

Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (Initial)

Report No: AC134

Section I - Basic Information

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 07/01/2003

A. Basic Project Data (from PDS)

I.A.1. Project Statistics

Country: KAZAKHSTAN	Project ID: P078301
Project: Forest Protection and Reforestation Project	Task Team Leader: Jessica Mott
Authorized to Appraise Date: October 18, 2004	IBRD Amount (\$m): 30.00
Bank Approval: July 5, 2006	IDA Amount (\$m):
Managing Unit: ECSSD	Sector: Forestry (80%); General public administration sector (15%); Animal production (5%) Theme: Land management (P); Environmental policies and institutions (P); Rural policies and institutions (S); Other environment and natural resources management (S); Civic engagement, participation and community driven development (S)
Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan (SIL)	
Status: Lending	

I.A.2. Project Objectives (From PDS):

The project objective is to develop environmental and economic services through more sustainable use, increased productivity and enhanced conservation of forest and associated rangeland resources, with a focus on in the northeastern pine forest and southern saxaul woodlands. The development objective is both local and global in nature. The project would include:

- (a) a policy, legal, organizational, and information framework that enables improved forest and rangeland management;
- (b) rehabilitation and effective management of damaged Irtysh pine forest in the northeast (Pavlodar and East-Kazakhstan Oblasts) to increase the value of the forest assets by reducing losses due to fire, pests, and unsustainable logging, and by otherwise increasing economic productivity and environmental services; and
- (c) vegetative plantings and improved management of the woodlands and associated rangelands in the south (Kyzyl-Orda Oblast) to control desertification, reduce wind-blown pollution of salts and dust from the Aral Sea bed, provide shade and fodder for livestock, and increase the value of timber and fuelwood.

The global nature of the development objective it is highly relevant to global environmental concerns of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in several focal areas. The land degradation is the most significant focal area in that the project would decrease the rate of desertification, including control of wind-blown dust in and around the Aral Sea bed. Other GEF focal areas relevant to the project development objective would include climate change, and ecosystem biodiversity and associated human communities in forests and semi-arid zones. Given this multi-focal objective, integrated ecosystem management would also be relevant. Potential global benefits associated with desertification control, air pollution control, carbon sequestration, and biodiversity, will be further investigated during project preparation.

I.A.3. Project Description (From PDS):

The following activities and investments are being considered for an initial six-year project. The long-term intention is to provide examples that can be replicated on a larger scale across the country

through follow-up investment by Kazakh or international lending sources.

A. Enabling Environment. This component would strengthen the National Forest Management Capability of the Forestry and Hunting Committee and its selected territorial and local branches. Project costs might include computers, other equipment, remote sensing and other data, office facilities including utilities, furniture, dissemination materials, other supplies, vehicles, field surveys, staff travel, technical advice, training, consultation workshops, and staff. Activities would include:

- i. Information, policy, and organizational support. This would include both information for forest management planning and monitoring, as well as policy and organizational development. This subcomponent would support a national forest inventory; upgrade facilities and skills in forest management; and improve forest information systems. It would also include the development of a National Forest Policy and Strategy process based on broad public consultation. In addition it would also would also upgrade capacities for economic analysis, forest product marketing policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, incentive frameworks, organizational arrangements, human resource development, and strategic communications.
- ii. Project coordination. While project management and implementation will be largely mainstreamed into permanent organizational entities, some additional support (e.g., procurement, financial management, project reporting) will be required for the duration of the project.

B. Protection and Rehabilitation of Irtysh Pine Forests in the Northeast. This would focus on the damaged Irtysh pine forests in Pavlodar and East-Kazakhstan Oblasts. Project costs might include forestry works including nurseries and rehabilitation plantations, computers, research equipment, nursery equipment and supplies, fire management equipment and facilities, other equipment, data, office facilities including utilities, furniture, dissemination materials, other supplies, vehicles, staff travel, field surveys, technical advice, training, consultation workshops, service contracts, community grants, and staff. Activities would include:

- i. Development and implementation of new forest management plans for improved and cost-effective reforestation and for a more effective and sustainable management of hazards (pest, fire, and illegal logging). These activities would involve local communities and businesses through public-works contracts in forest fire protection and reforestation, as well as strengthen local participation in forest management planning and should develop feasible models for replication by the Government in other northern and eastern regions.
- ii. Development of small demonstration investments in:
 - community or private forest management contracts,
 - testing establishment of private forest plantations, and
 - small community grants to increase community involvement in reforestation and environmental education.

