

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA6588

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 20-Mar-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 21-Mar-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Colombia	Project ID:	P145732
Project Name:	AF - CO Mainstreaming Sust. Cattle Ranching Project (P145732)		
Task Team Leader:	Carole Megevand		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	09-Dec-2013	Estimated Board Date:	12-Mar-2014
Managing Unit:	LCSAR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (40%), Agricultural extension and research (30%), Animal production (30%)		
Theme(s):	Environmental policies and institutions (30%), Other environment and natural resources management (30%), Climate change (20%), Biodiversity (10%), Participation and civic engagement (10%)		
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:	21.67	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			0.00
Single Purpose Trust Fund			21.67
Total			21.67
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective would remain unchanged, i.e. “to promote the adoption of environment-friendly Silvopastoral Production Systems (SPS) for cattle ranching in Colombia’s

Project areas, to improve natural resource management, enhance the provision of environmental services (biodiversity, land, carbon, and water), and raise the productivity in participating farms”.

3. Project Description

The proposed Additional Financing would expand the project activities into two additional areas (in La Guajira and El Meta). Both are national deforestation hotspots: they have significant degrees of ecosystem fragmentation, but with high potential for increasing ecological connectivity between remnant riparian vegetation. It would also pilot a new scheme to support carbon sequestration (PES-2) in small and medium farms, through the adoption of intensive silvopastoral systems. The Additional Financing has also been designed to address the major challenges identified during the first three years of implementation of the project, particularly the much high needs in terms of technical Assistance than anticipated during the preparation of the Parent project and the limited availability of high quality planting materials.

The structure of the project would remain unchanged and the activities under the Additional Financing would be implemented under the existing components and sub-components.

Component 1. Improving productivity in participating cattle ranching farms in Project areas, through SPS would pursue the institutional capacity building on SPS at the national and local levels to provide technical assistance to farmers on silvopastoral systems and cover the selection process for the additional 300 beneficiaries in the two “hotspot of deforestation” areas.

Component 2. Increasing connectivity and reducing land degradation in participating cattle ranching farms would provide support under the PES-1 scheme to 700 additional farmers, would support the production of high-quality planting material and would pilot a new scheme to promote the adoption of intensive silvopastoral systems in about 1,250 farms.

Component 3. Institutional strengthening, Dissemination and M&E would provide policy-makers with evidence-based results on the benefits (social, environmental and economic) of SPS to support the transformation of the cattle ranching sector in Colombia.

Component 4. Project management would support the overall Project coordination.

It is proposed to process this Additional Financing concomitantly with a Level Two restructuring of the original project, in order to (i) adjust the outcome indicators set for the original project to better align with early implementation results, and (ii) include new outcome indicators on climate change mitigation and poverty alleviation (two focus areas targeted by DECC). In addition, the restructuring will (i) reallocate the proceeds of the original project, particularly to take into account the higher needs for technical assistance and the reduced targets in terms of payments for environment services (PES), and (ii) extend the closing date from September 23, 2015 to August 23, 2017, to close on the same date as the Additional Financing.

The CMSCR project targeted 2,000 farms to be enrolled and benefit from project instruments (technical assistance and/or payment for environmental services). To date, a total of 2,491 farms have already been selected in the project. While the Additional Financing would provide additional support to 1,500 farms, this support could benefit some of the already selected farms. In total, it is expected that the project will directly benefit around 2,700 farms. In addition, a group of “farm control” will be set up as part of the Impact Assessment.

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

The Additional Financing would expand the project activities into two additional areas, namely la Guajira and la Meta. The two additional intervention areas are part of the national deforestation Hotspots, according to IDEAM: they have significant degrees of ecosystem fragmentation, but with high potential for increasing ecological connectivity between relict riparian vegetation.

The two areas were selected based on the following criteria: (a) they represent two distinct zones of ecological importance and significant biodiversity (the dry forest near the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, which is one of the most threatened ecosystems, with only 2% of coverage remaining, and the region of the Orinoco which is important for the connectivity between the Macarena mountains and the Andean forests), (b) they are areas where cattle ranching has been identified as a key driver of deforestation, and (c) their proximity to existing project areas, allowing the use of existing project infrastructure and staffing, and thus considerably reducing costs.

