

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA1105

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 15-Nov-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 19-Nov-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Nepal	Project ID:	P149606
Project Name:	ROAD SAFETY SUPPORT PROJECT (P149606)		
Task Team Leader:	A.K. Farhad Ahmed		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	27-May-2014	Estimated Board Date:	18-Nov-2014
Managing Unit:	GTIDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (100%)		
Theme(s):	Other public sector governance (10%), Infrastructure services for private sector development (90%)		
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:	7.47	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			0.00
Global Road Safety Program			7.47
Total			7.47
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

To reduce the risk of roadway departure crashes on selected sections of the roads targeted under the RSDP and to strengthen the Government of Nepal's capacity for improving road safety.

3. Project Description

The proposed project entails a Global Road Safety Phase 2 Multi-Donor Trust Fund (GRSP2 MDTF)

grant of US\$ 7.47 million (equivalent) that will fund investments in parallel to the IDA-supported Road Sector Development Project.

PROJECT COMPONENTS

Component A – Capacity strengthening for the Implementation of Road Safety Action Plan (US\$ 0.80 million equivalent)

Component A will support measures to strengthen capacity for improving road safety in Nepal with a focus on Nepal's Road Safety Action Plan. Specific themes under this component include: (i) establishing the Nepal Road Safety Council & secretariat; (ii) legislation, regulation, and skills development; and (iii) small scale road safety pilots to identify promising initiatives for later scaling up. The Association and MoPIT have agreed to focus on these areas as they represent high priority opportunities for making progress against the Nepal's Road Safety Action Plan that cabinet approved in 2013. Annex B includes a detailed breakdown of activities under Component A.

Component B – Improved physical safety of RSDP roads (US\$ 6.67 million equivalent)

Component B will fund procurement and installation of roughly 70,000 m of crash barriers in high risk sections of RSDP roads where steep drop-offs or other hazards make road departure crashes particularly dangerous. Expenditures eligible for funding will also include those related to ancillary costs of civil works such as site inspections, contract supervision, auditing, and engineering. Once in place, crash barriers will help prevent vehicles that lose control from plunging off the road surface. DOR's Project Coordination Team (PCT) for the Road Sector Development Project has undertaken a road safety audit of project roads and identified the specific locations where crash barriers can be effective. The technical approach for crash barriers in a specific site will be determined on a case-by case basis. In some instances where space is available, gabion style rock cages will be a suitable technical solution. In other instances, 'W' section steel barriers or other technologies will be preferred options.

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

The project will develop approximately 70km of crash barriers along sections of road developed under the IDA-supported Road Sector Development Project (RSDP). The indicative length of crash barriers by road is as follows:

Satbanjh-Baitadi-Tripurasundari Road: 4 km of barriers
 Satbanjh –Gokuleshwor-Darchula Road: 10 km of barriers
 Khodpe-Bajhang Road: 10 km of barriers
 Surkhet- Kalikot-Jumla Road: 28 km of barriers
 Tallodhangeswor-Dailekh Road: 4 km of barriers
 Chinchhu -Jajarkot Road: 4 km of barriers

DOR's Environmental and Social Management Framework was applied under RSDP to the development of these roads. Barriers will be within existing rights of way and will not require additional land acquisition or resettlement.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Drona Raj Ghimire (GENDR)
 Parthapriya Ghosh (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The provisions of OP/BP 4.01 on environmental assessment will apply to the project. Project activities are expected to classify as having low risk of adverse impacts and a simple site specific Environmental Management Plan (EMP) will be adequate to manage associated impacts. DOR will manage environmental considerations in accordance with the project's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project is not expected to impact on Natural Habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project is not expected to impact on forests and forest resources.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project is not expected to procure or use pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project is not expected to impact on PCR.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The RSDP project sites, in which road safety works will be implemented, are located in the area inhabited by one or the other ethnic group. Hence, Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10) will apply. For any works that are identified during project preparation in area inhabited by indigenous people, an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan will be prepared in accordance with the Environmental Social Management Framework.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	Activities under Component B of the project will occur within the right of way of RSDP roads where RSDP has already managed resettlement activities. Similarly, road safety pilot interventions implemented under component A of the project are likely to be within existing rights of way (i.e. on the existing road surface or shoulder). The proposed project is therefore not expected to entail any additional land acquisition or resettlement. Hence OP 4.12 on involuntary resettlement has not been triggered.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Dam related activity is not part of the project scope.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project scope does not include any activity over or around an international waterway that could cause potential conflict.

