

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

**Report No.: ISDSA13289**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 15-May-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 15-May-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Armenia	<b>Project ID:</b>	P150505
		<b>Parent Project ID:</b>	P126782
<b>Project Name:</b>	Lifeline Road Network Improvement AF (P150505)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	LIFELINE ROAD NETWORK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (P126782)		
<b>Task Team Leader(s):</b>	Maria Carolina Monsalve,Nargis Ryskulova		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	18-May-2015	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	31-Jul-2015
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GTIDR	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (60%), General transportation sector (40%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Rural services and infrastructure (60%), Infrastructure services for private sector development (20%), Trade facilitation and market access (20%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	50.00	Total Bank Financing:	40.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			10.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			40.00
Total			50.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

## 2. Project Development Objective(s)

### A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

The Project Development Objective is to improve access of rural communities to markets and services through upgrading of selected lifeline roads, and to strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Transport and Communication to manage the lifeline road network.

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

## 3. Project Description

The proposed Additional Financing for the Lifeline Road Network Improvement Project (LRNIP-AF) would finance the rehabilitation of about additional 155 km of the lifeline road network, institutional capacity building activities, and project management costs. The Project will have two components:

Component 1: Lifeline Road Improvement (Total cost: US\$46.51 million; IBRD: US\$37.20 million). This will rehabilitate additional 155 km of lifeline roads, bringing the total number of km rehabilitated under the project to 360 km. This component comprises civil works for the rehabilitation of roads (sub-component 1.1), two rehabilitation and maintenance contracts (sub-component 2.2), supervision and technical designs (sub-component 2.4), and includes the construction costs associated with the Safe Village schemes on all road sections rehabilitated under the AF and the purchase and installation of road signs.

Component 2. Project Management and Institutional Strengthening (Total cost: US\$3.39 million; IBRD: US\$2.71 million). This component will finance project management and implementation, including financial audits (sub-component 2.1), purchase of road laboratory equipment (sub-component 2.2), the development of a road safety action plan and the implementation of selected activities from the action plan (sub-component 2.3), and under the technical assistance sub-component 2.4 it would finance: (i) preparation of a social monitoring and evaluation study; (ii) preparation of a strategic development plan for the lifeline road network; and (iii) lifeline road network data collection for the RAMS; and (iv) technical assistance with regard to disaster risk preparedness for the road sector.

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

Seven road sections were selected for rehabilitation during the first year of the project implementation: (1) H1-Hrazdan-H55, (2) Martuni-Vahashen-Vardenik, (3) M2-Sisian, (4) Eranos-Tsakqar, (5) Maralik-Qaraberd-Dzithankov, (6) H6-Nor Gehi-Argel-Arzakan-Hrazdan, and (7) M11 Martuni-Vardenis-NKR brd., km 6+500 - km 10+700. The remaining road sections will be identified during the project implementation.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Darejan Kapanadze (GENDR)

Sarah G. Michael (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Activities financed under the LRNIP-AF are not expected

		<p>to have significant impact on the environment. All planned physical works are limited to rehabilitation of the existing alignments. Overall long term social and environmental impacts will be positive, while negative impacts will be of minor scope and duration, and typical for any small to medium size road rehabilitation activity. The project continues to be classified as environmental Category B.</p> <p>The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is prepared through updating of the Environmental Management Framework of the original LRNIP. The ESMF provides guidance for undertaking site-specific environmental due diligence throughout the Project life, including procedures for environmental screening proposed individual investments, planning measures for mitigating potential risks of these investments, and monitoring application of these measures. The use of an EMP Checklist for Small Scale Road Construction or Rehabilitation is proposed for facilitating site-specific environmental management planning under the Project.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The Project does not finance construction of any new roads and all works will be undertaken within the present road corridors. Hence an impact on natural habitats is not expected. Site-specific EMPs will examine proximity of individual work sites to the designated protected areas or to valuable habitats outside them and will recommend mitigation measures as required.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project will not finance construction of any new roads, therefore it is unlikely to impact any registered historical and cultural monuments. Likelihood of chance findings is modest as no new roads will be constructed and no significant re-alignment of the existing roads will be undertaken. However, as a precautionary measure, the updated ESMF provides guidance on proper handling of chance findings should they be encountered during earth works.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The Project is expected to have positive social impacts in the form of improved access to markets, nearby towns,

