

CI-GCF/GEF AGENCIES ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) SCREENING REPORT

☐ Preliminary Screening (Conceptual Stage) ☒ Second Screening (Proposal Stage)

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Profile

Countries: Colombia	GCF Project ID:
Project Title: Building Water Resilience in Bogotá and the Region	
Executing Entity (EE): Conservation International Colombia and Fondo Acción	
GCF Focal Area: Mitigation Results Areas (MRA): ARA 1, ARA2 Y ARA 4	
GCF/GEF Project Amount: US\$45,946,948	
ESS Report Approved by: Ian Kissoon, Senior Director, CI-GEF/GCF Agencies	
Date of Approval: May 08, 2026	

B. Summary of Project Risk Categorization, ESS Standards Triggered and Mitigation Plans Required

Project Category:	Category A	Category B	Category C
		X	
The proposed project is being classified as Category B based on the potential environmental and social risks identified at this stage. However, these risks are low to medium, site-specific, and manageable with the appropriate mitigation measures in place.			
ESS Standards Triggered:			
☐ Environmental & Social Impact Assessment	☒ Cultural Heritage		
☒ Protection of Natural Habitats and Biodiversity Conservation	☒ Labour and Working Conditions		
☒ Resett. & Physical/Economic Displacement	☒ Community Health, Safety and Security		
☒ Indigenous Peoples	☒ Private Sector Direct Investments and Financial Intermediaries		
☒ Resource Efficiency & Pollution Prevention	☒ Climate Risk and Related Disasters		
Mitigation Measures Required:			
☐ Limited or Full ESIA	☐ Resource Efficiency & Poll. Prevention Plan		
☒ Environmental & Social Management Plan	☐ Cultural Heritage Management Plan		
☐ Plan for Natural Habitat Protection and Biodiversity Conservation	☐ Labour Management Procedures		
☐ Voluntary Resettlement Action Plan	☐ Community Health, Safety and Security Plan		
☐ Process Framework	☐ Environmental and Social Management Framework/System		
☒ Indigenous Peoples Plan	☐ Climate and Disaster Risk Management Plan		

C. Program Objective:

The goal of the Bogotá-Region project is to increase freshwater resilience in the Bogotá-region by delivering a "proof of concept" for mobilizing and unlocking long-term public and private finance. This is achieved by proving that conservation and restoration actions yield quantifiable water benefits.

D. Program Description:

The project is divided into two Components:

Component 1. Proof of concept to achieve the highest Volumetric Water Benefits at the Watershed scale. Seeks to generate robust territorial evidence that climate-resilient productive practices and ecosystem conservation produce measurable Volumetric Water Benefits (VWBs), scaling from the plot level up to the watershed level.

Output 1.1. Strategic High Andean ecosystems restored and conserved to yield hydrological benefits.

Activity 1.1.1. Conserve high Andean ecosystems:

- 1.1.1.1. Implement control and surveillance, monitoring and climate training in Protected Areas.
- 1.1.1.2. Reduce ecosystem loss through conservation agreements and payments for landowners.

Activity 1.1.2. Restore high Andean ecosystems:

- 1.1.2.1. Implement passive restoration of moderately degraded lands allowing natural regenerative processes.
- 1.1.2.2. Implement active restoration of highly degraded lands.

Output 1.2. Climate-resilient transformation of productive practices to yield hydrological benefits and resilient livelihoods.

Activity 1.2.1. Implement climate-resilient production systems at farm level:

- 1.2.1.1. Implement silvopastoral systems in place of traditional dairy production.
- 1.2.1.2. Implement agroecological practices in traditional potato production systems.
- 1.2.1.3. Implement efficient use and water saving at farm level.
- 1.2.1.4. Implement and diversify agrifood systems.

Activity 1.2.2. Commercialization and opening of markets that value rural products that contribute to water regulation:

- 1.2.2.1. Develop business models for climate-resilient production systems.
- 1.2.2.2. Implement commercialization and market access initiatives through producer associations.

