

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: PIDISDSA20550

Date Prepared/Updated: 15-Dec-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Bolivia	Project ID:	P158532
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P127743
Project Name:	Additional Finance BO Rural Alliances Project II (P158532)		
Parent Project Name:	Rural Alliances Project II (P127743)		
Region:	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	14-Dec-2016	Estimated Board Date:	23-Feb-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Agriculture	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s):	GOVERNMENT OF BOLIVIA		
Implementing Agency:	EMPODERAR		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source		Amount
	Borrower		0.00
	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development		100.00
	Local Farmer Organizations		29.30
	Financing Gap		-4.30
	Total Project Cost		125.00
Environmental Category:			
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:	The Environmental Category of the parent project (B) remains unchanged, since there is no significant variation with respect to parent project; no major negative environmental impacts are expected; it is a low-risk project.		
Is this a	No		

Repeater project?	
--------------------------	--

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Bolivia's recent economic growth, one of the highest in Latin America, has brought about significant benefits to the poor, with poverty decreasing from 63 to 39 percent in the last decade. As in other Latin-American countries highly dependent on extractives industries, Bolivia's economy has been affected by multiple global factors, particularly by low commodity prices. The overall economy slowdown will make it difficult for countries like Bolivia to maintain the levels of investment that characterized the previous decade. Furthermore, damaging weather events, such as floods in 2013 and a severe drought in 2016, have taken a huge toll on Bolivia's economy, particularly in the agricultural sector, where prices of domestic staple products have risen considerably, disproportionately affecting urban and rural poor. Changes in climate patterns will exacerbate climate variability, and therefore, their impacts on vulnerable populations.

Sectoral and institutional Context

The proposed AF, with its scale-up to reach poor producers countrywide, is consistent with WBG and GoB development agendas for 2016-2020, which prioritize inclusive economic growth, reducing poverty and inequality, and building capacity to cope with climate change. The AF is aligned with the World Bank Group Country Partnership Framework (CPF- 2016-2020) for Bolivia, Pillar 1 (Promoting broad-based and inclusive growth), particularly under Objective 3 (Improving opportunities for income generation, market access, and sustainable intensification); and also supports Pillar 2 (Addressing environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change). In relation to government priorities, PAR II will contribute to reaching the targets set forth in the General Economic and Social Plan (PGDES), particularly under Pillar 1, Result 2 (reducing moderate poverty), and under Pillar 6 (sovereignty with productive diversification). It is important to note, that as part of its Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDCs), the Government of Bolivia has committed to triple the irrigation area and double food production under irrigation by 2020; the Project is also aligned with those priorities.

Key results. The AF will scale up activities to enhance the impact of a well-performing project that has proven effective in improving rural income and reducing poverty; the alliance approach will also help small-scale producers cope with climate variability. With an expanded geographical area countrywide, the AF will reach directly an additional 30,000 rural and majority-indigenous households, via supporting about 850 productive alliances. Public infrastructure subprojects will reach out to about 70,000 indirect beneficiaries. As in the original project, the AF will continue promoting strong engagement by women in the subprojects. Maintaining the menu of activities of the original project, the AF will make extra efforts to improving efficiency in water use. As a result, the bulk of additional funds (up to 75%) allocated to alliances will not only serve to improve access to markets, as PAR has been doing over the past ten years, but also strengthen resilience to a harsher climate.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The objective of the Project is to improve accessibility to markets for small rural producers in the Selected Areas by: (a) promoting productive alliances between different small rural producer

organizations and purchasers; (b) empowering rural producers through the establishment and strengthening of self-managed grass-root organizations; (c) increasing access to productive assets, technology and financial services; (d) promoting more effective, responsive and accountable service organizations at the local level; and (e) enhancing environmental sustainability of productive practices. The Project is a follow on operation to the successful PAR I, which tested the model for improving market access.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The re-written PDO would be: ➤ (The Objective of the Project is to improve accessibility to markets and climate resilience for small-scale rural producers in the country ➤ (

Key Results

The Project will track progress against the PDO through the following indicators:

- Increase in the average volume of sales of the product(s) involved in the alliance
- Producer Organizations (SPOs) ➤ (s members that apply climate -related resilience practices/ measures as defined in the business plans
- Producer organizations that maintain or improve their commercial relations (alliances) for at least two productive cycles
- Direct project beneficiaries (disaggregated by men and women): Direct producer beneficiaries from SPOs (disaggregated by men and women) and Beneficiaries of public investment sub-projects (there is not disaggregation).