The selected areas were approved by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), during the Public Policy Committee Proyecto de Ganaderia Colombiana Sostenible held on March 19, 2013.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Dora Patricia Andrade (C3PLA)

Carlos Alberto Molina Prieto (LCSSO)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed Additional Financing is classified as Environmental Category B (as was the original project). Positive environmental impacts are a basic objective of the project; there is however a slight chance that productive activities incur in negative environmental impacts. In order to help ensure the environmental soundness and sustainability of the project, and in conformity with Bank policy, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was conducted in the two additional areas to be covered under the Additional Financing. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) prepared under the original project and implemented satisfactorily during the first three years of implementation, has been updated to reflect the changes adopted by this additional finance operation in terms of the spatial scope. The document has been submitted to the Bank in September, 2013. It was disclosed in country on December 6, 2013 and on the Bank website on December 6, 2013 The EA is also publicly available on the FEDEGAN website at http://www.fedegan.org.co/programas/publicaciones-

		ganaderia-colombiana-sostenible .Training is fully part of the EMP and the program for project management, field personnel, and stakeholders include several environmental thematic areas including: biodiversity presentation, land-use planning and ecosystem connectivity, low-carbon cattle ranching practices and other thematic areas that may result from local needs during project implementation.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>The project seeks to increase sustainability, maintain and enhance habitat through biodiversity conservation, and enhance environmental goods and services in rural areas. No significant conversion or degradation of natural habitat is expected from project investments. One major feature under the Parent project is to enhance ecological connectivity in the landscape. The different activities under the SPS may allow, among other things, biodiversity conservation and connect fragmentized ecosystems. EA and EMP ensure that project activities do not perversely encourage further deforestation to expand the land area used for cattle ranching.</p> <p>The two hotspots of deforestation in La Guajira y El Meta represent two distinct zones of ecological importance and significant biodiversity (the dry forest near the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, which is one of the most threatened ecosystems, with only 2% remaining, and a region of the Orinoco which is important for the connectivity between the Macarena mountains and the Andean forests).</p> <p>In the intervention area in La Meta department, fifteen ecosystems have been reported, including Pastures of the helobioma Amazonia and Orinoquia (21,631.7 hectares), the Amazonia and Orinoquia Peinobioma Grassland (16,680.9 hectares) and annual crops or transitory helobioma Amazonia and Orinoquia (8,096.7 hectares) as the dominant ecosystem in terms of its extension. Some of them represent critical habitats of national importance that are scarcely represented in the National System of Protected Areas.</p> <p>The areas of intervention do not overlap with any</p>

	<p>protected area. It is important to mention that the Guayabero District includes the Andean forest remnants that still retain some of their original structure and floral composition. These ecosystems house 283 vertebrate species, of which 30% are in some level of conservation status (endemic, threatened or endangered). In terms of plant diversity, 315 vascular plants species are reported (Magnoliophyta), of which only four species have endangered category.</p> <p>In the intervention area in La Guajira department, fourteen ecosystems have been reported. The Tropical Dry Grassland Caribbean zonobioma (21'204, 4 hectares), Orobioma Natural Forests under the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and Macuira (12'503, 2 hectares) and low Orobioma Pastures of the Sierra Nevada Santa Marta and Macuira (12'195, 1 ha) are the dominant ecosystems in terms of its extension, and they represent critical habitats that are scarcely represented in the National System of Protected Areas. These ecosystems house 735 vertebrate species, of which 20% are in some level of conservation status (endemic, threatened or endangered), and 115 species of vascular plants (Magnoliophyta) are also reported from which 6 are registered in a threatened category.</p> <p>The intervention area covers an area of 95,752 hectares, and is not overlapping with any protected area. The nearest one corresponds to the National Natural Park Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta. However, from a regional perspective, the project activities could contribute to the connectivity and consolidation of SIRAP (Regional System of Protected Areas) - Guajira. The selected area will contribute to the connectivity of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and the Serrania of Perijá. The high rate of deforestation in the area creates favorable conditions for the design and implementation of PES schemes (short and long term) that could contribute to the conservation and restoration of critical ecosystems, as well as the ecological connectivity at the regional level.</p> <p>No natural habitats have been affected so far</p>
--	--

