

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: PIDISDSA16808

Date Prepared/Updated: 22-Mar-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Guinea	Project ID:	P156422
		Parent Project ID (if any):	
Project Name:	Third Village Community Support Project (P156422)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	06-Nov-2015	Estimated Board Date:	31-May-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Irrigation and drainage (10%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (10%), Pre-primary education (30%), Health (30%), Sa nitation (20%)		
Theme(s):	Decentralization (30%), Education for all (20%), Rural non-farm income generation (20%), Rural services and infrastructure (30%)		
Borrower(s):	Ministry of Finance		
Implementing Agency:	Ministry of Decentralization and Territorial Administration		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source	Amount	
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT	0.00	
	International Development Association (IDA)	15.00	
	Total Project Cost	15.00	
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):			
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Guinea is one of Africa's poorest countries. Over the past decade, the country has witnessed political instability coupled with military take overs. The presidential elections of November 7, 2010 marked the return of the country to constitutional rule after the army seized power on December 23, 2008. After a difficult period of military transition, the first democratically elected president and the new political context paved the way for economic opportunities for Guinea. Several reforms were introduced and Guinea reached the completion point for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative in September 2012. This debt cancellation amounted to \$2.13 billion reducing Guinea's total debt from 65.9 percent of GDP in 2011 to 19 percent of GDP in 2012. The political transition was completed with the legislative elections that took place on September 28, 2013. However, political dispute erupted during the President's term and the Members of Parliament (MPs) belonging to the opposition groups withdrew from the Parliament for about one year, a few months after the beginning of their term. Ethno-political strains have been and will remain a major threat to stability. In this regard, there have been a number of violent clashes between antigovernment activists and security forces in recent months, in relation to the Presidential and Local electoral calendars. Following pressure from the UN, the Government and opposition leaders agreed to resume talks in early June 2015. As a result, the MPs of the op-position recently returned to Parliament and, in accordance with the constitutional calendar, the new Presidential elections were held on October 11, 2015. As a result, President Alpha Conde was re-elected, and it is expected that ongoing reforms will be pursued, along with the steady implementation of the post-Ebola recovery plan.

From the economic standpoint, mining and agriculture are the dominant sectors of Guinea. The mining sector consists of large-scale mining of bauxite, aluminum, and gold; in 2013, it accounted for about 20 percent of GDP, 80 percent of foreign currency earnings, and 20 to 25 percent of government revenues. That same year, the agriculture sector represented 20 percent of GDP. The implementation of the 2012-2014 economic and financial programs, supported by the IMF Extended Credit Facility, helped to reduce macroeconomic imbalance. Real GDP grew by 3.9 percent in 2011 and reached 3.8 percent in 2012, compared with 1.9 percent in 2010. However, real GDP growth slowed down to 2.5 percent in 2013, due to a combination of external shocks and delays in mining investment, coupled with internal political factors. For 2014, GDP was projected to be 2.4 percent due to the aftermath of Ebola outbreak, delays in mining investment, and contractions in agriculture and services. Economic growth was expected to reach five to six percent in 2015; however, this growth is unlikely to materialize given, among others, the magnitude of the impact of the Ebola crisis. The social and political risks are also considerable and growth could be derailed if political stability is not restored and the global economic outlook remains weak

Despite progress in the overall economy, per capita GDP remained at US\$480 in 2014, while poverty has increased steadily. The 2012 Limited Poverty Evaluation Survey showed that 55 percent of the population was considered to be poor, compared with 53 percent in 2007 and 49 percent in 2002. As is typical for many of the sub-Saharan African countries, most of the poor are still living in rural areas with a poverty rate of 65 percent against 32 percent in urban areas in 2012. However, poverty is increasing in urban areas, mainly because of the increase in prices of essential goods, the exodus of the rural population, and the employment crisis.

In addition, Guinea has been facing a deadly Ebola virus disease outbreak since mid-February 2014 resulting in 2,078 dead out of 3,338 affected (62.3% of confirmed cases) in mid-September 2015, which has had serious socio-economic implications in the country and particularly in rural areas. In spite of recent significant progress in the fight against the epidemic, including a vaccine tried with success over a large sample of people, Guinea was declared Ebola free by WHO from December 29, 2015. is still struggling to get to zero cases.