D. Project Description

PAR II project aims at strengthening market access and climate resilience for small scale producers by: supporting producers ➤ (collective action via the establishing and strengthening of small producer-based self-managed grass-root organizations; strengthening farmers ➤ (linkages with buyers; and increasing their access to productive assets, climate-resilience technologies/ practices, knowledge, and financial resources. As in the parent project, Small Producer Organizations (SPOs) will identify opportunities for business upgrades; consolidate those opportunities into Business Plans (BPs); and co-fund and implement those plans. Although the Project will maintain its demand-driven focus, it will introduce mechanisms to contribute to shape the demand by SPOs, in alignment with the increased resilient emphasis of the project's investments. In fact, in the AF phase, the Project will more strategically support climate resilient investments via irrigation modernization and climate smart practices. Investments under the BPs will be complemented with off-farm investments under Municipal Subprojects to improve productive infrastructure and facilitate market linkages.

PAR II safeguard performance has consistently been rated as satisfactory. The track record of EMPODERAR carrying out PAR and PAR II, confirms strong capability to monitoring compliance with environmental and social safeguards throughout the lifespan of subprojects. Over the years, the PIU has put in place a set of standards and procedures, which has proven effective in diverse environments and social contexts, and which form the basis for the instruments that the PIU will use countrywide in the AF. These tools are included in the Social Assessment & Management Framework, the Resettlement Policy Framework, and the Environmental Management Framework, and will allow the PIU to conduct permanent social and environmental analysis, reinforce information and consultation, strengthen women ➤ (s

participation, and define site-specific mitigation measures, among other multiple actions.

Component Name

Institutional Strengthening

Comments (optional)

This component will continue supporting pre-investment activities for the creation and strengthening of Rural Alliances. As in the parent project, this component will support alliance pre-investment activities to: (i) promote the project concept and outreach, viacommunication and dissemination campaigns; (ii) strengthen capacities of eligible Small Producer Organizations to: form Rural Alliances, identify potential business opportunities, fully prepared business plans, formalize their organizations, and improve their marketing and business skills; (iii) strengthen capacities of service providers and local governments; and (iv) appraise alliances.

Component Name

Implementation of Rural Alliances

Comments (optional)

This component would provide grants to co-finance investments found technically and financially feasible under component 1. These include grants to co-finance the implementation of competitively selected business plans / rural alliances (Subcomponent 2a); and co-finance the implementation of public infrastructure subprojects (Municipal Subprojects Subcomponent 2b). Support to SPO via advisers (acompanantes) would be provided under Subcomponent 2c.

Component Name

Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

Comments (optional)

This component would support the incremental costs associated with project administration and monitoring, to support project activities, such as: updating and operation of the Geo-referenced Management Information System (SIGG, for its acronym in Spanish) and of the public information system; baseline information collection and the impact evaluation of the Project. The component will also support the undertaking of studies.

E. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

In the additional financing phase, PAR II will expand opportunities to farmers countrywide. The expanded geographical coverage of the project, includes a variety of six ecological regions spanning from high-altitude valleys to tropical humid forests. The Borrower has finalized an Environmental Assessment (EA) including a guide of good environmental practices that complements and updates the earlier assessments of environmental characteristics and problems relevant to the Project by each ecological region, including projected concerns of climate vulnerability. The Borrower conducted a complementary social assessment (SA) for the extended project area. The SA analyzed the particular social, cultural, and productive features in each of the eco regions, with emphasis on the TCO/TIOCs and their regulations. The social instruments that were part of the original SA in the parent project (e.g. those for detecting potential social dynamics that might affect the subproject) were revised taking into account the new project area.

To facilitate the application of the social tools, the Social Assessment was broken down into 3 items.

