

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: PIDISDSA18088

Date Prepared/Updated: 13-Jul-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Serbia	Project ID:	P158413
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P108005
Project Name:	Corridor X Highway Additional Financing (P158413)		
Parent Project Name:	CORRIDOR X HIGHWAY PROJECT (P108005)		
Region:	EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	18-Jul-2016	Estimated Board Date:	21-Oct-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Transport & ICT	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s):	Ministry of Finance		
Implementing Agency:	Koridori Srbije Drustvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornoscu, Koridori Srbije Drustvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornoscu		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source		Amount
	Borrower		0.00
	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development		39.13
	Total Project Cost		39.13
Environmental Category:	A - Full Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Serbia is a landlocked country spreading over an area of 77,474 km². It has a population of 7 million people and an average per capita Gross National Income of US\$ 5,590 in 2015. Serbia is located in the central part of the Balkan Peninsula, on an important route linking Europe and Asia and often referred to as the cross-roads of Europe. The rapid growth experienced by Serbia during 2001-08 was driven mainly by domestic consumption and resulted in significant internal and external imbalances. As a result, economic performance was sluggish since the onset of the global financial crisis, with Serbia experiencing three recessions in six years (2009-2014). While the 2009 recession was mainly due to the severe impact of the international economic crisis, recessions in 2012 and 2014 were primarily caused by natural disasters - a drought in 2012 and severe floods in 2014.

Growth recovered to an estimated 0.7 percent during 2015 and is expected to rise to around 2 percent in 2016 and over 3 percent over the medium term. Short- to medium-term growth will be underpinned by more supportive external demand, improved investment, and gradual recovery of consumption. In late 2014, the Government put in place a fiscal consolidation program, which contributed to significantly improve fiscal performance in 2015. These resulted in general government deficit reduction to an estimated 3.7 percent of GDP in 2015, down from 6.7 percent a year earlier and significantly lower than the targeted 5.9 percent. Fiscal consolidation measures will limit the contribution of domestic demand to growth in the short term, but increased investment (including government's investment) will be beneficial in medium-to long- term growth and will contribute to growth and employment.

Pre-crisis growth particularly benefited the poor and B40, but these groups were also disproportionately hurt during the recent economic slow-down and recession. The lower income groups experienced higher than average growth prior to the crisis. Between 2008 and 2010, the decline in income of the B40 in Serbia was among the worst in ECA. Poverty reduction has slowly resumed since poverty peaked in 2010. As a result of some improvements in economic and employment conditions, the poverty rate (using the regional poverty line of \$5/day in 2005 PPP) dropped from 15.1 percent in 2010 to 14.5 percent in 2013. Poverty is estimated to remain at 14.4 percent in 2015 and has not come back down to its lowest level seen in 2008. While rising private sector employment has improved welfare, the decline in agriculture output in 2015 is likely to have had adverse impacts on rural poverty.

Serbian poverty rate places it among the poorest countries and one of the oldest populations in Europe. The project roads passes through among the under developed and poorest municipalities of Serbia (Dimitrovgrad, Vladicin Han, Vranje and Leskovac), and is characterized by high level of unemployment, low income levels, large proportion of pensioners with small pensions, etc. In these municipalities, poverty is especially significant in rural areas, where higher share of elderly and single member families compared to urban areas and is faced with problem such as lack of access to basic education, poor infrastructure and road connectivity, inadequate water supply, lack of access good health care, lack of adequate sewer and telephonic network.

Sectoral and institutional Context

Connectivity is a critical driver of competitiveness, and the quality of infrastructure networks is an important factor in Serbia's ability to shift the economy towards export-orientation. The primary road network, length of 15,500 km, is estimated to have an asset value of about US\$13 billion, but connectivity and road conditions need improvement to support economic growth.