Sectoral and institutional Context

The process of decentralization began in the 1980s with the adoption of laws related to the organization and operation of decentralized local authorities. These local authorities consist of elected boards that are vested with legal and financial autonomy. Decentralized entities are Collectivities Locales which includes Urban Communes (CU) and Rural Communes (CR). The country now has seven administrative regions and the special zone of Conakry, 33 prefectures, 38 urban municipalities, and 304 rural communes covering in total 2,300 rural districts. The municipalities are governed by a municipal council headed by an elected mayor and cover 33 areas of competency that include among others: land-use planning, economic development, social, educational, development of natural resources, etc. In addition, some institutional and regulatory instruments are in place and govern local governance and local development. The following are the most important of those instruments:

The Local Government Code (Code des Collectivites Local -CCL), adopted in 2006, focuses on administrative decentralization. The code creates a regional public service and provides local authorities with the responsibility to recruit, supervise, and manage the decentralized staff. It also gives important responsibilities to the CRs for the management of local budget and technical sectors (rural development, health, education etc.). The CCL is currently being revised to clarify the magnitude of these responsibilities and the transfer of planned resources to local governments.

The National Policy Letter on Decentralization and Local Development (LPN / DDL), adopted in March 2012, is the government's roadmap for decentralization and local development. It is divided into five areas: (i) territorial development; (ii) deconcentration and decentralization; (iii) capacity-building for decentralized stakeholders; (iv) fiscal decentralization, with the decision on a minimum percentage of the state budget to be allocated to municipal budgets, revision of local taxation and the establishment of a local development funding mechanism; and (v) piloting of decentralization.

The new Mining Code (2011), amended in 2013, provides: (i) the mandatory signature of a local development agreement between a mining company and neighboring local communities, which regulates mining companies' financial contribution to local development; (ii) the creation of a Local Development Fund (LDF) replenished by tax revenues from mining companies; (iii) the introduction of the direct payment of annual taxes calculated according to mining companies' exploitation area and new tax revenue to each municipality concerned; (iv) the allocation of a 15% mining tax to the financing of a local development fund targeting all rural communes (CRs) in the country according to a distribution key yet to be defined.

With regard to current issues related to Decentralization and Local Development in Guinea, it is worth noting that, while the process of decentralization is certainly moving, it is however slow and mainly happening through the support of the country's diverse technical and financial partners. Moreover, local entities are in need of legitimacy because their electoral mandates are extending by far beyond the constitutional term. Thus, they remain hopeful that the State will

organize new local elections in 2016, which would reinforce territorial governance and constitute a key element of State reforms. Should these local elections materialize, the PACV3 would contribute to the consolidation of rural communes, thereby advancing the decentralization process.

The Village Communities Support Program (PACV) - In 1998, with support from external partners including the World Bank, a national program for local development and decentralization support (the PACV), was developed. It aimed to support the Rural Communes (CR) in the performance of their tasks as follows: (i) identify and prioritize services needed by the communities through a participatory approach; (ii) build and manage their infrastructures; (iii) mobilize and seamlessly use their financial resources. The program was designed in three phases of four years each.

The first phase of "initiation" (PACV1, 2000-2009, \$ 38.7 million in total, of which \$ 22 million from IDA and co-financed by the French Development Agency (Agence française de développement -AFD), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Bank, the Government, and contributions from beneficiaries) covered 159 Rural Communes and funded 371 Annual Investment Programs (AIP) corresponding to 1,034 micro-projects (education, health, village water supply, agriculture, etc.). It enabled (i) the emergence of municipal competencies; (ii) the establishment of a participatory approach to planning; (iii) a more professional and transparent management of budgets; and (iv) better governance of local development actions. The methods and tools applicable to community-driven development (CDD) were tested during this first phase.

The second phase (PACV2, 2009-2014, \$ 46.3 million in total, of which \$ 17.4 million from IDA; co-financed by AFD, IFAD, WB, the Government, and contributions from beneficiaries) extended coverage to the entire country (304 rural municipalities). It contributed to further capacity-building in planning, management and monitoring of all communes and funded 311 AIPs corresponding to 481 projects in the areas of basic services and market infrastructures. The PACV has now become a national benchmark for local development and decentralization.

13. The third phase (PACV3, 2016-2019) is intended to consolidate the program and sustain its gains by establishing a national funding system and sustainable technical support to local communities. This national funding system would rely on an Autonomous Public Entity ("établissement public à caractère administrative" -EPA) to be established, and through which government funds would be channeled. Thus, the EPA would benefit from secure domestic financial resources, especially through the implementation of the funding provisions of the Mining Code (the 2013 Amendment allows for the allocation of 15 % of the mining companies' revenue to local development).