		<p>and provided opportunities for temporary employment through the contractors. Based on the experience of the ongoing original LRNIP, the road improvements will include upgrading or arrangement of sidewalks, drainage, etc., with good engineering standards, and will require a minimum road cross-section of 10 meters. It is possible that all roads may not have 10-meter encumbrance free cross-section. Thus, the Project may require some minor land acquisition. In order to mitigate related impacts, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was updated by the Government. The RPF covers the process of identifying the anticipated impacts, consultation process during design and implementation stages, grievance mechanisms, implementation arrangements, monitoring mechanism, coordination with civil works, etc.</p> <p>Once the detailed designs for specific road sections are finalized and if any of those requires involuntary resettlement, a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) will be prepared, disclosed and discussed with the affected people. The Government will be responsible for implementing RAPs prior to commencement of civil works. Bank approval will be sought if project financing is proposed for land acquisition.</p>
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

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>The Project is not expected to have significant impact on the environment. All planned physical works are limited to rehabilitation of the existing alignments. They are unlikely to induce immediate or mid-term new development of a significant scale in the project area. Therefore, negative social and environmental impacts of the project will be of minor scope and duration, and typical for any small scale road rehabilitation activity, while the long term social impact will be positive.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Framework(EMF) currently used for the purposes of LRNIP has been re-worked into the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to be applied for the needs of LRNIP-AF. It provides general guidelines for applying environmentally sound practices to local roads rehabilitation. Site-specific Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) will</p>
---

be produced for all road sections to be upgraded with the Project support. Site-specific EMPs will specify environmental risks associated with rehabilitation works to be carried out in respective locations, recommend respective mitigation measures, and provide monitoring schemes for tracking adherence to the mitigation plans. EMPs will be included into tender documents and later get incorporated into contracts for the provision of works hence becoming contractually binding for works contractors. Adherence to the EMPs in the course of civil works will be sufficient for keeping environmental impacts of the Project at the acceptable minimum level.

The Project will not undertake any form of massive land acquisition and will not cause restriction of access to sources of livelihoods, because all physical activities will be carried out within the existing right of way. Based on the experience of the previously completed Lifeline Roads Improvement Project (LRIP), the road improvements will include upgrading or arrangement of sidewalks, drainage, etc., with good engineering standards and will require a minimum road cross-section of 10 meters. It is possible that all roads may not have 10-meter encumbrance free cross-section. In order to mitigate the potential social or economic impact of any minor land take or related impacts, therefore, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was prepared by the Government as a precautionary measure. Overall, the potential social impacts of the project investments are expected to be of a small scale and site-specific; and thus easily remediable typical of category B projects. Any project-related social or economic displacement will be handled through the Resettlement Action Plans (if needed).

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

No indirect and long term negative impacts are anticipated in relation to future activities in the project area.

**3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.**

The project does not include new developments: it will be rehabilitating existing roads, therefore no alternatives were considered. It will improve sections of the existing lifeline road network critically important for rural livelihood.

**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.**

The Borrower drafted ESMF for LRNIP-AF by revising EMF currently used for the purposes of LRNIP, and updated the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) also applied to the ongoing LRNIP. These framework documents provide comprehensive guidance for undertaking site-specific safeguards work. Once designs for the rehabilitation of individual road sections are prepared on the rolling basis, site-specific Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) will be developed for all works, and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) will be prepared in cases if rehabilitation works require any type of involuntary resettlement. Adherence to EMPs and implementation of RAPs, as required, will be mandatory for works financed from the project proceeds.

The Ministry of Transport and Communication (MoTC), as an owner of the lifeline road network and policy making authority, will have the overall responsibility for implementation of the Project. The MoTC will delegate day-to-day implementation of the project to the existing Transport Projects Implementation Unit (PIU) under the MoTC. The TPIU is governed by the Project Management Board chaired by the MoTC and comprised of stakeholder ministries and Government agencies. The TPIU was established to implement development projects financed by

the Bank and the Government of Armenia. It successfully implemented Lifeline Roads Improvement Project (LRIP) and is currently managing the ongoing LRNIP. The TPIU has no in-house environmental and/or social specialist and uses external consultant service for the application of safeguard policies. Environmental and social performance under LRNIP is satisfactory. The TPIU adheres to the requirements of the EMF, ensures development of site-specific EMPs for all individual investments, and tracks coverage of environmental aspects by the technical supervision consultant. As a result of these efforts, no environmental damage has been done throughout the implementation of LRIP and LRNIP.