C. Vegetative Plantings and Improved Management of Woodlands and Associated Rangeland in the South. This component would support field testing to assess the costs and benefits of potential treatments to the dry Aral Seabed and of management approaches to the desert saxaul woodlands in Kyzyl-Orda Oblast, and scaling up of cost effective measures. Project costs might include forestry works including nurseries and rehabilitation plantations, computers, research equipment, nursery equipment and supplies, other equipment, data, office facilities including utilities, furniture, dissemination materials, other supplies, vehicles, staff travel, field surveys, technical advice, training, consultation workshops,

service contracts, community grants, and staff. In populated areas new forest/rangeland management would aim to combine desertification control and protection of the existing native woodlands, while restoring pasture and forest quality and reducing rural poverty through increased involvement of local communities in integrated forest/range management. Activities would include:

- i. Field testing of the cost-effectiveness of saxaul plantations, grass, or other treatments in the dry Aral Sea bed and surrounding abandoned agricultural lands to stabilize the toxic salts, and if appropriate, support for scaling up of the most cost effective treatments.
- ii. Improving the capacity in woodland and associated range management of traditional saxaul areas at oblast and rayon levels including development of management plans and incentives for sustainable use, communication, fire control, etc. It would include field testing to improve the capacity and quality of saxaul reforestation in historic saxaul areas, and if appropriate, support for scaling up of the most cost effective treatments, support for planting stock improvement, modern (where possible private) nurseries, and more extensive private sector involvement.
- iii. In addition, the project could develop demonstration pilots in:
 - the effective protection of tugai floodplain woodlands in the south;
 - rangeland leasing, livestock migration routes, and water supply; and
 - testing establishment of private tree plantations for fuel wood and gardening.

I.A.4. Project Location: (Geographic location, information about the key environmental and social characteristics of the area and population likely to be affected, and proximity to any protected areas, or sites or critical natural habitats, or any other culturally or socially sensitive areas.)

The Project areas are located in

- (a) two northern oblasts i.e. Pavlodar and East Kazakhstan which are dominated by pine forests that, among others, and protect the city of Semey from sand dune encroachment. The areas is dominated by pine forests, interspaced with grassland, and occasional salt pan and salt lake. It is inhabited by (state paid) forest workers, some other forest workers and farmers; most are ethnically Russian.
- (b) the southern oblast of Kyzyl Orda with saxaul and tamarix woodlands on the north and south side of the Syr Dara river irrigation system and adjacent dry Aral Sea coast. The project areas are rural and are seasonally populated with mainly Kazakh or Uzbek livestock herders; some parts were abandoned during the transition due to the lack of employment. There are also villages of former fishermen, railway workers, and rice farmers.

The project does not include parks, although in January 2003 the Government designated the eastern Irtysh pine forest (a major target of the project) as two national forest reserves. Unlike national parks, in natural reserves timber harvesting can still take place as sanitary fellings or for thinning immature stands.

B. Check Environmental Classification: B (Partial Assessment)

Comments: No significant adverse environmental impacts are foreseen. Environmental benefits are fundamental to the project development objective and outcomes. These beneficial environmental impacts include reduced desertification, salt and dust control, reforestation of degraded lands, improved conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in selected ecosystems, and reduced use of potentially harmful pesticides. The reforestation is expected to utilize native species of pine, saxaul, tamarix, poplar, willow, aspen and other. The forest planning and management activities (including fire management strategies) will address natural habitat considerations in both the site-specific and landscape context.

The project will help develop more environmentally acceptable pest management strategies. There is a

possibility of using a limited amount of pesticides in preparing planting stock in nurseries and in major pest outbreaks, but overall pesticide use is likely to be reduced in favor of biological controls.