Activity 1.2.3. Implement efficient water use measures efficiency in community-run water supply systems in prioritized watersheds:

- 1.2.3.1. Install macro-metering and upgrade community-run water supplies systems to cut losses.
- 1.2.3.2. Apply efficient water use practices in water supply community-run systems.
- 1.2.3.3. Implement drinking-water treatment in water supply community-run systems.

Component 2. Finance mobilization and scale-up. Seeks to widen the use of existing regulations to secure large-scale public and private investments. This involves establishing financial mechanisms so that private companies and public water tariffs can fund water resilience in the long term.

Output 2.1 Financing instruments and mechanisms for scaling water volumetric benefits.

Activity 2.1.1 Incorporate an environmental fee to the water tariff:

- 2.1.1.1. Define and validate indicators and methodologies to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of water-resilience investments.
- 2.1.1.2. Implement systematic reporting for authorities that measure investments effectiveness in hydrological outcomes.
- 2.1.1.3. Develop replication models for other water utilities.

Activity 2.1.2 Operationalize a long-term financial mechanism for private investments:

- 2.1.2.1. Develop automatic tools for spatial prioritization of investments, monitoring and quantification of water volumetric benefits.
- 2.1.2.2. Establish the administrative, operational, and financial structure of the mechanism.

E. Project location, biophysical and socio-economic characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis:

The prioritized three intervention landscapes, which represent the most strategic and sensitive zones within the Bogotá Region. Each combines unique ecological characteristics with pressing environmental challenges:

1. Guandoque: Located in the upper basins of the Frío and Neusa rivers, this area includes the Guerrero páramo, heavily impacted by potato farming and coal mining (Conservation International, 2024) (Conservation International Colombia, 2023).
2. Villapinzón: Headwaters of the Bogotá River, within the Guacheneque páramo, facing water quality issues due to agriculture and tannery activities (Conservation International, 2024) (Conservation International Colombia, 2023).
3. Tominé Norte: Includes the Sisga and Siecha watersheds, with cloud forests and sub-páramo wetlands that contribute to Bogotá's water supply (Conservation International, 2024) (Conservation International Colombia, 2023).
4. Tunjuelo: Includes four sustainable landscapes in Bogotá: Paso Colorado Peñas Blancas, La Requilina-El Uval, Los Soches, and Quiba.

Páramos and high-Andean forests act as natural “water towers”, while wetlands buffer floods and maintain hydrological cycles. However, deforestation, agricultural expansion, urbanization, and climate change exacerbate ecosystem loss, reducing habitat integrity and compromising water security and biodiversity under the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems framework (Etter, Andrade, Saavedra, Amaya, & Arévalo, 2017) (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2019) (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2012) (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2023c).

The Bogotá-Region Landscape is a highly diverse and ecologically strategic territory that encompasses a mosaic of natural and anthropogenic ecosystems (Figure 4). Its ecological complexity is shaped by steep altitudinal gradients, varied hydrological regimes, and a dynamic interface between rural and urban land uses. This heterogeneity supports a wide array of ecosystem types, each playing a critical role in biodiversity conservation, water regulation, and climate resilience.

More specifically, the prioritized areas have the following biological characteristics:

- Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs): The project intersects the Gravilleras del Valle del Río Siecha and Chingaza National Natural Park and Surroundings.
- Critical Habitat Status: Strategic ecosystems include Páramos (Sumapaz, Chingaza, Guerrero, and Guacheneque complexes) and high Andean forests. Nine restricted-range species were confirmed, including the Bogota Rail (*Rallus semiplumbeus*) and Black Inca (*Coeligena prunellei*).

- AZE/Ramsar/World Heritage: Chingaza National Natural Park is an AZE Site. Additionally, there are 15 Ramsar-designated urban wetlands in the Bogotá system.
- Ecosystem Services: Key services include water regulation (baseflow stability), carbon storage, flood mitigation, and pollination. Cultural services include sacred groves and ritual paths for the Muisca community.
- Legacy Impacts: Historical impacts include soil erosion from overgrazing, habitat loss due to potato monocultures, coal mining in Guandoque, water contamination from tanneries in Villapinzón, and the spread of invasive species like gorse and rainbow trout.

