. Existing access restrictions are clear, well-understood, and consistently enforced. IPs/SSAHUTLCs and local communities in governance or co-management fully accepted. Limited subsistence or cultural use of the PCA by local communities. No organized criminal or commercial</p>	<p>Access restrictions mostly known but inconsistently enforced.</p> <p>Project-supported access restrictions would cause limited impacts on current users of PCA resources.</p> <p>Accountable governance including participation of IPs/SSAHUTLCs and local communities.</p>	<p>New access restrictions. Or existing access restrictions or their impacts unclear or poorly understood, or inconsistently enforced. Or requirements to restrict access to the PCA by large numbers of IPs/SSAHUTLCs or local communities. Or extensive organized or criminal commercial extraction of PCA resources. Significant legacy issues and history of conflict and violence.</p>

Table IV.1 Degrees of Risk for Each Issue

	Less Risk	—————→	More Risk
	extraction of PCA resources.		
Issue 5: Physical resettlement	No inhabitants in the PCA. No physical resettlement or economic displacement required under the project or planned in the project area.	Past or planned resettlement is limited, resources are available, and capacity and participatory structures are in place and are trusted.	Inhabitants in the PCA subject to or at risk of physical resettlement. Local laws prohibit human settlement in the PCA despite existing settlements. Unresolved claims to PCA land by local communities. Historical, planned, or ongoing resettlement in the area.
Issue 6: Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities	Where applicable, customary land and resource rights of IPs/SSAHUTLCs are recognized by national laws and their role in defining conservation objectives is legally recognized and built into the country's PCA system, including Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) for the creation of new PCAs, defining boundaries and management plans, and a role in implementing those plans.	IPs/SSAHUTLCs are granted some continued access, usage, and co-management rights, but are not allowed to have lands titled that overlay PCAs. Processes are in place to establish and enforce agreements, ensure engagement, and resolve any issues.	IPs/SSAHUTLCs have customarily lived, used, and accessed natural resources within the PCAs in the project area, yet the national legal frameworks do not recognize their customary rights, and require physical displacement or restrictions of access to their customary lands and natural resources. Or, despite legal recognition, outstanding claims and rights over lands that overlay PCAs are not implemented by the Borrower. IPs/SSAHUTLCs feel intimidated and fear retaliation. Recent history of hostile treatment by PCA rules enforcement entities.
Issue 7: Vulnerable Groups	Vulnerable groups not subject to physical resettlement, access restrictions, or other adverse project impacts.	Limited number of vulnerable persons at risk of access restrictions but resources and social programs are available and there is a commitment to address their needs with an adequate level of trust/track record.	Vulnerable groups at risk of physical resettlement, significant access restrictions, or other adverse project impacts, such as risks to food security and increased health and safety concerns.
Issue 8: Human-Wildlife Conflict	PCA wildlife poses no or minimal threat to human economic or physical security.	Growing human or wildlife population with good management and mitigation measures in place.	History of human-wildlife conflict with inadequate PCA management response.
Issue 9: Stakeholder Engagement	Limited populations in the project area with limited impacts from the project. Well established	Large and diverse population with varied but reconcilable interests. Defined stakeholder groups	Large, diverse population with potentially conflicting interests. Large, geographically dispersed, and socially diverse populations.

Table IV.1 Degrees of Risk for Each Issue

	Less Risk	—————>	More Risk
	<p>stakeholder engagement structures and inclusive practices. Enabling country conditions present for an open dialogue at the PCA level. No track record of retaliation for expression of stakeholder views, preferences, and concerns. Project Implementation Unit (PIU) staff with stakeholder engagement expertise.</p>	<p>and engagement process that requires active management and commitment to implement. Capacity and trust levels are adequate. PCA management approach includes a commitment to the stakeholder engagement process.</p>	<p>Presence of inter-community conflict or criminal activity in the project area, leading to suppression of stakeholder engagement. Poor track record of sharing information and communication between relevant authorities and affected communities. Stakeholders fear retaliation, and lack trust in leadership and other entities.</p>
Issue 10: Bank Supervision	<p>Small project area. Well-resourced Bank Task Team, with commensurate skills and budget. High-capacity PIU. Monitoring arrangements in place to capture potential new developments.</p>	<p>Medium-sized project area with manageable population and resources. Implementing agency with some capacity and commitment to gap-filling measures. Bank team well-resourced and adaptive management options attainable.</p>	<p>Large project area with limited accessibility and extensive populations. Bank resources for supervision not commensurate with project profile. Low-capacity PIU. Monitoring arrangements insufficient to capture potential new developments.</p>
Issue 11: Incident Reporting and Grievance Mechanism (GM)	<p>Incident reporting protocol agreed with Borrower and operational. GM operational, widely accessible, well-used, and responsive to complaints. Timely completion of root-cause analyses and follow-up. Knowledge available on local-level grievance management systems and practices in the project area. Information available on referral structures that can be used to direct complaints that cannot be resolved by the PIU (see Annex XII for more information). A designated GM focal point role in the PIU for tracking, reporting, monitoring.</p>	<p>Borrower and Bank aware of gaps, with clear plan and commitment to fill them. Borrower commitment to transparency and management of incidents and grievances. Reasonable levels of trust and willingness to air and resolve issues.</p>	<p>No or incomplete incident reporting protocol agreed with Borrower. GM not fully operational, widely accessible, or responsive to complaints. Lack of trust and low willingness of stakeholders, project-affected parties to use the GM due to fear of retaliation, poor past experience, access barriers (e.g., language). Incidents not subject to timely root-cause analyses or follow-up.</p>