

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA12662

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 28-May-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 29-May-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Bolivia	Project ID:	P154854
		Parent Project ID:	P107137
Project Name:	BO Community Investment in Rural Areas Project Additional Financing (P154854)		
Parent Project Name:	BO PICAR Community Investment in Rural Areas (P107137)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Norman Bentley Piccioni		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	20-May-2015	Estimated Board Date:	30-Jul-2015
Managing Unit:	GFADR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (60%), General transportation sector (20%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (20%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (50%), Participation and civic engagement (30%), Other rural development (20%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	64.10	Total Bank Financing:	60.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			60.00
Local Communities			4.10
Total			64.10
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		

Is this a Repeater project?	No
------------------------------------	----

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

To improve access to sustainable basic infrastructure and services for the most disadvantaged rural communities selected in some of the poorest municipalities of Bolivia.

B. Proposed Project Development Objectives – Additional Financing (AF)

3. Project Description

In the last several years Bolivia has made substantial gains in reducing poverty and in improving shared prosperity; however, it still faces significant challenges in eradicating extreme poverty in rural areas. Using national poverty lines and the latest information available, overall poverty decreased from 63 percent of the population in 2002 to 39 in 2013 and extreme poverty from 37 percent to 19 percent in 2013. Similarly, the Gini coefficient measuring inequality has decreased from 0.60 in 2002 to 0.49 in 2013. The average income of the bottom 40 percent of the population has also improved by increasing 15 percent per year over the same period. Despite all those major achievements, rural Bolivia, comprising approximately 3.3 million inhabitants (30 percent of the total population), still faces chronic development challenges: 6 out of 10 rural inhabitant still are under the poverty line and 4 are classified as extreme poor. The rural poor are highly vulnerable to food insecurity, dispose of limited economic opportunities and lack access to basic services and infrastructure. This particularly affects indigenous groups and the rural women, who on average have two fewer years of education than their male counterparts and face a series of constraints derived from socio cultural biases.

The proposed AF, with its scale-up in outreach to most vulnerable communities, is consistent with the current CPS and the development agenda of the Government of Bolivia (GoB), which pursues extreme poverty eradication. The current CPS (2012-2015) defines sustainable productive development as one of the four pillars for the World Bank Group (WBG) investments in Bolivia. Within that pillar, the WBG has committed to support sustainable agricultural productivity and to improve productive infrastructure in rural areas. This will directly contribute to addressing the country's high rates of poverty in rural and peri-urban areas. The CPS progress report of January 2014 states that Bank's efforts have been particularly successful in rural areas where investments such as PICAR have yielded significant results in improving the living conditions of poor rural households and their exit from poverty or extreme poverty. In 2013, GoB launched the 2025 Patriotic Agenda with the overall goal of eradicating extreme poverty and translating prosperity into local principles of well-being. To this end, the GoB seeks to expand development projects and programs such as PICAR, which have reached proof of concept and need now to reach scale in the poorest rural communities of the most vulnerable municipalities of the country.

The original credit finances approximately 800 subprojects and benefits 130.000 rural inhabitants in 35,000 rural households from the poorest 642 communities, improving basic and productive, non-commercial infrastructure; with an outstanding performance, the project is likely to achieve or surpass all targets. Through April 2015, PICAR has financed 612 sub-projects in 551 communities from 48 of the most vulnerable municipalities in the Departments of La Paz, Oruro (highlands),

Cochabamba, and Chuquisaca (valleys). The project has benefited 132,219 rural inhabitants in 25,871 households. 75 percent of sub-projects are completed and fully operational. Sub-projects include water and sanitation (37 percent), livestock protection and other productive infrastructure (30 percent), small irrigation schemes (13 percent), and rural roads and bridges (9 percent). During implementation, the project improved women's participation in sub-project identification and implementation. As a result, 40 percent of sub-projects were prioritized and implemented by women only, developing about 660 female leaders at community level. The project has complied with all credit covenants. Procurement has been consistently rated Satisfactory for the past three years, while finance management has been recently upgraded to Satisfactory signaling a positive fiduciary performance. All audits and financial reports have been submitted timely with no qualifications. Safeguard compliance has also been satisfactory.