The integration of the Serbian transport network into the regional and Trans-European Network (TEN-T) remains critical for Serbia's economic and social development. The Vienna Western Balkans Summit of 2015, driven by the Berlin process, reaffirmed the importance of Corridor X in Serbia, designating it a Core Network Corridor. As the most important transport route for Serbia, Corridor X through its 792 km of roads and 760 km of railways enhances regional connectivity through linkages to the TEN-T Orient East-Med Corridor and represents the shortest link between Western and Central Europe, on the one side, and the Middle East, Asia and Africa, on the other. Despite the importance of the road network and government dedication to improve it, many years of underinvestment Serbia is still placed unfavorably in terms of road infrastructure quality. According to the 2015/2016 Global Competitiveness Report (GCR), Serbia is ranked 114th out of 140 countries on the quality of roads, which is lower than its overall rank (94th).

The sectoral context is governed by several laws, most important being the Law on Ministries from 2014 (amended in 2015) and the Law on Public Roads from 2013. According to the Law on Ministries, transport infrastructure sector is under responsibility of the Ministry of Transport, Construction and Infrastructure (MoCTI). Public Enterprise "Putevi Srbije" (PEPS, also known as Roads of Serbia) are responsible for maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of existing roads as well as for construction of new infrastructure. In 2009, due to the importance of the Corridor X highway construction, Government of Serbia (GoS) established a daughter company of PEPS "Koridor 10 Društvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornošću" (K10DOO). The primary role of K10DOO is to project manage to completion, all the construction activities associated with the entire Corridor X improvements. Later, on July 20, 2010, funder rights have been transferred to the (GoS) and name of the company has been changed to "Koridori Srbije Društvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornošću" (KSDOO, also known as Corridors of Serbia). MoCTI has been authorized to execute all rights and obligations deriving from the contract on behalf of GoS.

In late 2014, GoS announced that KSDOO would be merged into PEPS. However, the merger has been postponed, to allow GoS time to implement wider road sector reforms to which this Additional Financing (AF) will contribute. The reforms will include, but not be limited to wider use of Performance Based Maintenance Contracts (PBMC), institutional reforms at PEPS, introducing a Service Level Agreement (SLA), reviewing design standards and policies, etc.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The Project Development Objective is to increase transport efficiency and improve traffic safety on the three project sections of Corridor X, between Nis and Dimitrovgrad and Grabovnica and Donji Neradovac respectively, and to improve road management and roadsafety in Serbia.

Key Results

The original Results indicators will apply and will be extended to include new indicators for Gender and Citizen Engagement.

The new Citizen Engagement indicator will build upon the achievements already made under the project and will monitor:

- a. The percentage of grievances registered that are addressed and closed-out, with a target of

100% proposed.

Two gender related indicators will be included, one being closely connected to the road safety agenda:

- a. Making Road Safety Action Plan gender sensitive (yes/no)
- b. Total number of person months of direct employment created, disaggregated by gender.

Although GHG emissions will not be directly measured, the impact has been modeled, and costed into the revised economic analysis, based on the Highway Development and Management Model (HDM-4).

D. Project Description

The total cost of the Corridor X program was estimated at EUR 1.3 billion, before taxes and contingencies, of which the World Bank is contributing EUR 275.2 million (US\$388 million equivalent) under the Original Loan, in a co-financed project with the Government of Serbia, EIB, and EBRD. Greece committed to grant EUR 100 million, but due to economic crisis provided only EUR 16 million and de-committed from the program on June 3, 2013. The GoS took over financing of the remaining works between Donji Neradovac and Levosoje, which further increased pressure on the GoS.

The proposed AF is consistent with the Original Loan description and objectives, and supports objectives of the Country Partnership Framework (CPF) 2016-2020, i.e. "Objective 2d: Enhanced Infrastructure Networks", within the focus area "Private Sector Growth and Economic Inclusion". The overarching goal of the CPF is to support Serbia in creating a competitive and inclusive economy and, through this, to promote integration into the European Union (EU).

Original Loan was approved on June 9, 2009, became effective on November 6, 2009 and was restructured (Level 2 restructuring) in February 11, 2014. The restructuring included: (i) the use of potential savings to finance the construction of a 5.8 km extension of the E-75 motorway between Caricina Dolina and Vladicin Han, known as Lot 6 under Component 1; and (ii) an extension to the Project closing date by 12 months, from December 31, 2015 to December 31, 2016. This has been the only extension of the project closing date up to date.