In terms of the socio-economic context, the Bogotá region faces significant climate justice challenges linked to water security, with approximately 20% of Colombia's population and nearly 13% of the country's GDP threatened by water availability. Climate change impacts disproportionately affect rural communities living in high Andean ecosystems, whose livelihoods are fragile and who face both climate threats, while contributing additional pressure on water supply systems. Rural communities in the upper Bogotá River watersheds experience multiple forms of environmental injustice, including campesino families facing limited economic alternatives and barriers to implementing sustainable practices. Gender roles significantly limit women's participation in income diversification and decision-making processes. Community-based water organizations struggle for recognition of their water management approaches, claiming justice as both recognition and equitable access to water as a common good and human right.

There are diverse livelihood activities in the prioritized landscapes, some of which are key drivers of deforestation and land degradation, directly threatening water security. Among the non-climatic drivers identified, unsustainable livestock farming and agriculture stand out as the primary activities that negatively affect most of the study areas in the region. These practices drive change and generate a series of economic, social, and environmental problems. From an economic perspective, soil degradation caused by overgrazing significantly reduces the land's organic capacity, which in turn decreases pasture production. This situation directly impacts milk production, as ranchers are forced to incur higher expenses to acquire concentrates and supplemental forage to adequately feed their livestock. From an environmental perspective, these activities also contribute to the loss of biodiversity, both through the transformation of natural habitats and the fragmentation of ecosystems. The expansion of the agricultural frontier without sustainable criteria puts native species at risk, alters hydrological cycles, and reduces the ecological resilience of landscapes.

These are some highlights of the socio-economic characteristics of the prioritized areas:

- The region has approximately 9.82 million inhabitants, with 97% living in urban areas. Rural livelihoods depend on potato cultivation and dairy production, often on smallholdings where 43% of farms are smaller than one hectare.
- Rural women spend an average of 8.6 hours daily on unpaid care work compared to 3 hours for men. In areas like Villapinzón, women sometimes require "male permission" for land management decisions.
- Land tenure informality averages 57% in páramo municipalities. There are active mining titles in conservation areas and tensions regarding water use regulations that may overlook traditional rights.
- Domestic violence rates are high, with Zipaquirá reaching 291.1 cases per 100,000 inhabitants. Project risks include potential harassment by contractor personnel and power asymmetries in isolated work areas

F. Executing Entity (EE)'s Institutional Capacity to Implement ESMF:

Conservation International Colombia has extensive experience in managing Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) for donor-funded projects, including those supported by the GCF and GEF initiatives. This experience is underpinned by Conservation International's robust Environmental and Social Safeguard System, which provides the policies, standards, procedures, and guidance to ensure projects are effective, efficient, and equitable. Designed to analyze, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse impacts on people and the environment at the outset of any project, relies on four operational policies and 10 standards detailed within an overarching Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). CI Colombia systematically screens projects to assess environmental and social (E&S) risks—categorizing them as low, medium, or high—and designs tailored safeguard plans accordingly. To actively promote human rights, reduce equity gaps, and improve social and environmental sustainability, CI mandates that all projects, regardless of their risk level, develop and implement a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, a Gender Mainstreaming Plan, and an Accountability and Grievance Plan. CI's framework also includes rigorous monitoring and evaluation phases to ensure ongoing compliance, accountability, and adaptive management throughout the project lifecycle.

Similarly, Fondo Acción is a Colombian non-profit organization and an accredited entity to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), with extensive experience in managing sustainable rural development and conservation projects. Fondo Acción operates under a rigorous Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS). This system is governed by its Environmental and Social Management Framework (MGAS) and Environmental and Social Policy, which ensure that all implemented projects comply with Colombian legislation and international environmental and social best practices. To guarantee equitable impacts, Fondo Acción implements a comprehensive Gender Equality Policy (Política sobre Igualdad de Género). This policy mandates the integration of a gender perspective across all initiatives, actively promoting equal rights, closing historical gaps, and empowering women, youth, and individuals with diverse gender identities within rural and environmental contexts. Furthermore, their commitment to stakeholder engagement and accountability is operationalized through formal safeguard instruments, including a Petitions, Complaints, and Requests (PQR) system. This transparent grievance mechanism is designed to mitigate potential adverse impacts, respond to community feedback, and ensure continuous local participation throughout the project lifecycle.