The proposed additional financing will scale up a well-tested poverty reduction, rural development model in about 750 new communities in five Departments, including Pando. It will also consolidate development impact by providing a second round of grants to about 120 communities. Based on the project's positive track record, the GoB has requested an additional credit to cover approximately 600 new communities in both the current 48 municipalities and further 21 new municipalities within the Oruro, La Paz, Cochabamba and Chuquisaca Departments. In addition, the funds will allow the project to include around 195 subprojects in 150 communities of the 14 vulnerable municipalities in the Pando Department (according to the latest study on Vulnerability to Food Insecurity, VAM 2012). Located in the Amazon basin, Pando has a fragile eco-system, and as a result of GoB's policies aimed at balancing access to new lands, communities in Pando are a mix of indigenous and migrant populations. This situation poses new environmental and social risks for the operation that are being addressed by revising the project negative list in the operational manual, and ensuring inclusive consultations. Besides subprojects in new communities, PICAR will support a new round of financing to communities, which already received grants, in order to consolidate access to infrastructure and services, enhance participatory decision making, and strengthen their capacity in project management and operation and maintenance (O&M). Evidence from CDD operations around the world suggests that one cycle of sub-project financing is not sufficient to achieve long term social or economic results. Hence, under the AF, about 120 communities with positive performance in O&M and provision of, at least, 20 percent counterpart contribution will profit of a new subproject. The AF would maintain the following three project components:

Component 1: Community Capacity Building. This component would finance technical assistance, training and capacity building for target communities to identify, implement, operate, and maintain community investment subprojects.

Component 2: Community-Driven Development Investment. This component would finance the provision of community investment grants to selected communities in order to carry out community investment subprojects. Subprojects would be presented by rural communities to respond to their self-identified priorities. Given the demand-driven nature of the Project, communities would have an open menu of social and economic investments, including rural infrastructure, basic services, vulnerability reduction and food security activities, nutrition, and management of natural resources. In AF, approximately 120 selected communities that have successfully implemented and maintained subprojects would receive second round of financing.

Component 3: Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation. This component would support establishment of a new regional operation unit in Pando, operation costs at national and regional operation units, monitoring and evaluation, and third party impact evaluation.

The proposed AF will be implemented under the same arrangements of the current project. The Ministry of Rural Development and Lands will continue to retain the overall responsibility for the AF implementation through the Unidad Desconcentrada EMPODERAR, which is the project implementation unit. EMPODERAR, has a demonstrated capacity in project implementation. The financing under the original project is fully committed for the remaining months of 2015, and it is projected to disburse fully by 2016, which is a year earlier than originally planned. Under the AF, EMPODERAR will maintain its existing central and two regional units (ROU), and in addition it will establish a new ROU in Pando.

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

The AF would support 870 targeted communities in five Departments in highlands (La Paz and Oruro), valleys (Chuquisaca and Cochabamba), and Amazonia basin (Pando). About 750 communities would be new to the project, 600 of which would be located in highlands and valleys, where the project has already been implemented. The remaining 150 communities would be located in 14 municipalities in Pando. Both environment and social assessments focused on the Pando Department for being a new Project area.

Pando Department is located north of Bolivia in Amazonia basin, bordering with Brazil and Peru. The Department has mostly a flat terrain with an average altitude of 280 meters over sea level. It has a fragile eco-system. Pando has a tropical climate and is covered with jungle of the Amazon and crossed by many rivers. The Madre de Dios and Tahuamanu rivers, both tributaries of the Beni River, which belong to the great Amazon basin course, are the main sources of surface water. The lower floors are characterized by frequent floods during several months a year. Pando is a region with a high level of precipitation with the average of 1,865 mm (between 143 and 1,990) with a maximum of 2,423 mm (1972) and a minimum of 1,298 mm (1963). The rainy season runs from October to April and the dry season has its minimum of rain in July. Surface waters abound throughout the year, but are of variable quality.