The Irtysh Forest may have been affected by fall-out of 1949-1962 nuclear tests on the nearby Semipalatinsk testing grounds. Preliminary data indicate that currently the dose contribution of most radionuclides is low. The risks associated with this nuclear contamination and the implications for forest management and related aspects such as soil erosion, fire management, and use of forest products will be assessed in an analysis to be carried out by a multi disciplinary Kazakh team and peer reviewed by an expert from the International Atomic Energy Agency or another internationally recognized center of excellence in issues related to radiation. The study will be part of the environmental assessment.

Temporary minor impact (dust, minor soil loss) can be expected from planting activities, building construction and other works. No new access tracks are envisaged. Improvement of shelter and access to water in the woodlands that could increase livestock movement and lead to trampling and some loss of topsoil will be carefully managed with necessary safeguards to prevent environmental deterioration.

C. Safeguard Policies Triggered (from PDS)

(click on  for a detailed description *or* click on the policy number for a brief description)

Policy	Triggered		
Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01, BP 4.01, GP 4.01)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Natural Habitats (OP 4.04, BP 4.04, GP 4.04)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TBD
Forestry (OP 4.36, GP 4.36)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Pest Management (OP 4.09)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Cultural Property (OPN 11.03)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TBD
Safety of Dams (OP 4.37, BP 4.37)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Projects in International Waters (OP 7.50, BP 7.50, GP 7.50)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60, BP 7.60, GP 7.60)*	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD

Section II - Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management

D. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues. Please fill in all relevant questions. If information is not available, describe steps to be taken to obtain necessary data.

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

The project is not expected to carry significant safeguard risks.

In view of possible minor risks the safeguards on forest and pest management are triggered, and safeguards on natural habitats and involuntary settlement may be triggered. Environmental Assessment is triggered as explained above under Section II B.

- (i) Forest is triggered because the project is intended to affect forested areas. It will be implemented in accordance with the Bank's operational policy. It will support investment in rehabilitation of existing degraded forests and woodlands to restore protective cover and to make these and other forests more productive. The project would not finance plantations that involve any conversion or degradation of

critical natural habitats. The project would not finance industry-scale commercial harvesting operations. Any harvesting by local communities or other local entities supported by the project would adhere to a time-bound action plan for achieving a standard of forest management developed with the meaningful participation of locally affected communities, consistent with the principles and criteria of responsible forest management.

- (ii) Pest management is triggered because the project would help to develop more environmentally acceptable pest control strategies. The possibility of using a limited amount of pesticides in preparing planting stock in nurseries, and in major pest outbreaks. In such cases the possibility of using biocontrol products will be explored before considering chemical interventions. Project preparation will include an evaluation of current patterns of pest management and pesticide use and make recommendations where needed on introducing/expanding integrated pest management tools, strategies and skills improvement. Action plans, including pest management plans will be incorporated into the overall forest management plans.
- (iii) Natural habitats may be triggered. The project is not expected to convert or degrade critical natural habitats. The process of site selection would include a field visit by a qualified biologist to further confirm that the project would not adversely affect endangered species or habitats.
- (iv) Involuntary Resettlement may be triggered, since the project may limit access to forest resources which could potentially curtail existing legal or illegal incomes of vulnerable people, at least on a temporary basis. There is no encroachment of human settlements in the project area forests and project itself will not cause involuntary physical displacement of people. The project would not include support for national parks.

II.D.1b. Describe any potential cumulative impacts due to application of more than one safeguard policy or due to multiple project component.

No cumulative negative impact expected. In the aggregate, the project is expected to have significant positive environmental impacts. The quality of Kazakhstan's natural habitats and forests, and associated environmental services is likely to improve, especially in contrast to the continuing decline which would likely take place in the without project scenario. Similarly, on forest management and social aspects, local people are likely to begin to participate in forest management in a meaningful way, gain more control over their destiny (empowerment and security) and to receive livelihood benefits. The principles underlying the safeguard policies are imbedded in the project's logical framework.

II.D.1c Describe any potential long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area.
No negative long term impact expected.