II. ESS STANDARDS TRIGGERED BY THE PROJECT

Based on the information provided in the ESS Screening Form, the following ESS Standards have been triggered:

ESS Standard	Yes	No	TBD	Justification
1. Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)		X		<i>No significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented are anticipated at this time.</i>
2. Protection of Natural Habitats and Biodiversity Conservation	X			<i>The project will implement ecosystem restoration activities inside and outside protected areas (mainly buffer zones), including connectivity corridors. Within Component 1, the project will support the implementation of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) equipment and diversification efforts to support resilient livelihoods in buffer zones.</i>

3. Resettlement and Physical and Economic Displacement	X			<i>The project plans to implement conservation agreements and support Payments for Ecosystem Services, which will result in the voluntary restriction of natural resource use. The project will also support Improved Water Management measures which have the potential to indirectly affect tariffs for users.</i>
4. Indigenous Peoples (Traditional Peoples)	X			<i>During the previous stage, the project identified a Muisca community, a self-identified indigenous group, that inhabits certain sectors of the urban intervention area. Nevertheless, at this stage, the urban intervention areas were left out of the scope of the project, and the project implementation will not affect their territory. Another Muisca group was identified at this stage, neighboring one of the project areas in Sesquilé. This group's territory is indeed affected by project implementation. The project activities can potentially affect their ancestral territories, sacred sites, ritual routes, and traditional knowledge. The project is required to seek FPIC and implement mitigation measures relevant to this community and ensure that project benefits are culturally appropriate.</i>
5. Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention	X			<i>The project foresees the use of pesticides to support the restoration activities. Under the diversification of livelihood activities, it also foresees the introduction of activities such as poultry and spaces to produce organic fertilizers within farms, which could potentially generate pollution. Furthermore, the installation of some EbA equipment could also generate waste or the need for sustainable water management.</i>
6. Cultural Heritage	X			<i>Through consultation with Indigenous authorities, three sacred sites (Piedra del Sapo, La Chorrera, and Camino del Cajón – Observatorio) and two ancestral paths have been identified within the area of direct influence of the project. Physical works, such as installing Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) equipment or performing restoration, may affect these ancestral paths or lead to incidental archaeological discoveries. Due to this, the standard on cultural heritage is triggered for this project.</i>
7. Labour and Working Conditions	X			<i>Although the EEs indicated that they have the necessary policies, procedures, systems, and capabilities to meet the minimum requirements on labour and working conditions, the sectors and value chains in which the project works have high risks of informal labour, so additional measures should be identified to mitigate these contextual risks.</i>

8. Community Health, Safety and Security	X			<i>The project presents security and safety risks. Although the prioritized areas don't have current risks related to Colombia's armed conflict, there are security risks related to fraud, public order risks, and the presence of criminal groups that might affect both the communities and project staff. Communities can also be involved in restoration or livelihood activities requiring training and personal protection equipment to avoid safety risks. GBV and SEAH are also prevalent in the project's landscapes, and the increased influx of workers for the restoration work and installation of EbA equipment can increase the risk for SEAH, in this context.</i>
9. Private Sector Direct Investments and FIs	X			<i>Although Activity 2.1.2 will support the design of a financial mechanism, the mechanism itself will not channel GCF resources downstream—as it is only being designed under this initiative with the expectation of mobilizing private sector and other funding, under Component 1 the project will provide sub-grants to local organizations to implement restoration and livelihood activities on the ground and support payments for ecosystem services.</i>
10. Climate Risk and Related Disasters	X			<i>The Bogotá region expects rising temperatures and significant shifts in precipitation patterns. These changes will alter evapotranspiration and runoff regimes, influencing both drought risks and high-flow events in the watersheds. The project identifies several hazards (droughts, floods, frosts, wildfires, and landslides) with the following impacts: (a) Achievement of Results: Extreme climate variability may exceed the tolerance thresholds of species selected for restoration, potentially preventing the generation of projected Volumetric Water Benefits (VWBs). (b) Sustainability: There is a risk of "maladaptation" if the design of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) equipment fails to account for future environmental factors, increasing long-term vulnerability. (c) Physical Risks: Structural damage to poultry production modules or rainwater harvesting systems due to hydrometeorological events, as well as safety threats to field personnel from landslides or wildfires. Considering the above, this standard is also triggered for the project</i>

Note: Other ESS Standards may be triggered at any time during the project cycle.