Pando's sources of income are mainly from timber, gold mining and other minerals, rubber extraction, and Brazil nuts. There also is some income from ecotourism. Other economic activities, such as agriculture and cattle ranching, are done mostly at the subsistence level. It has very little tourism infrastructure as it continues to be a thick jungle riddled with rivers, has very few roads, and suffers from continuous flooding. The humid tropical forest of the Pando Amazon forms an ecosystem that is home to a rich biodiversity and containing species of high economic value such as Brazil nut (*Bertolletia excelsa*), rubber (*Hevea brasiliensis*), mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*), cedar (*Cedrela odorata*) as well as many palm trees and non-timber products for medicinal use.

Pando has a population of 109,173. According to Vulnerability to Food Insecurity study (VAM 2012), 11 municipalities (out of total of 15) are classified as highly vulnerable to food insecurity, and 3 are classified as moderately vulnerable. Pando has the highest share of highly vulnerable municipalities (about 11 percent) in Bolivia. There are indigenous groups, including Tacanas, Cavineño, Esse Ejja, Machineri and Yaminahua. Over the last 10 years, the population in Pando grew by 108 percent, due to migration of 56,648 people from highlands and valleys. AF target communities, therefore, would have mixture of ethnically and culturally different populations of indigenous groups, Aymara, Quechua, and mestizo migrants. Livelihoods of indigenous groups are dependent on fishery and forestry (such as Brazil nuts), while migrants are on agriculture, bringing exogenous productive practices, which could boost deforestation. These ethnic and socio-cultural

differences are also at the root of unresolved issues stemming from overlapping rights of use of forest land, a major source of conflict in Pando. This is most acute in northwestern Pando, where forest areas that were traditionally occupied by indigenous populations have been declared as concessions.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Juan Carlos Enriquez Uria (GENDR)

Miki Terasawa (GSURR)

Rodrigo Victor Hernan Munoz Reyes Pantoj (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The policy was triggered for the original project. An ESMF was prepared to address potential negative impacts on air quality, soil and vegetation from subprojects that focused mainly on water and sanitation (37 percent), livestock protection and other productive infrastructure (30 percent), small irrigation schemes (13 percent), and rural roads and bridges (9 percent).</p> <p>In the AF, subprojects in Pando would likely include fisheries from artificial ponds, forestry, river transportation (financing small boats or rehabilitation of small wooden docks), micro-hydroelectric initiatives, and post-flood rehabilitation. Potential negative impact could include water pollution. No substantial negative impact, such as over exploitation of forest products or fish is foreseen, as sub-grants are small. EIA was undertaken to analyze potential impacts given the fragile ecosystem of Pando. ESMF has been updated to ensure that sub-projects are implemented in an environmentally sustainable manner. It also builds on lessons learned from past EA experiences, such as using a negative list to guide sub-project prioritization, identifying potential climate risks for sub-projects (extreme events), and making some funding available for technical assistance related to environmental issues in operation and maintenance.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>PICAR does not finance any subproject that would require change of forest land use or change of natural landscape. Even though subprojects could be located in areas close to critical natural habitats or protected areas, PICAR will not finance any subproject that implies significant degradation or conversion of natural habitats.</p> <p>Given the limited scale of the investments to be financed, PICAR expects no significant negative impacts on critical natural habitats. Minor impacts could derive from a more intensive use of non-timber forest products by the benefiting communities. To prevent and minimize any</p>