The here proposed AF and extended closing date by 18 months, from December 31, 2016 to June 30, 2018, would allow the project to achieve its development objectives by closing unanticipated financing gaps and covering cost overruns and allowing enough time for works completion. The AF will enable completion of ongoing works and procurement of the remaining eligible goods and services. The additional funds for works will be applied exclusively to finance completion of eligible contracts under the Project, adhering to all existing safeguards and fiduciary requirements. The main reasons for project closing date extension and additional financing, as stated in official requests from GoS on January 27 and February 29, 2016, respectively, are as follows:

Additional financing is requested to:

- a. Enable financing of cost overruns and time increases, resulting from contractor claims to address the impacts of delayed expropriation processes, unexpected geological conditions, design changes, and relocation of utilities; which had not been originally identified and which impacted

construction progress and costs.

b. Mitigate the impacts and costs of exogenous factors such as extreme weather conditions (floods), the need to remove unexploded ordinance, and to properly excavate and preserve archeological sites, which all caused delays in construction.

c. Provide more resources for implementation of the comprehensive road sector reforms and extend the impact and reach of the activity.

d. Provide resources to procure additional road safety enforcement equipment, and to complete the development and installation of a comprehensive road accident database, noting that proposals for this Technical Assistance are above the estimated budget.

Project restructuring (i.e. closing date extension) is to complete the ongoing works contracts, and to allow more time to implement comprehensive structural changes in the road sector. Whilst a further twelve month extension has been requested, given ongoing delays in construction activities and just recent award of one construction contract, this may not be sufficient to complete the project components, and therefore an extension of eighteen months is proposed, to 30 June 2018. The project closing date extension will provide:

a. Additional time to complete the construction of Lot 6, where Lot 6 was introduced to the project scope during the previous restructuring. Contractual completion date is beyond Original Loan closing date. In addition, the project is several months behind the schedule and is reasonable to expect that entire construction season (April-November) of 2017 will be needed for full finalization of works.

b. Additional time to complete the remaining construction activities on the Dimitrovgrad Bypass. As a result of bankruptcy and poor performance of the initially appointed two contractors; the Works were recently tendered for the third time, which has introduced a considerable lag in implementation. A contract has been signed with the new contractor on May 11, 2016 and contractual period is beyond the current loan closing date.

c. Additional time and resources to support GoS and MoCTI in implementing Road Sector Reforms, including introduction of Service Level Agreement (SLA) and performance based Maintenance Contracting (PBMC); and to review and address the anticipated impacts of the proposed road sector consolidation.

Since the previous restructuring, good progress has been achieved, with four (of six) E75 Works contracts opened to traffic. Overall, 32.6 km of new highway has been completed and put in operation, while there are still 2 sections, Lot6 and Dimitrovgrad Bypass, total length of 14.6km, to be completed. Also, the E80 Lot 3 tunnel contract reached substantial completion in October 2014. The Client has progressed with procurement of the E80 Tunnel Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) and Mechanical and Electrical Plant (MEP). Other achievements include preparation of the Road Reform Action Plan; establishment of the Road Safety Agency made possible through the new Road Safety Law; and adoption of a new Road Safety Strategy (RSS). The Road Safety Action Plan, based upon the RSS, will be adopted in second half of 2016. Procurement of a comprehensive road crash database and road safety enforcement equipment has been initiated. Compliance with financial management, procurement, environmental and social safeguards continue to be acceptable and satisfactory. However, given that two remaining work contracts have contractual closing dates beyond the Original Loan closing date and that delayed access to site, expropriation, geology, utilities and weather conditions resulted in increased contract costs, additional financing is necessary to achieve the project PDO.