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

The development objective of the Third Village Communities Support Project (PACV3) is to improve the living conditions of Guinea's rural population by strengthening rural communes' capacities in developing and managing local development plans and annual investment programs.

Key Results

- i. A permanent intra-governmental transfer mechanism has been put in place to finance a Local Development Fund (LDF)

- ii. An agency has been created to manage the resources of the LDF and to provide technical assistance to CRs
- iii. Selected CRs are using sound O&M practices for all their local investments
- iv. People have been (re)trained in participatory local development in selected CRs (disaggregated by category: civil servants, locally elected officials, and members of civil society at large)
- v. People living in CRs benefiting from the investment fund are satisfied with the services that were provided (disaggregated by gender and age)

D. Project Description

The design of the proposed PACV3 would build on the achievements and lessons learned from the implementation of the two previous phases (PACV1 and PACV2), similar operations in Guinea such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP)-funded Local Development Project in Guinea (PDLG), and other ongoing CDD interventions of the Bank and various development partners in West Africa. The design of the project also takes into account the lessons learned from the Community-based Land Management Project (CBLMP/PGCT) and the Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Management (CMBMP), closed in 2013 and 2014 respectively. These two projects whose implementation was associated with the PACV2 put an emphasis on natural resources management, including land management techniques and agroforestry, while aiming at substantially increasing productivity and resilience against climate change, in order to foster economic growth, improve food security and nutrition, and end extreme poverty.

18. With the growing concern of youth unemployment in many African countries, it is critical to enable CDD to be more youth- and gender- oriented by offering further opportunities and incentives for women and the youth. The project design pays a particular attention to these aspects. Altogether, to achieve the development objective of scaling-up and consolidating the gains from the PACV1, the PACV2, and to their associated projects, as well as increasing the participatory approach and economic opportunities through local governance, the PACV3 would consist of the following three components:

Component I: Infrastructure financing through the local investment fund (\$ 8.5 million)

19. Through the Local Investment Fund (LIF), the CR would receive funds to finance basic infrastructure (education, health, drinking water, youth centers, etc.), public markets (markets, abattoirs, etc.), and agriculture and natural resources management (NRM) activities (land protection, small scale irrigation, agro-forestry, etc.), identified in their Local Development Plans (LDPs) and Annual Investment Programs (AIPs). Phase III will co-finance nearly 180 AIPs with a focus on economic micro-projects and sustainable management of natural resources (agroforestry, composters, stone bunds, etc.). Particular attention will be paid to the quality of infrastructure (improved technical reference, in particular to integrate the "gender" dimension, quality control), the requirements for proper operating (equipment provision, Public Service Personnel), and their maintenance. The operating and maintenance mechanisms will cover both PACV3-financed micro-projects and those emerging from proper local level initiatives. Overall, transparency and accountability mechanisms will be established at the community level for the planning, implementation, and monitoring of micro-projects.

20. Under PACV1 and PACV2, transfers to CRs was set at US \$50,000 per CR. This amount

will be increased to US\$70,000 per CR to finance the full costs of the implementation of their AIPs, and to improve the functionality of the micro-projects, depending on the type of infrastructure financed. Micro-projects led by vulnerable groups, including women, would represent at least 20% of the Local Investment Funds (LIF). Better participation (30% target) of vulnerable populations in the infrastructure management committees, in particular women and youth, will be sought.

Component II. Sustained capacity building and planning (\$ 5 million)

21. This component would consolidate the capacity of communal councils in accompanying the municipalities and their partners. The project will aim at strengthening municipal capacity on various topics: local government financing, accounting, procurement, diagnostics, consultations, participatory monitoring and evaluation, etc. The capacity of Communes and Communities will be reinforced so as to ensure full ownership of the local development process. This component would ensure that mechanisms for communes and communities to oversee local expenditures and services delivery are fully established. In addition, it is expected that local entities will have the ability to oversee and monitor the services and resources that are provided to their citizens (e.g. presence of teachers/availability of school books; community-level health workers; drugs availability and their access, etc.).