		<p>damage, productive subprojects will include training in sustainable agriculture, agroforestry and forest management, as indicated in the revised ESMF.</p> <p>In Pando, there are two protected areas: Manuripi Heath Reserve Protected Area at national level and Forest Reserve Bruno Racua as a protected area at department level. PICAR subprojects are likely to boost sustainability in these areas.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>The project screening mechanism identifies subprojects with potential impacts on forests, such as deforestation.</p> <p>In Pando, key selection criteria for forestry sub-projects would include promotion of sustainable agricultural / agro-forestry practices, no deforestation, or no damage to fragile ecosystems. . Subprojects could involve collection of nuts or other vegetation. There is no foreseen impact of overexploitation, as sub-project investments would be small. Screening process has been enhanced and included in the ESMF.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>Under the original financing, 13 percent of subprojects established small irrigation scheme. In addition, some home gardens were financed by productive infrastructure support. The policy is triggered because investments in agriculture (small irrigation schemes, improvement of food-security production, etc.) might lead to increased use of pesticides. Integrated pest management would be a part of subproject activities under Component 2. Any procurement of pesticides would comply with the requirements of OP 4.09 which lists pesticides ineligible for Bank financing. The Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM) from the parent project was updated, which includes a positive list of pesticides.</p> <p>The environmental conditions of Pando with high temperatures and levels of humidity increase the threat of pest attack to agriculture, agro-forestry and forest management initiatives, thus increasing the risk of pesticide misuse and/or water and soil contamination. To address this issue a specific crop mapping of Pando was prepared and IPM was updated, including a revised positive list of pesticides.</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	<p>PICAR does not finance any subproject with known potential negative impacts on physical cultural resources, sacred and/or religious sites. For example, Pando has an important archaeological site (Las Piedras) in Gonzalo Moreno.</p>

		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 subproject financing.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The original project triggered OP/BP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples, and the whole operation was designed as an Indigenous Peoples Project. Approximately 95 percent of sub-project beneficiaries were indigenous populations. At consultations, these groups requested equal attention to all communities and expressed support for the project as an opportunity to build capacity of communities in consultation, planning, implementation and operation of projects to facilitate access to basic infrastructure services (detailed in Section 5). Based on these dialogues, the original project prepared a community participation plan, which ensured consultations with indigenous groups. The project worked with indigenous organization leaders to facilitate consultations with indigenous groups at various stages of sub-project planning and implementation. These leaders also participated in sub-project implementation committees. Moreover, the project hired field operators to facilitate capacity building workshops in indigenous languages and support skills development in sub-project implementation committees. Based on these lessons learned and the cultural, ethnic and productive diversity showcased in the Pando's social assessment, the guidelines for participatory planning have been updated by including, for instance, an assessment of potential land conflicts linked to overlapping of use rights or unclear borders.</p> <p>In Pando, there are two indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation (Machineri and Yaminahua). The revised ESMF will ensure that no subprojects are implemented in the area inhabited by these indigenous groups.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	As the Project involves small-scale community investments, no significant involuntary resettlement or land acquisition is anticipated. The project prepared Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). In the original project, there was no involuntary resettlement but a few voluntary land donations, which were not well documented. RPF has been revised to improve documentation and reporting of such donations. RPF has a grievance redress mechanism, around which the project would build on the project-wide mechanism.
Safety of Dams OP/BP	Yes	PICAR does not finance building of any large dam.