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	No disputed area in the proposed project area.
--	----	--

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:

Environment

The provisions of OP/BP 4.01 on environmental assessment will apply to the project. Some common environmental issues that may arise under this project include: (i) dust pollution; (ii) construction noise; (iii) minor disruptions to traffic along work routes; (vi) health and safety of workers. Though the duration of works is likely to be relatively short, sanitation at labor camps is a concern that DOR will need to manage through appropriate contract provisions and supervision. Project activities are expected to classify as having low risk of adverse impacts and a simple site specific Environmental Management Plan (EMP) will be adequate to manage associated impacts. DOR will manage environmental considerations in accordance with the project's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).

Social

Social issues under the project will be governed by the DOR's Environmental and Social Management Framework, which was recently been revised for RSSP works and disclosed by the World Bank's infoshop on June 27, 2014. The ESMF fulfills GON's regulations/policy requirements and the requirements of World Bank's Operation Polices 4.12 and 4.10. Activities under Component B of the project will occur within the right of way of RSDP roads where RSDP has already managed resettlement activities. Similarly, road safety pilot interventions implemented under component A of the project are likely to be within existing rights of way (i.e. on the existing road surface or shoulder). The proposed project is therefore not expected to entail any additional land acquisition or resettlement. Hence OP 4.12 on involuntary resettlement has not been triggered. The RSDP project sites, in which road safety works will be implemented, are located in the area inhabited by one or the other ethnic group. Hence, Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10) will apply. For any works that are identified during project preparation in area inhabited by indigenous people, an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan will be prepared in accordance with the Environmental Social Management Framework.

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

The road safety works within the right of way is not expected to result long-term and indirect adverse impacts. The impacts of the project are expected to be positive. The project activities are likely to significantly benefit communities along RSDP roads as it has the potential to reduce the accident related risks that community members might endure when accessing other regions of Nepal via road transport. Road accidents, particularly those where multiple family members are injured or killed, can contribute to households falling into poverty or becoming more severely poor due to lost income, health related costs, etc. The proposed project therefore represents an important intervention for helping to support communities in two of Nepal's least developed regions.

It is important to note that installation of crash barriers will help to avoid environmental damage

that often arises when hazardous substances leak from vehicles that have suffered large drops from road surfaces (e.g. petroleum, oils, various chemicals carried as cargo, etc.). In many locations along RSDP roads vehicle retrieval or environmental remediation following such an incident would not be practicable with technologies readily available in Nepal. Avoiding such incidents can help prevent considerable damage to the environment and people living nearby / downstream from hazardous sections of road.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
N/A
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 DOR is familiar with the Bank's social/environmental requirements and has been engaged with the IDA funded projects such as ongoing the RSDP and BIMP operations. The department has established a Geo-Environmental and Social Unit (GESU) to deal with environmental and social aspects of roads: it has played an important role in mainstreaming environmental consideration in road planning and development. DOR has prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) in 2007, which was recently revised by DOR. The revised ESMF is acceptable to the Bank and is being applied to the ongoing RSDP. Social and environmental issues under the proposed project will broadly be governed by the already agreed road sector ESMF.
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 stakeholders are government officials (Ministry of Physical Infrastructure and Transportation, Department of Roads, Ministry of Finance, Local Environmental authorities), Ministry of Labour and Transport Management, population residing along the RSDP road, transport operators and road users (vehicle drivers and passengers, pedestrians).
The ESMF clearly requires that potentially affected people participate throughout the various stages of planning and implementation of the Program. Local communities will be consulted in various phases of a project cycle; affected people will be pre-informed about the loss and damages and possible benefits of the project.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	24-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	26-Jun-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Nepal	26-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	24-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	26-Jun-2014

"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:	
NA	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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: A.K. Farhad Ahmed
<i>Approved By</i>	

Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Karla Gonzalez Carvajal (PMGR)	Date: 19-Nov-2014
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------