III. PROJECT CATEGORIZATION

Based on the ESS Standards triggered, the project is categorized as follows:

PROJECT CATEGORY	Category A	Category B	Category C
		X	
<i>The proposed project is being classified as Category B based on the potential environmental and social risks identified at this stage. However, these risks are low to medium, site specific, and manageable with the appropriate mitigation measures in place.</i>			

IV. MANAGEMENT OF ESS STANDARDS TRIGGERED

The project is required to prepare during the proposal development stage, an Environmental and Social Management Plan that addresses the following ESS Standards triggered by the project:

ESS2. Protection of Natural Habitats and Biodiversity Conservation and ESS10. Climate Risk and Related Disasters

The CI-GEF/GCF's ESMF identified restoration as an activity that could result in adverse environmental and social impacts. As such, the project is required to demonstrate that it will restore or improve biodiversity and ecosystem composition, structure, and functions, and that the restoration activities are environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial across genders, and economically viable. In addition, within Component 1, the project will support the implementation of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) equipment and diversification efforts to support resilient livelihoods in buffer zones, particularly in critical natural areas and habitats that house vulnerable and endemic species e.g. Andean Bear. Considering the above, the project is required to develop a Limited-ESIA and ESMP that considers risks to the protection of natural habitats and biodiversity conservation, and appropriate mitigation measures. Also, given that the paramo and high-Andean forest landscapes are highly vulnerable to climate change and related natural disasters, which can affect the project Outcomes, the project is required to plan for mitigation measures to ensure that the restoration and EbA interventions are adapted and resilient to this scenario, as well as responding to the scenario of natural disasters. This should be reflected in the ESMP as a dedicated section/chapter.

Further, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum ESS2 indicator:

1. Number of hectares of natural and/or critical natural habitats negatively impacted by the project.

ESS3. Economic Displacement

The project is required to develop a Process Framework that describes the nature of potential restrictions or how economic displacement will be addressed when encountered by the project, the participatory process by which restrictions will be agreed upon and/or compensated, how the criteria for identifying, negotiating, and compensating economically displaced persons will be developed, and measures to restore livelihoods. This Process Framework should be developed as a chapter within the ESMP.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum ESS3 indicators:

1. Number of persons economically displaced in a voluntary way.
2. Number of persons compensated for voluntary economical displacement.

ESS4 and ESS6. Indigenous Peoples/Traditional Peoples and Cultural Heritage

The project is required to develop an Indigenous Peoples Plan and identify the potential impacts (both positive and negative) of the project on the Muisca Community of Sesquilé and their cultural heritage,

design appropriate mitigation measures where negative impacts cannot be avoided, agree upon and negotiate benefits with the community, and adhere to the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process. Mitigation measures to prevent risks related to Cultural Heritage, such as identified sacred sites, should also be included in the IPP and as a chapter of the project's ESMP.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum ESS4 indicators:

1. Percentage of indigenous/traditional communities where FPIC has been sought and documented.
2. Number of Indigenous/traditional communities present in the project sites that participated in the project.

ESS5. Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention

The project foresees the use of pesticides to support the restoration activities. Under the diversification of livelihood activities, it also foresees the introduction of activities such as poultry and spaces to produce organic fertilizers within farms, which could potentially generate pollution. Furthermore, the installation of some EbA equipment could also generate waste or the need for sustainable water management. To mitigate these risks, the project should include a Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention Plan as a chapter/section within the ESMP.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following indicator:

1. Number of measures implemented to avoid or minimize pollution from project activities/adverse impacts on human health and the environment.