4.37		<p>Irrigation and water supply subprojects could depend on storage and operation of an existing dam for their supply of water and may not function if the dam failed. The ESMF stipulates that financing of any such subproject requires a preliminary specialized dam safety assessment.</p> <p>The original project financed two subprojects that triggered this policy, which constructed mini dams for irrigation with a capacity of 6,000 and 1,600 m3 of water. Based on this experience the OM considers the provision of technical assistance for the operation and maintenance in order to guarantee sustainability and safety.</p>
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	<p>This policy has been triggered under AF, because of the expansion of the project reach to the Pando Department. The exception to riparian notification was approved by the Regional Vice President, because (a) drinking water and irrigation sector micro-projects would be of limited local scale and focused on the rehabilitation of existing village systems for drinking water sector and rehabilitation and cleaning of village canals in the irrigation sector; and (b) rehabilitation and improvement of small wooden docks and fishing facilities would also be limited local scale and focused around enhancement of the existing facilities. The proposed project activities are not likely to adverse the quality or quantity of the water flowing to downstream riparians and the project will not be affected by other riparians' possible water use.</p>
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	<p>No project activities are involved in disputed areas as defined in OP/BP 7.60. Thus the Disputed areas safeguard policy is not triggered.</p>

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p>
<p>It is not anticipated that AF would generate direct negative impacts, based on the experiences from the original project. Most of the subproject investments are small scale and have full support and ownership of target communities in implementation, operation, and maintenance. Subprojects under the AF would be the same scale, implementing similar activities.</p>
<p>In AF, key safeguard issues and impacts are related to operation in Pando that has fragile ecosystem of Amazonia and mixture of indigenous and migrant populations in communities with different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Because livelihoods are dependent on fishery, forestry, and agriculture in Pando, potential sub-projects in Pando could include collection of forest products (such as Brazil nuts), river transportation, and artificial fish pond, and micro hydroelectric initiatives. The micro-hydroelectric plants that can be implemented in Pando will be river run-of type, using a maximum volume of water of 40 lt/sg, and reaching a maximum power</p>

<p>of 100 kW. The environmental impacts are marginal in terms of water use and landscape. Given the large volumes of water flow in rivers of Pando, the cumulative impact of up to 50 micro-hydroelectric plants (2m³/sg) is negligible.</p> <p>ESMF, including subproject screening, has been updated to mitigate potential risks. Annex 7 of the Environmental Management Framework includes a detail on micro-hydroelectric plants.</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 750 new communities in 84 municipalities in five Departments. The ongoing project experience shows that PICAR has the ability to significantly increase capital and capacity building in the community, with a strong focus on gender. In the original financing, women’s participation in subproject identification and implementation was strengthened. As a result, 16 percent of sub-projects were prioritized and implemented by women only, developing about 660 female leaders at community level. PICAR has also shown that it can improve the social and productive infrastructure with its focus on community empowerment.</p> <p>According to the experience and results obtained in the original credit implementation, PICAR would have the following social impacts on participating communities: improving the level of social capital and increasing the participation of women in community subprojects.</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 project include mechanisms for: a) improving information and transparency, and adopt participatory monitoring at the community level; b) integration of vulnerable groups within communities to the processes of decision-making on priority needs, as well as the implementation, maintenance and equal access to benefits of community projects, 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>AF will continue to be implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development and Land (MDRyT) and Decentralized Unit, EMPODERAR. EMPODERAR developed capacity in environment and social safeguards during the original project implementation. EMPODERAR prepared ESMF, including subproject screening, and other safeguards instruments, such as IPM, community participation plan, gender action plan, and RPF. During the original project implementation, EMPODERAR revised community participation plan to enhance women’s participation. Communities had women only consultations and incorporated women’s priorities in sub-project decision making. In supporting women’s sub-project implementation, EMPODERAR increased female technical facilitators to 37 percent of all facilitators. In AF, these tools are updated to expand the project in Pando in Amazonia Basin, based on the environmental and social assessments carried out in Pando. New Regional Operational Unit will be set up in Pando, which will be staffed with Environment and Social Development Specialists to ensure safeguard compliance. These specialists will be trained and given hand-holding support from the central or other regional operational units. EMPODERAR will also have a workshop to train safeguards and key program staff on the updated ESMF and tools prior to the AF implementation.</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>
<p>The key stakeholders of the project are community members, including indigenous populations,</p>

migrants from highlands and valleys (in case of Pando), and women, civil society organizations, NGOs, government agencies, and private sector.