- The Social Assessment (Part I) includes the analysis of social context, poverty aspects, cultural diversity, gender and cross-generation issues in the 6 eco regions (Amazonia, Yungas, Altiplano, Valles, Oriente and Chaco), covering 339 municipalities. The preparation of this document also included a systematic consultation process, which was based on an initial stakeholder analysis.
- The Social Management Framework (Part II) provides technical criteria and customized tools for assessment of feasibility of alliances through social lens; systematizes pertinent information for social monitoring and evaluation; and includes criteria to retro-feeding the beneficiaries to organizations with valuable recommendations to ensuring cohesion and sustainability.
- The Social Management Framework (for Indigenous Peoples/Part III) includes specific tools and procedures to strengthen consultation processes with indigenous peoples; those tools are particularly useful to analyzing the conditions and specific regulations of minority groups located in the TCO/TIOCs and conducting Free, Prior and Informed Consultation processes
- The Resettlement Policy Framework has been updated to reflect the geographic expansion of the project. A land donation protocol has been included to address the land cession for municipal infrastructure subprojects.

Overall the institutional arrangements of the Parent project will remain unchanged, including responsibilities in the supervision of environmental and social aspects. To strengthen implementation capacity, with the expansion of project coverage, the PIU will hire additional safeguard specialists for the Departmental Units and provide them with pertinent training, with support from the Task Team.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Angela Maria Caballero Espinoza (GSU04)

Juan Carlos Enriquez Uria (GEN04)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

In order to streamline the implementation of subcomponent 2.2 (Municipal Subprojects), in the AF, the National Fund of Productive and Social Investment (FPS) would take responsibilities in the administration of financing resources aligned with Subcomponent 2.b activities. Under the original design, EMPODERAR performs most of the activities for subcomponent 2b, such as: defining the Municipal Subprojects pipeline; funding the preparation of pre-feasibility/feasibility studies, and paying contractors. Meanwhile, the FPS was only assigned with the function of appraising the Municipal Subprojects, and procuring and overseeing (from a technical and safeguard perspective) the civil works.

The proposal to assign fiduciary responsibilities to the FPS in the implementation of subcomponent 2.b activities derives from recent changes in public procurement rules, which are slowing-down the implementation of Municipal Subprojects, particularly resulting from cumbersome registration procedures and new requirements for registering procurement processes. To reverse these unforeseen obstacles that emerged during implementation, EMPODERAR will hand over to FPS the responsibility of managing the financing resources for Subcomponent 2b, including the payment for contractors that perform the civil works. This will allow FPS to register the budget for subprojects and manage the procurement in a more straightforward manner. It is important to note that, besides this change, the AF will maintain the same distribution of roles and responsibilities as in the Parent

project.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	As in the original project, no large-scale impacts are expected given the limited, producers-based nature of Project activities. In the AF phase, most of the alliances will be devoted to agricultural /livestock primary production. A number of associated small municipal public works will also be financed such as road rehabilitation and improvement and small vehicular bridges. The AF will place strong emphasis on irrigation and water management both on-farm and in municipal subprojects. To account for it the project has triggered OP/BP 4.37 (Safety of Dams) and OP/BP 7.5 (Projects in International waterways). An EA was conducted by the Borrower to reflect the expanded coverage area (six eco-regions). The EA report includes an updated Environmental Management Framework (EMF) at the Project level reflecting management measures in compliance with OP 4.37 (Safety of Dams), instructed in the Environmental Management Manual. The updated EMF will be included as an annex to the Operational Manual.
Natural Habitats OP/ BP 4.04	Yes	The updated EMF includes a comprehensive exclusion list to be applied at the early stage of subproject evaluation in order to prevent any negative impacts on natural habitats. No activities will be eligible within the core zones of protected areas, but specific activities such as beekeeping can be financed within their buffer zones, provided pertinent authorizations have been obtained and the activities are compatible with the area's Management Plan.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	As in the original project, the updated EMF contemplates deforestation risks of humid or dry forests related with expansion of croplands or pastures that might be induced by some of the beneficiary rural alliances or other Project effects. On the other hand, rural alliances focused on eco-tourism and gathering of non-timber forest products could effectively promote natural habitat conservation by rural producers. PAR II, has however, financed very little (if any) of these types of productive activities.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	As in the original project, Pest management is expected to be one of the main risks to environmental management. To minimize this risk, the PIU revised and improved the pest management plan, which is part of the EMF, taking into account the extended project area (and new crops).
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP	Yes	Considering the portfolio of investments supported by the original project and expected to be financed in the AF, the