		during project implementation. The EMP which provides for an environmental review framework, have been updated to ensure that natural habitats will not be adversely affected in the two additional areas and positive effects will be maximized.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The two new areas under the Additional Financing are areas where cattle ranching have been identified as a key driver of deforestation. The activities under the Additional Financing are aimed to promote the development of silvopastoral systems through the cultivation (nurseries) and introduction of forage and woody forest species in selected farms, and secondly through the payment for environmental services and carbon sequestration, promoting forest conservation and benefiting small and medium farmers. While the project is expected to overwhelmingly generate positive environmental impacts (biodiversity, ecosystem connectivity and water regulation), there is a risk that increased productivity at farm level, following SPS adoption, may create incentive for an expansion of cattle ranching, potentially causing more deforestation in the project areas. Specific features will be included in the PES schemes (both PES-1 and PES-2) to reward preservation of natural forests. The CMSCR project is successfully implementing PES-1 scheme for forest conservation, with participant farms with 30% of their land covered with forests agreeing to preserve them (the PES-1 scheme for forest conservation under CMSCR project recognizes a baseline payment of US \$23 and of US \$18 in the following years of the project). While under PES-2, no payment will be made for forest preservation, farmers involved in deforestation practices (based on land use monitoring) will be automatically withdrawn from the project and all PES contracts will be terminated.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	While SSP usually reduce the use of pesticides, this policy is triggered (as it was in the parent project) as pesticides may be used in silvopastoral systems supported through the project. The project will support the use of biological or environmental pest control methods and to diminish reliance on synthetic chemical

		<p>pesticides. The project will support technical assistance for the adoption of proven, economically and environmentally sustainable Integrated Pest Management practices (IPM), an approach designed to increase farmer productivity (yields) while reducing input costs, human health risk and adverse environmental impacts through the virtual elimination of pesticide use.</p> <p>The IPM approach further increases sustainability of cattle ranching farms by focusing on improving the knowledge and skills of farmers to enable better management of resources. The information related to pest management has been incorporated in the Environmental Assessment and the dedicated chapter “Pest Management” of the EMP has been adjusted to reflect the extended scope under the Additional Financing, and particularly the support to the on-farm nurseries for the production of seeds and seedlings .</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	This policy is not triggered as no physical cultural resources have been identified in the two project areas and project activities will have no impact on physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The majority of the population in the el Meta-hotspot area is mestizo (mixed). There is no presence of indigenous reservations in the project area. The Guajira department has an important cultural diversity with the presence of indigenous ethnic groups such as Wayuu, Wiwa and Kogis. Nevertheless, the social assessment conducted in the project area in la Guajira clarified that: (i) there is no overlap between legally-constituted resguardos and the project intervention areas; (ii) within the project intervention areas there are two zones where Wayuu family groups live in a traditional way (but not legally constituted as resguardos). During one of the field visit, guided by a technician from Fedegan who is a member of the Wayuu ethnic group, the team visited one of the two zones and interacted with the leader and other members of the group. It was observed that the Wayuu group does not hold cows for cattle ranching activities, but only sheep and goats as a main livelihood. The Wayuu leader informed that this situation was similar in the other Wayuu community living inside the project area; and (iii)

		<p>apart from these two groups, there are Wayuu people within the project area who have private land-holding, possess their own economic activity, and although they maintain certain traditional customs, they have chosen westernized lifestyles. These people do not meet the criteria under the IP policy. Based on the above, it was agreed not to trigger the Indigenous Peoples Policy (OP 4.10) given that the indigenous peoples (Wayuu) that carry out cattle ranching in the area do not fulfill OP 4.10 criteria as they (a) do not have collective attachment to the land and (b) do not have social or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society.</p> <p>In regards to the activities proposed to work with indigenous peoples communities in the neighboring areas and with individuals of indigenous descent that do not fulfill OP 4.10 criteria but are present in the project area, a Social Management Plan was prepared to disseminate project information through education material translated to Wayuunaiki and information/ education sessions through peer-to-peer discussions with farmers participating in the project to showcase the environmental benefits of the conversion of traditional cattle ranching practice activities to more sustainable ones. Additionally, it is envisioned under the project that the two Wayuu communities in the project area that are not cattle ranchers, and thus, are not affected by the project, but expressed interest in benefitting in terms of seeds and seedlings, could be considered under the “on-farm nursery” activity under Component 2 of the project: this is seen as a best practice and could strengthen the transfer of knowledge between the Wayuu communities and the project beneficiaries with a potential of great value added to the project.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	<p>In both areas, the project will not finance any activities that involve involuntary resettlement including both involuntary taking of land and restrictions in access to protected areas. The screening procedures established under the Parent Project would be applied to ensure that farms benefitting from the project are under legal ownership.</p>

Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered as the project will not support the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will it support other investments which rely on the services of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy is not triggered as REDD+ activities will not impact any international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	This policy is not triggered as REDD+ activities will not be implemented in any disputed areas.

II. 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:

The proposed Additional Financing would scale up the parent project, through an expansion into two new areas and the piloting of a new scheme to promote the adoption of intensive silvopastoral systems (iSPS). While the original project only focused on biodiversity-friendly land uses (under which iSPS are not eligible for payments), the Additional Financing would specifically support the adoption of iSPS and enhance carbon stocks in cattle ranching farms. The two schemes are expected to complement each other and to reinforce their positive environmental and economic impacts.