22. The prefectural services (the SPD) will also receive support (training, small equipment provision, etc.) to enable them to carry out their permanent functions. In this regard, the role of Local Development Agents (ADL) will be further clarified and reinforced. The ADLs' mission is to support the implementation of activities pertaining to the National Directorate of Decentralization (DND) and the ministry of decentralization and territorial administration (MATD)'s National Directorate of Local Development (DNLD). The ADLs' mission will continue including support to the functioning of the EPA, the new public institution to be created for sustainable funding and technical support to local authorities. It will further include local development planning under the oversight of 8 Regional Support Teams (RST/ERA), which will look at the implementation of the project at the regional level. The National Coordination Unit (NCU) and RST will be responsible for the design, evaluation, and improvement of all methodologies and tools for the PACV3. These tools would include inter alia: a guide for Local Development Plans (LDPs), a guide for Annual Investment Programs (AIPs); agreements between municipalities and the mining companies, etc. The NCU and RST would also be in charge of the organization of trainings, exchange workshops, and consultation workshops (targeting communes, decentralized departments, etc.).

Component III. Project Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation (\$1.5 million)

23. This component aims at ensuring the proper functioning of the PACV3's national coordination unit of. This NCU will be tasked with the coordination, management, monitoring and evaluation, and fiduciary management (procurement, financial management, accountability, etc.) of the project. The oversight mandate of the ministry of decentralization and territorial administration will also be part of this component. This component will further finance baseline studies, a mid-term evaluation, an end-of-project evaluation, financial audits, environmental and social safeguards, etc., and will support consultation workshops for the communes, deconcentrated departments, other local level stakeholders including civil society organizations (CSOs), etc.

Component Name

Component 1: Local Investment Fund with specific financing windows

Comments (optional)

The aim of this component is to finance a series of small investments in selected CRs. All of these investments will be implemented following PACV's procedures that are described in detail in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM). The technical and fiduciary review of the activities are placed at the appropriate level in support of the subsidiary principle. The budget allocations to various CRs

Component Name

Component 2. Capacity building for sustainable local governance and community participation

Comments (optional)

The component will be implemented through 3 sub-components: (i) consolidation of decentralization and local development policy, (ii) capacity building of central and deconcentrated public services of key sectoral ministries to improve support to local communities and (iii) capacity building to CR to improve citizen engagement/participation to planning, management and evaluation of services. The ob

Component Name

Component 3: Immediate Response Mechanism

Comments (optional)

This zero budget component establishes a disaster contingency fund that could be triggered in the event of a natural disaster through formal declaration of a national emergency, or upon a formal request from GoG. In such a case, funds from the unallocated expenditure category or from other project components would be re-allocated to finance emergency response expenditures to meet emergency needs.

Component Name

Component 4: Project coordination and management

Comments (optional)

Project implementation as under the previous phases is the responsibility of the National Coordination Unit (Cellule de Coordination – CNC). This Unit is still operational as it is being funded by AFD's PACV3. The procedures concerning administrative and financial management will be adapted to the new financing framework (parallel financing instead of joint financing). Nevertheless, the CNC will p

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

The project is nationwide and the exact sites of the subprojects to finance are not yet known. It is however worth mentioning that the particular geography of the country's rural physical features is made of a variety of natural landscapes, which are representative of typical equatorial and humid sudanian biomes. Also, since the country is known to be west Africa's "water tower," any physical activity should take into account natural resources sustainability and/or wise-use principles.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Abdoul Wahabi Seini (GSU01)

Maman-Sani Issa (OPSPF)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

Partnership arrangements. The Bank's support to PACV3 complements AFD's financing of its third phase of PACV which started early 2015. The AFD project is a consolidation of its previous involvement. The financing is about Euro15.0 million and covers (i) small infrastructure investments through the local investment fund; (ii) institutional support to local development; and (iii) support for project management. The European Union (UE) finances a Sectoral Program in support of Decentralization and Deconcentration and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) that used to co-finance PACV2, currently focuses on Agriculture Value Chains Development in directly supporting the CNOP-G, one of the key producers organizations in Guinea's Agricultural sector. IFC is heavily involved with the mining sector, especially the Simandou iron ore project that would greatly impact a significant number of CRs. Concrete collaboration modalities will be agreed upon with AFD and the team will seek to clarify how best to coordinate activities with AFD, UE, IFAD and IFC.

Institutional Arrangements. The key institutions involved in PACV3 are at (i) the national level: the Ministry of Territorial Management and Decentralization with the National Directorate of Decentralization (DND) and National Directorate of Local Development (DNDL); the Steering Committee; the National Coordination Unit (CNC); (ii) the regional level: regional project support teams (équipes régionales d'appui); the regional directorates of the Ministry of Plan, regional technical services in support of local governments (Service Régional d'Appui aux Collectivités et de Coordination des ONG – SERACCO); (iii) the prefecture level: the prefecture development services (Service Prefectoral de Developpement – SPD), prefecture local development agents (Agent de Developpement Local Prefectoral – ADLP), and the prefecture development council; and at (iv) the CR level: the rural commune with its President and his counselors, the districts and villages; the different local committees for transparency, operation and maintenance, procurement, etc., and the local development agents (Agent de Developpement Local – ADL).

