

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: PIDISDSA15058

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 25-Aug-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Sierra Leone	Project ID:	P154904
Project Name:	Labor-intensive Public Works to Mitigate Ebola Impacts (P154904)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Nina Rosas Raffo		
Estimated Appraisal Date:		Estimated Board Date:	15-Sep-2015
Managing Unit:	GSP07	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Other social services (100%)		
Theme(s):	Improving labor markets (15%), Social Safety Nets/Social Assistance & Social Care Services (65%), Social Protection and Labor Policy & Systems (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:	2.95	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Ebola Recovery and Reconstruction MPF			2.95
Total			2.95
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to provide temporary employment to youth in poor households to help mitigate the socioeconomic impact of the EVD outbreak in Sierra Leone.

3. Project Description

The proposed project would contribute to the scale up of the national labor-intensive public works program, to help mitigate both immediate and longer term socioeconomic impacts. The labor-intensive public works (LIPW) program was previously financed through a US\$10 million component of the YESP; however, these activities closed in January 2015. Similar to the arrangements under the previous project, this project will be implemented by the National Commission for Social Action (NaCSA). The Project will target 12,000 youth in poor households in approximately 150 communities within the four districts with the highest extreme poverty incidence

in the country, Bombali, Kono, Moyamba, and Western Rural, which are also among the districts which faced the highest Ebola caseloads during the outbreak.

LIPW is uniquely placed to support the recovery process through multiple channels: (i) providing an alternative source of livelihoods to youth in poor households that have suffered job losses or loss of an income earner; (ii) helping maintain or create community assets that might not otherwise be invested in due to lack of funds or over-stretched capacity at both central and decentralized levels; (iii) stimulating other small-scale income generating activities both by reducing household risk and providing access to capital. Indeed, evidence from a recent randomized impact evaluation of the ongoing LIPW program shows that it not only increases household consumption, but also promotes asset accumulation and creation of household enterprises, and increases access to health services, among other positive impacts. Together with cash transfers, LIPW has been at the core of recent Government efforts to build SP systems and has reached nearly 40,000 beneficiaries.

The project will therefore finance: grants to targeted communities for the implementation of LIPW sub-projects, including for the procurement of materials (e.g., small equipment and tools); cash transfers to youth in targeted households in exchange for their participation in the LIPW sub-project implementation; and program management and capacity building for efficient project implementation and monitoring.

On March 9, 2015, the Acting Country Director, approved the request to process this project under paragraph 12 of OP 10 and to apply the condensed procedures for project preparation.

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

This project is characterized by the implementation of many small scale sub-projects, which are geographically spread and often located in remote rural communities. Road networks and communications are generally poor, which poses a great challenge for monitoring safeguards implementation. However, safeguards implementation is facilitated by the project implementation arrangements in which Community Oversight Committees are responsible for the physical implementation of the sub-projects, with support and monitoring by NaCSA District Coordinators. NaCSA has developed an Environmental and Social screening list for sub-projects with crucial issues of concern to be applied to each sub-project for improved social and environmental sustainability.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Gloria Malia Mahama (GSU01)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project triggers OP4.01 due to the proposed beneficiary activities under Component 1: Labor-intensive Public Works (US\$1.15 million; Recipient Executed). Sub-projects are expected to involve creation or improvement of priority community infrastructure including feeder road rehabilitation and maintenance, community agricultural projects; and environmental management. The subcomponent activities will upscale the ongoing LIPW component under the YESP Project. Additionally, an ESMF will provide guidance on the

		screening process for implementing sub-projects. The ESMF was sent to the World Bank's InfoShop for disclosure on August 24th, and per standard business processes is expected to be published by August 28th, 2015. The ESMF was also disclosed in-country on August 14th, 2015.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Natural habitats are not expected to be significantly impacted by the project, as subproject screening checklist will identify any potential significant natural area for further assessment as part of the subproject preparation process.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Forests are not expected to be significantly impacted by the project; all sub-projects that might trigger OP4.36 are eliminated at the screening stage.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	Pest management is not triggered because the project as it is not expected that there will be any use of pesticides or purchase of pesticides under the project.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The works to be undertaken under this project are not expected to trigger this safeguard. All sub-projects activities that might trigger OP4. 11 will be screened and chance find procedures will be included in the subsequent ESMPs/ ESIAs as the case may be to mitigate any potential impacts.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous peoples expected to be present in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Some sub-project activities under LIPW include community level farm production and road rehabilitation. These activities are likely to result in land acquisition and loss of livelihoods. The challenge is that the location and type of sub-project to be selected by the local communities is not known during this preparation phase. An RPF is therefore prepared as a safeguards guidance measure. Emphasis however will be placed on sub-project screening during project implementation and where needed, appropriate action plans will then be developed for sub-projects that have been identified to have adverse social impacts related to involuntary resettlement.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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:
2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
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.
NaCSA has experience in implementing World Bank-financed projects since 2003. NaCSA has been the main implementing agency for the LIPW component of the ongoing YESP. The project is scheduled to close on June 30, 2015 and all LIPW activities have been completed. Implementation of this grant builds on and will use the existing safeguard frameworks that have been used under the YES LIPW. NaCSA have staff at the national and regional levels who are experienced on screening subprojects activities for potential environmental and social impacts per the guidelines within the adopted ESMF and RPF and have received training over the years to strengthen the capacity. Additionally, during the June, 2014 mission the Bank safeguards team identified a need to further strengthen safeguards capacity in the project implementation arrangement. As a result, two NaCSA staff at the regional level were designated and trained to manage safeguards implementation and NaCSA developed forms, guidance, and checklists to apply to each subproject at the sub-project identification stage. To further strengthen safeguards implementation, the project will also ensure capacity building for designated NaCSA staff responsible for safeguards implementation as well as for the COCs who will be managing the day-to-day implementation of the sub-projects.
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

B. Disclosure Requirements

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

"In country" Disclosure	
<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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement			
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input 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 type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected			
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected			
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input 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 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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Nina Rosas Raffo	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Glenn S. Morgan (SA)	Date: 25-Aug-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Stefano Paternostro (PMGR)	Date: 26-Aug-2015