Positive environmental impacts have been and remain the basic objective of the project and therefore, no large scale, significant and/or irreversible negative impacts are foreseen. Some of the expected direct positive impacts in the project area include: (i) enhanced preservation of biodiversity, (ii) improved ecological connectivity, (iii) soil fertility; (iv) enhancement of carbon stored in cattle ranching farms and reduction of associated greenhouse gases emissions and (v) improved water quality (both surface and ground water); and (iii) greater biodiversity within riparian zones. In addition, the project is expected to generate evidence-based results on benefits of the SPS that could positively influence the policy-making in favor of a transformation of the livestock sector in Colombia and the scaling up of sustainable cattle ranching practices.

The monitoring and evaluation systems developed under the project specifically target the environmental indicators: while the M&E tool for biodiversity is already up and running, specific indicators on Climate Change mitigation (at the farm and landscape levels) have been developed and will be specifically monitored under the Additional Financing.

Social and environmental assessments have been conducted in the two areas as part of the preparation of the Additional Financing. In both case, the analysis concluded that the two areas could significantly benefit from a broader adoption of sylvopastoral systems (including intensive SPS) to tackle the most pressing environmental challenges encountered in these areas (deforestation and water availability in both terms of quality and quantity). As a result of these assessments, it can be concluded that the Project environmental category remains as B as well as the triggered safeguard policies on which the same instruments already developed for the parent project can satisfactorily be applied.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

<p>No indirect or long term negative impacts are foreseen as a result of anticipated future activities in the project area. Long term impacts are expected to be positive, given the focus on sustainability and poverty alleviation in rural areas. The design of the parent project, and the Additional Financing, has been guided toward long-term sustainability and demonstration potential for future up-scale of SPS activities in Colombia beyond the timeframe of the project.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The additional financing will scale up what is perceived as a successful intervention model: it will add an innovative scheme to further promote sustainable silvopastoral systems. An alternative would have been to prepare a separate stand-alone project, which has been discarded at the Concept stage as it would not have allowed generating synergies that have been generated between the parent project and this additional financing. While the preparation period for the Additional Financing has been almost the same as for the preparation of a new project, it has also allowed the restructuring of the parent project and have hugely benefitted from the lessons learnt from this process.</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>The implementation arrangements would remain the similar to the existing ones under the Parent project. FEDEGAN would remain the lead executing Agency and would be the signatory of the Grant Agreement with the World Bank: Subsidiary agreements signed between FEDEGAN and CIPAV, Fondo Acción, and TNC, as “Core partner agencies” would be extended, as needed, at least till the new closing date of the project.</p> <p>All this partners has development institutional capacity to conduct the different activities of the components and subcomponents of the project. In terms of Safeguards, performance of the different partners has been rated satisfactory. The implemented of the safeguards instruments has been deemed satisfactory under the parent project and the same instruments will thus be used under the Additional Financing. All partners have been fully involved in the preparation of the Environmental and Social Assessments in the two new areas and the revision of the Environment Management Plan and are thus considered fully ready to satisfactorily implement safeguards instruments under the Additional Financing.</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 parental project was consulted through regional meetings involving multiple stakeholders: government agencies, regional autonomous corporations, municipalities, universities, livestock producer associations, agricultural and environmental NGOs in each region, with extensive participation and project feedback .</p> <p>The primary stakeholders of the project are the cattle ranchers. The two Convocatoria conducted under the parent project have been an opportunity to disseminate information on SPS practices and their potential benefits (environmental and economic) at the farm level. A Communication and dissemination strategy has been implemented and will further disseminate information.</p> <p>The secondary target stakeholders of the project are the policy-makers: a specific communication strategy has been drafted and will be further fine-tuned during the Additional Financing to provide them with evidence-based results on benefits of SPS practices and their potential contribution to the transformation of the livestock sector in Colombia.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Dec-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Dec-2013
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Colombia	06-Dec-2013
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.fedegan.org.co/programas/publicaciones-ganaderia-colombiana-sostenible	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Dec-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Dec-2013
"In country" Disclosure	
Colombia	06-Dec-2013
<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 Sector Manager (SM) 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 SM? 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 4.36 - 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"/>]
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"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Carole Megevand	
Approved By		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Glenn S. Morgan (RSA)	Date: 21-Mar-2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Victoria Stanley (SM)	Date: 21-Mar-2014