ESS7. Labour and Working Conditions

Although the EEs indicated that they have the necessary policies, procedures, systems, and capabilities to meet the minimum requirements on labour and working conditions, the sectors and value chains in which the project works have considerable risks of informal labour, so additional measures should be identified to mitigate these contextual risks. These measures should be included as part of the ESMP.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following indicator:

1. Percentage of measures implemented to address the gaps identified during the ESS screening on the minimum requirements for working and labor conditions.

ESS8. Community Health, Safety, and Security

The project presents some CHSS risks, including those related to fraud, public order risks, and the presence of criminal groups that might affect both the communities and project staff. Communities can also be involved in restoration or livelihood activities requiring training and personal protection equipment to avoid safety risks. GBV and SEAH are also prevalent in the project's landscapes, and the increased influx of workers for the restoration work and installation of EbA equipment can increase the risk for SEAH in this context. The project is required to have the appropriate mitigation measures in place to prevent accidents, security incidents, and to respond to emergencies as a result of project activities. For this reason, it is required to develop a Community Safety and Security Plan chapter within the Environmental and Social Management Plan.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum CHSS indicators:

1. Number of health, safety and/or security incidents reported and addressed.
2. Percentage of measures implemented to ensure that risks or potential impacts to the health, safety

and security of project-affected communities/project staff are avoided or mitigated.

ESS9. Private Sector Direct Investments and Financial Intermediaries

Activity 2.1.2 will support the design of a financial mechanism; the mechanism itself will not channel GCF resources downstream, as it is only being designed under this initiative with the expectation of mobilizing private sector and other funding. Nevertheless, under Component 1 the project will provide sub-grants to local organizations to implement restoration and livelihood activities on the ground and support payments for ecosystem services. The project will be required to have a system in place that complies with and flows down the CI-GCF ESMF to sub-grantees.

Further, the EE will be required to monitor and report on the following minimum ESS9 indicators:

1. Number of sub-projects/sub-grantees/investees screened by the EA/EE/FI to determine their ESMF risk category.
2. Number of actions (disaggregated by type) implemented by EA/EE/FI and Funds to monitor and supervise that sub-projects/sub-grantees/investees are adequately implementing ESMF requirements.

Other Plans

Apart from the ESS Policy, the project is required to comply with the CI-GEF/GCF's Accountability and Grievance Policy, Gender Policy, and Stakeholder Engagement Policy by preparing and submitting for review and approval to the CI-GEF/GCF during the project development stage, the following plans:

I. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

To ensure that the project meets CI-GCF Project Agency's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism Policy, the EE is required to develop an Grievance Redress Mechanism (template provided) that will ensure people affected by the project are able to bring their grievances to the EE for consideration and redress. The mechanism must be gender-sensitive, cater to GBV and SEAH issues, in place before the start of project activities, and disclosed to all stakeholders in a language, manner and means that best suits the local context.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum accountability and grievance indicators:

1. *Number of times/events the AGM is disclosed to project stakeholders; and*
2. *Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been addressed.*

II. Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP)

The GAAP (template provided) should include a gender analysis including the role of men and women in decision-making, and appropriate interventions with gender-related outcomes to ensure that men and women have equal opportunities to participate and benefit from the project.

Further, the project should examine the extent of Gender Based Violence (GBV) and Sexual Exploitation and Harassment (SEAH), the likelihood of project activities contributing/exacerbating GBV and SEAH, and proposed mitigation measures as needed.

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum gender indicators:

2. *Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g. employment, income generating*

activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project; and if relevant

3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans) and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations.

III. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

To ensure that the project complies with the CI-GEF/GCF's Stakeholders' Engagement Policy, the EE is required to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (template provided).

In addition, the EE is required to monitor and report on the following minimum stakeholder engagement indicators:

- 1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and other stakeholder groups engaged in the project implementation phase;*
- 2. Number persons (sex disaggregated) engaged in project implementation phase; and*
- 3. Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase*

V. DISCLOSURE

Following approval of the plans, the EE must disclose the plans to stakeholders no later than 30 days from date of approval.