The economic analysis of the project was reevaluated for the additional financing using HDM-4

considering discount rate as per World Bank guidelines, the actual construction costs that include the additional costs financed by the additional financing, and the actual traffic measured in 2015. Economic analysis showed that all road sections yield a positive Net Present Value (NPV). The overall EIRR of the project is 13 percent, with EIRRs ranging from 9.7 to 16.3 percent per road section. The sensitivity analysis results, overall EIRR of 10 percent, increasing the construction costs by 20 percent and decreasing the project benefits by 20 percent confirm the economic justification of the project.

Disbursement performance has improved substantially. As of June 2016, the project has disbursed about 74 percent. Since contractual completion on ongoing works is beyond the current closing date, the disbursement schedule will be updated to correspond with changes in the implementation schedule.

The Original Loan is rated as environmental category A, and this will not change. The project's environmental and social instruments, namely, the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) as well as site specific Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and Resettlement Action Plans, were disclosed as required under the Original Loan, and followed during the course of the project. Financial covenants on ongoing project are complied with, i.e. quarterly financial reports and annual audited financial reports are delivered timely and are acceptable.

Component Name

Construction works on the E-75 (Corridor Xd) and E-80 (Corridor Xc) branches

Comments (optional)

This component supports construction works on the E-75 and on the E-80 motorway. Up to now, 4 of 5 contracts on E-75 and one of the 3 contracts on E-80 have been completed, totaling 32.6km of new highway construction and two tunnels. The scope of this component will not change, but additional financing of EUR 33 million is required to complete the original and re-structured scope and cover for cost overruns on all contracts and supervision. Estimates are based on the current contract prices, and an analysis of known pending variation claims. Cost overruns and time increases result from the impacts of delayed expropriation processes, unexpected geology, design changes, and relocation of utilities, as well as exogenous factors such as floods, and non-performance and bankruptcy of a contractor

Component Name

Road Safety

Comments (optional)

This component supports GoS efforts in improving the road safety in the country. Since project start, the Road Safety Agency and National Road Safety Council (NRSC) have been established, a national Road Safety Strategy developed and adopted, two multi-sectoral road safety pilots launched, and road safety enforcement equipment procured. Procurement of the comprehensive Road Safety Database is in the final stage. Road Safety Action Plan is drawn from the strategy and should be enhanced with gender sensitive analysis and adopted in the second half of 2016. A further EUR 0.150 million is required to procure more enforcement equipment and to complete the development and installation of the comprehensive Road Safety Database.

Component Name

Implementation Assistance & Institutional Support

Comments (optional)

This component provides project management and implementation assistance to KSDOO. It includes the procurement of a (i) separate independent environmental and social supervision; (ii) an independent technical audit of the civil works; (iii) other necessary technical assistance and training; (iv) incremental operating expenses; and (v) technical assistance to support institutional strengthening in PEPS through the development and implementation of a Reform Action Plan. Additional financing of EUR 1.84 million is required to expand the technical assistance already envisaged within this component, in order to improve the proposed road sector reforms.

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

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

I. U. B. Reddy (GSU06)

Nikola Ille (GEN03)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The implementation, procurement and financial management arrangements will remain the same as in the on-going Project. The Project is compliant with the financial covenants; and reporting will continue as per the agreement in the legal documents. Operational monitoring, project management and supervision of the Project will be carried out by the KSDOO, which will work daily with Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure (MoCTI) to streamline decision-making.

KSDOO responsibilities include day-to-day management of the project, operational monitoring and supervision of the project, procurement, financial management, reporting and liaison with the Bank. At the moment company has 107 employees and is supported by external specialists. It is managed by General Director and Assembly.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Original Loan is rated environmental category A. Existing project documents, including corridor level EIAs and section-specific EMPs continue to apply. As there are no additional physical areas to be included in the Project, as compared to Original Loan, there is no need for additional documents. Existing implementation, monitoring and reporting arrangements will continue to apply.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Existing arrangements, as detailed in section-specific EMPs, continue to apply.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	

Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	Existing arrangements for chance finds, as detailed in section-specific EMPs, continue to apply.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	Large scale expropriation and displacement of families is involved in the Original Loan. No additional impacts are involved due to additional financing.
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	