4.11		major risks regarding OP/BP 4.11. are associated with civil works such as roads and irrigation canals that could possibly uncover significant cultural property. This risks did not materialize in the original project. As in the original project, management plans in individual subprojects will be developed to manage specific issues if identified. It is possible that excavations could unearth cultural artifacts. The ESMF includes measures to ensure that chance finds are timely determined and respected before proceeding with approval of municipal subproject financing.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Given the fact that most of the potential beneficiaries identify themselves as indigenous (58% of the targeted population), PAR II AF will operate further as an Indigenous People Project in compliance with the OP/BP 4.10. The PIU will encourage minority groups in the lowlands to benefit from the intervention. Project documents and the Operational Manual will include key procedures and activities to ensure culturally adequate implementation, which essentially consists of using their native languages to the greatest extent possible, as well as respecting their traditional and functional social structures and deliberation forms. Furthermore, the project will include regular consultations at the local, regional and national levels, following the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consultation processes. Finally, the project will pay special attention to the traditional and valid gender roles in production. By doing so, the PIU seeks to avoid any negative impact derived from the interference or disruption of social and productive traditional networks. IP rights and women rights will be mapped during all the project cycle.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	As in the parent project, the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP/BP 4.12) will continue triggered in the AF because of the possibility of minor physical impacts on land (up to 5% of the property) and assets, in complementary municipal infrastructure investments. The PIU updated the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to reflect the new project area and included more specific mitigation measures related to access to services, natural resources and physical impacts on land, infrastructure and assets. A land donation protocol has been included to address land cession for municipal infrastructure subprojects.
Safety of Dams OP/ BP 4.37	Yes	Although PAR II does not finance the building of any large dam, this policy is newly triggered in the AF because of the emphasis on irrigation. In the event that a subproject depends on water supplied from an existing dam, the EMF stipulates that, before financing the subproject, the PIU will require a preliminary specialized dam safety assessment.

Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	This policy is newly triggered because of the renewed emphasis of the AF on supporting irrigation investments. The exception to riparian notification has been requested because the project will essentially rehabilitate and improve efficiency in existing irrigation systems. Moreover, the proposed project's activities are not likely to damage the quality or quantity of the water flowing to downstream riparians; similarly, the Project will not be affected by other riparians' possible water use.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	No project activities are contemplated in disputed areas.

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

It is not anticipated that the AF would generate negative environmental impacts, based on the experience of the original project. As in the parent project, the bulk of the investments in the AF will continue to be of a small scale and be led by the beneficiaries themselves. In addition, the projected investments in irrigation, both on-farm and off-farm, will focus on improving efficiency of water use and, therefore, are likely to generate positive environmental impacts. Based on the experience gained with PAR I and PAR II, the PIU has incorporated into the revised EMF multiple good practices that have proven effective in minimizing environmental impacts, such as crop rotation, terracing, reforestation, and soil protection.

By applying the revised EMF, PAR II AF is likely to result in positive long-term environmental impacts, at least, on the following three fronts: (i) reducing risk of soil erosion through the adoption of practices such as crop rotation, pasture management and terracing; (ii) reducing negative effects of pesticides on health and environment as a result of the reduction of toxicity of products used and through awareness-building training; and (iii) improving efficiency in water use through implantation of modern irrigation systems.

Findings from the consultations for the AF phase, highlighted the importance of continue strengthening women participation in project activities. In Amazon and Chaco regions, the participation of women in the project activities is lower as a result of diverse constraints that they face. Under these considerations the project will continue promoting the participation and empowerment of women in the 6 ecoregions but particularly in the Amazon and Chaco ecoregions by improving the access to opportunities of training and decision making in the Alliances. The project will continue promoting women participation and empowerment by, among others, facilitating their access to and engagement in training and decision making in the subprojects. In particular, the PIU will make extra efforts to hire more female technical staff for training, technical assistance and technology transfer, so that the project can reach out to women in a more effective manner.