In the original project, consultations were conducted with indigenous groups with the following feedback: (a) communities demanded equal attention to all communities; (b) communities have developed an organizational structure based on their traditional uses and customs, dedicated to the defense of their land rights, skills in organizational management is limited; (c) livelihoods are mainly subsistence agriculture (barley, bean, wheat, alfalfa, quinoa, and potato cañahua), and in central highlands, livestock (camels, cattle and sheep); (f) individual land ownership and rights of use coexists intended for agricultural production, and communal property where the land is used for grazing. Irrigation is done communally under a traditional rotation organizational system; (g) main social organization is an agricultural union; and (h) the project is considered as an opportunity to increase community capacity and improve livelihoods. In addition, on gender, the main barriers to the participation of women in activities within communities are: (i) role of work that limit the free time, (ii) the perception that men are responsible for the communities and therefore make decisions, (iii) the stigma that knowledge is limited women associated with self-esteem of women, (iv) poor communication and information received by women, (v) lack of training possibilities for women.

In Pando, two public consultations were held in Cobija and Puerto Gonzalo Moreno, participated by both indigenous groups and migrants. There were 377 participants in total, 30 percent of whom were women. The overall feedback was positive, as the AF would provide economic, environmental and productive enhancement. During the AF implementation, community members, including indigenous groups and women, would be consulted and continuously engaged in project activities, including sub-project identification, prioritization, design, implementation, and operation and maintenance.

Other stakeholders are mostly civil society organizations (CSOs) and public sector institutions. CSOs include indigenous organizations at community and regional level (affiliated to national level organizations such as the CIPOAP, CARABO and CIDOB), organizations or unions of migrant producers (with male and female representations), and organizations of skilled workers, such as “Brazilian Nut Harvesters” and “Federation of Industrial Workers”. There also are a few NGOs in Pando, such as CIPCA, CARITAS, IPHAE and FAUTAPO. Private sector is limited to Brazilian nut and rubber processing companies. Because the project contracts private sector and NGOs as facilitating partners, limited availability of development services and support poses a significant difference in relation to other regions.

The public sector stakeholders include local level public institutions, such as the Municipal Secretariats of Sustainable Economic Development from the different municipalities. Regional level institutions are represented by the MAMUNAB Commonwealth of Municipalities. National level public institutions include SENASAG, ACCESO, ADEMAF, the Ministry of Productive Development and Plural Economy (MDPyEP), the Ministry of Rural Development and Land (MDRyT) and EMPODERAR.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	06-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-May-2015

For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	////
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	15-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> Documents are available at http://www.empoderar.gob.bo/estudio-de-evaluacion-de-impacto-ambiental-pando-picar Hard copies are available in the regional offices of the Ministry for Rural Development and Lands	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	06-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-May-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	15-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.empoderar.gob.bo/estudio-de-evaluacion-de-impacto-ambiental-pando-picar Hard copies are available in the regional offices of the Ministry for Rural Development and Lands	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-May-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	15-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> Because about 95 percent of beneficiaries are indigenous populations, the original project as well as AF were designed as an IP project. Therefore, no independent IP was prepared by the project and the full elements of an Indigenous Peoples Plan were embedded in the project design. The date indicated is the date of social assessment disclosure.	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-May-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Bolivia	15-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.empoderar.gob.bo/estudio-de-evaluacion-de-impacto-ambiental-pando-picar Hard copies are available in the regional offices of the Ministry for Rural Development and Lands	
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 type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams			
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes []	No []	NA [×]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes []	No []	NA [×]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes []	No []	NA [×]
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways			
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes []	No []	NA [×]
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 [×]	No []	NA []
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []
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 [×]	No []	NA []
All Safeguard Policies			
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [×]	No []	NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Norman Bentley Piccioni		
Approved By			
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Laurent Msellati (PMGR)		Date: 29-May-2015