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p>
<p>All environmental and social impacts are already determined under the Original Loan. No additional impacts are identified under the Additional Financing. In respect to environmental impacts, they are defined and detailed in section-specific EMPs as well as respective mitigation, monitoring and reporting measures.</p> <p>The project impacted 2510 land owners, out of which 124 are public and 2386 are private land owners. 2330 land owners (98%) have received compensation. In all, 278 PAPs decided to decline the offer and go to court. Out of all court cases, 52 are still not concluded. Also, the remaining 56 cases consist of 52 pending court cases and 4 owners that were not available to receive compensation. The payment of transitional allowance to 40 physically displaced families, as required under the RPF, is completed substantially and only 4 families have not yet received it since their Bank accounts are not in order. The payments are expected shortly. The recently completed Resettlement Impact Assessment (RIA) reports confirm that the project has extended certain benefits to the poor and needy people. There are no irreversible social impacts.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>There are no additional potential impacts in relation to the Original Loan.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The alternatives have been considered while designing the Original loan and various options have been considered while finalizing the road section alignments to minimize the expropriation and displacement impacts. There is no change to physical characteristics of the Original Loan that would necessitate development of new alternatives.</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>

Within Corridors of Serbia (CoS) exists a Social Team led by a Senior team member with legal background who is managing the expropriation related impacts. Third Party Environmental Supervision consultant's scope of work also includes the support of social impacts.

The project involved expropriation of 383 hectares and displacement of 40 families, triggering, OP4.12, Involuntary Resettlement. The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) outlining the policy provisions for expropriation and resettlement and institutional arrangements was adopted in line with the Bank's OP 4.12 at the time of project approval and disclosed locally and in the Bank's Info shop in 2009. Subsequently, four Resettlement Action Plans (RAP) were prepared, endorsed by the Bank and disclosed both locally and in the Bank's Info Shop. The Grievance Committee with membership from Implementing agency, local municipality and representatives of Project affected people has been constituted in all project municipalities. In addition, each contractor had a dedicated department to deal with citizens complains and requests.

The client regularly provide Expropriation progress updates and have good data base on progress in expropriation and payment of related entitlements to PAPs and support provided to the PAPs as part of RAP implementation. The project encountered certain challenges such as delays in providing budgets for expropriation, additional expropriation requirements, and resistance from businessmen for relocation, delays in payment of transitional support and purchase of a medical van to one of the municipality in lieu of support to vulnerable people. On account of this, the safeguards rating for Involuntary Resettlement OP 4.12 was rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory or Unsatisfactory in the last 2 years. However, these challenges are now overcome and most of the issues were resolved to the Bank satisfaction. One of the long pending issue of payment of Transitional allowances was resolved following the initiation and completion of the Resettlement Impact Assessment reports. As a result, the rating was upgraded to Moderately Satisfactory in March, 2016. The only outstanding issues as of now are: payment of transitional allowances to four (4) PAPs whose Bank accounts are not in order; four (4) land owners who are not available to receive compensation; and the pending compensation payment to 52 out of 278 court cases. The Team will continue to monitor these few pending tasks.

The RIA study results for E-80- indicate that though the affected people have expressed dissatisfaction with compensation amount, their socio-economic standard has improved over the baseline situation in terms of the real income (7% increase in inflation adjusted income), poverty level (reduced by 18%), indebtedness (deceased by 36%). The report observed that the compensation amounts are mostly used for productive purposes. The report also indicated few shortcomings related to transaction support to three displaced families and additional support to a businessman and damages due to blasting. The client is examining these shortcomings and the Team will monitor addressing the study findings.