Additionally, in alignment with the up-coming new safeguard requirements, the SA includes instruments to better understand the possible risks of the project associated with child labor issues and possible mitigation measures to address them if identified. The prohibition of the management

<p>and use of pesticides by minors is introduced.</p> <p>EMF, including subproject screening, has been updated to mitigate potential risk.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>AF is expected to benefit approximately 850 new SPOs in nine Departments. The ongoing project experience shows that PARII has the ability to significantly increase capacity building in the SOPs, and promotes inclusion by women and youth. In the original financing, women's participation in subproject identification and implementation was strengthened. As a result, 30 percent of the participants in alliances were women. However, the SA recommend strengthening gender-related activities in some regions (Amazons and Chacho).</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>It is expected that the social impact of the project in general is positive. Mitigation measures incorporated into the project design and/or reflected in the Operations Manual of the project include mechanisms for: a) improving information and transparency, and adopt participatory monitoring at the SPO level; b) integrating vulnerable groups within farmers' groups to the processes of decision-making on priority needs, as well as the implementation, maintenance and equal access to benefits of subprojects, and c) promote the inclusion of women.</p>
<p>4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.</p>
<p>Based on previous experience, for the PAR II project, EMPODERAR has developed a series of criteria and instruments for the environmental management, monitoring and control process. The instruments developed serve to identify and assess possible environmental impacts and establish mitigation and control measures that are necessary for each type of activities. In the same way, it has developed instruments for the process of control and monitoring of climate threats and measures to adapt to climate change. In the case of Municipal Subprojects, FPS will have the responsibility to follow and comply with the EMF.</p> <p>EMPODERAR has in place reasonable standards and procedures for the implementation of the social safeguards policies. In the AF, the PIU will take advantage of those instruments to ensuring information and consultation for indigenous minorities during the project cycle. The use of those instruments will be an integral part of the assessment of proposals from the social perspective. In addition, the PIU will identify opportunities to strengthening women's participation and developing further the existing GRM mechanisms, which thus far comprise the following three elements:</p> <p>(i) The regional units use a protocol to assessing and, to the extent possible, solving conflicts by identifying key stakeholders and their views, interests and needs; this tool seeks to anticipate risks and tensions that can either strengthen or weaken the Alliances, and to handle expectations and possible conflicts before escalating.</p> <p>(ii) The regional units also offer an open space, where individuals can file complaints, affectations or recommendations; The NCU receives and processes the claims. To strengthen this mechanism, each regional unit will make available a Community Book of Complaints.</p> <p>(iii) The PIU will put in place a public transparency platform to track beneficiaries' satisfaction and provide public information; the NCU will monitor the system on a regular basis.</p>
<p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p>

The key stakeholders of the project are community members, including indigenous populations, women, government agencies, and the private sector.

In the AF phase, extensive stakeholder consultation took place during project preparation, and will continue through implementation. Particularly vulnerable groups, such as women and minority indigenous groups, were specifically targeted. This process included six consultation workshops and various group interviews held in the following ecoregions (Valles (Cochabamba), Altiplano (La Paz), Yungas (Chimore) and Amazon (Rurrenabque). Each consultation comprised two stages: (i) discussion on the project concept, its development objectives and eliciting suggestions, the project components and discussion on how best to implement and develop partnerships, and (ii) discussion on potential risks and how to avoid or mitigate them, listening and answering to consultations. As a result, the exercise made it possible to gather a comprehensive set of recommendations, in particular with respect to minority indigenous groups and gender issues.

Consultations with a total of 496 participants were held between August and September 2016. In addition, through structured interviews and questionnaires the PIU collected and analyzed valuable socio-economic data for the social assessment. In addition to these primary sources of data and inputs from stakeholders, secondary sources such as existing studies and project reports were reviewed to ensuring appropriate design and targeting in terms of indigenous groups, gender, cross generation needs and priorities, and mitigation of social risks and impacts.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	08-Dec-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Dec-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	14-Dec-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	13-Dec-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Dec-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	14-Dec-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	08-Dec-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Dec-2016
"In country" Disclosure	

Bolivia	14-Dec-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	08-Dec-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Dec-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	14-Dec-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams	
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways	
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Luz Berania Diaz Rios

Title: Senior Agribusiness Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: GOVERNMENT OF BOLIVIA

Contact: Jules Cesaire YAGANZA

Title: Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploit

Email: legrand_cesar@yahoo.fr

Implementing Agencies

Name: EMPODERAR

Contact: Jules Cesaire YAGANZA

Title: Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploit

Email: legrand_cesar@yahoo.fr

VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank

1818 H Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20433

Telephone: (202) 473-1000

Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Luz Berania Diaz Rios	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Noreen Beg (SA)	Date: 15-Dec-2016

Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Garry Charlier (PMGR)	Date: 15-Dec-2016
Country Director:	Name: Emmy Silvyia Yokoyama Tsuchikame (CD)	Date: 05-Jan-2017