Similar to the present arrangement under the LRNIP, civil works under the LRNIP-AF will also be supervised by a consulting firm commissioned by TPIU. Along with other responsibilities, this firm will be assigned to track compliance of civil works contractors with the EMPs and will monitor implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.

**5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.**

The key project stakeholders are the MoTC, Ministry of Territorial Administration, Ministry of Nature Protection, Traffic Police, local municipalities, and residents of settlements which use lifeline roads for connecting to services and markets. A wider range of population of Armenia will benefit in a longer term from the expected increased access to economic and social opportunities, and job creation resulting from better connectivity through the rehabilitated lifeline roads.

The final draft versions of the ESMF and the RPF were disclosed through the World Bank Infoshop on April 22, 2015. The documents were also disclosed through the website of the Ministry of Transport and Communication of Armenia on May 04, 2015 in Armenian ([http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&id=77&page\\_name=announc](http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&id=77&page_name=announc)) and English languages ([http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&id=78&page\\_name=announc](http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&id=78&page_name=announc)). On May 5, 2015 the invitation for public consultations was published in one of the local newspapers providing website links to the documents, as well as date and time of the public consultation (attached to the minutes of the public consultations, Annex III, ESMF and RPF). On May 15, 2015 the public consultations were held. Participants included representatives of the Transport PIU, regional governments (marzpetarans), representatives of environmental and resettlement NGOs, representatives of NGOs and experts/specialists dealing with women/gender issues. Minutes of these consultations are presented in Annex III of ESMF and RPF. Following public consultations, the ESMF and the RPF were updated and re-disclosed through the Bank Infoshop on May 18, 2015. Site-specific EMPs will be drafted, disclosed, and consulted with local stakeholders prior to tendering of works at any given work site. RAPs, if required, will be drafted, disclosed, discussed with project-affected people, and implemented by the Government prior to commencement of works.

**B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Apr-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Apr-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	////

<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Armenia	05-May-2015
<p><i>Comments:</i> The final draft version of the ESMF was disclosed through the website of the Ministry of Transport and Communication of Armenia on May 04, 2015 in Armenian (<a href="http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&amp;id=77&amp;page_name=announc">http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&amp;id=77&amp;page_name=announc</a>) and English languages (<a href="http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&amp;id=78&amp;page_name=announc">http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&amp;id=78&amp;page_name=announc</a>). On May 5, 2015 the invitation for public consultations was published in one of the local newspapers providing website links to the documents, as well as date and time of the public consultation (attached to the minutes of the public consultations, Annex III, ESMF). On May 15, 2015 the public consultations were held. Participants included representatives of the Transport PIU, regional governments (marzpetarans), representatives of environmental and resettlement NGOs, representatives of NGOs and experts/specialists dealing with women/gender issues. Minutes of these consultations are presented in Annex III of ESMF. Following public consultations, the ESMF was updated and will be re-disclosed through the Bank Infoshop on May 18, 2015. Site-specific EMPs will be drafted, disclosed, and consulted with local stakeholders prior to tendering of works at any given work site.</p>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Apr-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Apr-2015
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Armenia	05-May-2015
<p><i>Comments:</i> The final draft versions of the RPF was disclosed through the website of the Ministry of Transport and Communication of Armenia on May 04, 2015 in Armenian (<a href="http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&amp;id=77&amp;page_name=announc">http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=1&amp;id=77&amp;page_name=announc</a>) and English languages (<a href="http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&amp;id=78&amp;page_name=announc">http://www.mtc.am/pages.php?lang=3&amp;id=78&amp;page_name=announc</a>). On May 5, 2015 the invitation for public consultations was published in one of the local newspapers providing website links to the documents, as well as date and time of the public consultation (attached to the minutes of the public consultations, Annex III, RPF). On May 15, 2015 the public consultations were held. Participants included representatives of the Transport PIU, regional governments (marzpetarans), representatives of environmental and resettlement NGOs, representatives of NGOs and experts/specialists dealing with women/gender issues. Minutes of these consultations are presented in Annex III, RPF. Following public consultations, the RPF was updated and will be re-disclosed through the Bank Infoshop on May 18, 2015. RAPs, if required, will be drafted, disclosed, discussed with project-affected people, and implemented by the Government prior to commencement of works.</p>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

***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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>			
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"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>			
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>			
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(s):	Name: Maria Carolina Monsalve, Nargis Ryskulova	
<b>Approved By</b>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Juan Gaviria (PMGR)	Date: 15-May-2015