In respect to environmental issues, CoS team has an environmental specialist, responsible for overseeing the environmental consultants and environmental supervisors for section-specific EMPs. Supervision of implementation of section-specific EMPs is undertaken by the Engineer and verified by an independent Environmental Supervision Consultant. Compliance with section-specific EMPs is currently assessed as moderately satisfactory, while during last 2 years had mostly been assessed as moderately unsatisfactory due to contractors' partial compliance with the construction waste management, handling of hazardous operations, organization and operation of the construction camps, and health and safety of workers. Proactivity of the contractors has improved during the last year, but is still not at the desired level. Non-compliance with section-

<p>specific EMPs require immediate remediation, through adequate action and will continue to be reported to the Bank on monthly level. Reporting arrangements as implemented on the original Project shall continue to apply on AF, through Monthly, Quarterly and Annual reports from the Borrower to the Bank.</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>In respect to environmental issues key stakeholders are: The Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection; Municipalities; Regional Institutes for Nature Protection; Regional Institutes for Culture Heritage Protection; Local and national NGOs; interested public. Consultation process for the Original Loan was undertaken in 2009 fully in line with the Bank's OP 4.01, including public meeting and Q&A sessions on Corridor Level EIAs. Public consultation and disclosure of section-specific EMPs was performed in 2011 and 2012. During the execution of civil works there is an ongoing cooperation with municipalities and interested public, as well as possibility for direct access to the Contractors, the Engineer and the Environmental Supervisors.</p> <p>As part of RAPs preparation, consultations were held with project affected people and local Municipalities and the RAPs both local language and English were disclosed in the Implementation agencies and municipalities websites as well as Bank's Info shop. Extensive consultations between citizens and municipality and Corridors of Serbia have been organized at the beginning of the project, in order to inform the citizens about their rights and RPF and RAP content. Bank team member(s) were present at these consultation. During the Bank's supervision missions, the PAPs, members of municipalities and Grievance Redress Committee members are consulted regularly.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Feb-2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-May-2009
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	03-Jun-2009
"In country" Disclosure	
Serbia	12-Mar-2009
<p><i>Comments:</i> The in-country disclosure of draft Corridor Level EIAs was carried out in period from February 25 (when the documents were made publicly available on site and at the Client's web site) to March 11 and 12 (when the public meetings were held in Bela Palanka (for e-80) and Vranje (for E-75). The final EIA document remains available at the Client's web site. Comments on draft and final EIA document could be sent to the Client's environmental unit from February 25, 2009 onwards.</p>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Feb-2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-May-2009
"In country" Disclosure	

Serbia	03-Apr-2009
<p><i>Comments:</i> A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was prepared by the borrower as a condition for appraisal which complies with OP 4.12. The reason for preparing a RPF instead of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) was that the main designs were not finalized at the time of scheduled appraisal for all the IFI funded sub-sections in the program, therefore the full impact not known. Site specific RAPs have been disclosed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section Vladicin Han - Donji Neredovac: in-country disclosure on June 10, 2012, submitted to Infoshop on June 28, 2012 2. Section Dimitrovgrad Bypass: in-country disclosure on April 23, 2010, submitted to Infoshop on April 28, 2010 3. Section Grabovnica- Grdelica: in-country disclosure on April 21, 2011, submitted to Infoshop on October 27, 2011 4. Section Lot6 Tunnel Manajle-Vladicin Han: in-country disclosure on May 15, 2014, submitted to Infoshop on May 15, 2014 	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</p>	

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 4.04 - 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" 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 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"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Svetlana Vukanovic

Title: Transport Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Finance

Contact: Dusan Vujovic

Title: Minister

Email: kabinet@mfin.gov.rs

Implementing Agencies

Name: Koridori Srbije Društvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornoscu

Contact: D Mitar Djurovic

Title: Director

Email: d.djurovic@koridorisrbije.rs

Name: Koridori Srbije Društvo sa Ogranicenom Odgovornoscu

Contact: Nina Vlacic

Title: Advisor to Director

Email: n.valcic@koridorisrbije.rs

VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-4500
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Svetlana Vukanovic	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Nina Chee (SA)	Date: 14-Jul-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Juan Gaviria (PMGR)	Date: 14-Jul-2016
Country Director:	Name: Antonius Verheijen (CD)	Date: 01-Sep-2016