II.D.2. In light of 1, describe the proposed treatment of alternatives (if required)

The project design integrates provision of environmental services with more classic forest production. This choice reflects the significant economic impacts of the environmental services resulting from the project, particularly those concerning desertification control. The project does not focus exclusively on environmental services because (a) sustainable multiple-use management approaches to the two project areas are possible and appropriate, and (b) economic utilization is likely to be essential to a politically viable and fiscally sound incentive framework for resource management.

II.D.3. Describe arrangement for the borrower to address safeguard issues

The Borrower will carry out an environmental assessment conforming to Bank procedures and Kazakh environmental regulations. The EA will identify possible environmental impact and the mitigation of risks. The Environmental Management Plan (including a Pest Management Plan) will be included as an

annex of the Project Appraisal Document. The preparation work will include drafting guidelines and procedures for the preparation of improved site-specific forest and rangeland management plans in the project areas that would be developed and initiated during the project implementation period. It will also include specialized consideration of legal aspects, pest management aspects, sustainable harvesting considerations, natural habitat considerations, and other environmental issues. A social assessment field survey will be carried out based on a combination of participatory rural appraisal methods, in-depth interviews, focus groups, and secondary data. The social assessment will also include an estimate of the number of affected people and the number of beneficiaries, disaggregated by gender, ethnic affiliation, level of wealth, age, and other social indicators. If the social assessment finds that vulnerable people are likely to be affected by restrictions of access, *An Access Restriction Process Framework (ARPF)* would be prepared prior to appraisal which would describe the participatory process by which the project was prepared and will be implemented, providing guidelines for designing site specific mitigation measures on the potential adverse impacts of restrictions of access on vulnerable people and developing an institutional arrangement for the implementation of mitigation measures.

II.D.4. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

Key stakeholders will include the rural people living in and around the forests, livestock-herder families, forest users, forestry staff, as well as environmental NGOs. Interactions to date include workshops in Astana, Kokchetau and Semey with environmental NGOs that are very interested in the project concept, and informal group meetings with villagers and foresters in the proposed project areas. Most likely consultations will involve a process of ongoing consultations (with local communities, NGOs, Academic Institutions, and other government agencies) that would elicit the input of key stakeholders and incorporate their views throughout the design period and during implementation. Prior to the departure of the appraisal mission, a Russian version of the EA report will be disclosed within Kazakhstan, and Russian and English versions will be made available in the Bank's Infoshop.

E. Safeguards Classification (select in SAP). Category is determined by the highest impact in any policy. Or on basis of cumulative impacts from multiple safeguards. Whenever an individual safeguard policy is triggered the provisions of that policy apply.

- S1. – Significant, cumulative and/or irreversible impacts; or significant technical and institutional risks in management of one or more safeguard areas
- S2. – One or more safeguard policies are triggered, but effects are limited in their impact and are technically and institutionally manageable
- S3. – No safeguard issues
- SF. – Financial intermediary projects, social development funds, community driven development or similar projects which require a safeguard framework or programmatic approach to address safeguard issues.

F. Disclosure Requirements

<i>Environmental Assessment/Analysis/Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	9/15/2004	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	9/15/2004	
Date of submission to InfoShop	9/30/2004	
Date of distributing the Exec. Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors (<i>For category A projects</i>)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<i>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>

Date of receipt by the Bank	9/15/2004	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	9/15/2004	
Date of submission to InfoShop	9/30/2004	
<i>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		
<i>Pest Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	9/15/2004	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	9/15/2004	
Date of submission to InfoShop	9/30/2004	
<i>Dam Safety Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why.

Signed and submitted by

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Task Team Leader:	Jessica Mott	6/26/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 1:	Radhika Srinivasan	6/26/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 2:	Tjaart Schillhorn-Van Veen	6/26/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 3:		

Approved by:

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Emilia Battaglini	6/26/2003

Comments

Cleared

Sector Manager	Marjory-Anne Bromhead	6/26/2003
----------------	-----------------------	-----------

Comments

The ISDS has been revised as agreed at the PCD Review and is herewith approved.