Implementation Arrangements. Implementation arrangements for PACV3 will substantially be the same as in the past. Overall oversight is with the Ministry of Territorial Management and Decentralization. A Steering Committee provides policy guidance and approves the annual work program and budget, and a technical committee (Comite Technique d'Execution – CTE) brings together on a regular basis all the representatives of the different components and activities. Day to day operations of the project are the responsibility of the National Coordination Unit (Cellule Nationale de Coordination – CNC) with its National Coordinator and his staff. CNC is also responsible for component 1. DND in close collaboration with DNDL is charged with the technical execution of all activities related to component 2 (Capacity building for sustainable local governance and community participation). At the regional, prefectural and local level, it is the ADLs that advice local communities on all non-technical aspects of preparing their local development and annual investment plans. Advice on technical matters is provided by SERACCO, and SPD and if they don't have the capacity, CRs call on private contractors to provide the necessary services.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project investments, as foreseen through component 1, will certainly be small-scale, thereby suggesting that potential negative impacts be of medium to low/very low magnitude as noticed with the two precedent phases of the project. The environmental and social category is B; and since the subproject types will not change, the existing safeguard documents (ESMF, RPF, PMP) of the precedent phases have been updated and re-disclosed both in-country at the Bank Infoshop.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project will not support any activity that is likely to threat natural habitats and/or protected areas. The ESMF will provide guidance to avoid selecting subprojects that may have a negative impact on natural habitats during implementation.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project will not finance plantations that involve any conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including adjacent or downstream critical natural habitats. The ESMF will provide guidance to prevent the introduction of invasive species, should afforestation/reforestation activities be financed.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Supporting small-scale irrigation and agroforestry may induce the acquisition and utilization of pesticides and/or any other chemical inputs (ex. fertilizer) for pest control and yield improvement. A Pest management plan (PMP), including vector control and agrobiolgy techniques, has been prepared and disclosed in-country and at Infoshop along with the ESMF.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The project will not finance investment on known cultural resources sites, but since all the archaeological sites are not yet inventoried over the country, it may occur that underground artifacts be dug up during construction. To manage such a situation, a "chance find procedure" and relevant specific measures will be detailed in the environmental and social management plan (ESMP) of and eligible sub-project that has been screened and subjected to an ESIA.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous people in the project intervention area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Land take or restriction of access to sources of livelihoods is potentially envisaged, and as due

		<p>diligence the Resettlement Policy Framework from the existing project has been revised and updated accordingly. The project will be built on the updated RPF which provided comprehensive guidance and guideline for the RAP with a strong focus on the key stakeholders capacity enhancement of safeguards. Once approved, the RPF will be disclosed and published in-country and at the Bank Infoshop prior to appraisal.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of any civil works that could lead to lands acquisition and/or physical or economical displacement, the project team will prepare a comprehensive Resettlement Actions Plan (RAP) to be submitted and cleared by the bank. Compensation in the course of the project implementation.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance dam construction, activity related to dam operation or activity downstream an existing dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project will not finance activity that will induce withdrawal of large amount of water from international waterways, or pollution of said waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project will not finance activity in disputed area.

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>The project is categorized B and triggers four safeguard policies: OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment; OP 4.09 on Pests Management; OP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources; and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement. Overall, the project will have substantial positive socio-environmental impact in the intervention areas, and is low risk. However, activities that are likely to induce adverse environment and social impact/risk are related to the construction and rehabilitation of small scale socioeconomic infrastructures (schools, markets, rural roads, water points, etc.), income generating activities and support to smallholders agricultural activities likely to induce use of chemical inputs (fertilizer, pesticide). Then, the borrower has prepared an ESMF, a PMP and an RPF to address any potential adverse effects of the project activities; these documents were disclosed in-country (February 1, 2016) and at the Bank's Infoshop (March 22, 2016). The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) identifies categories of risk and impact to prevent or monitor during the project implementation: (a) site-specific vegetation loss during rehabilitation works; (b) soil erosion as a result of the exploitation of pits and the development of access roads to construction/investment areas; (c) involuntary destruction of underground cultural wealth; (d) pollution from wastes generated during works; (e) pollution of water resources due to inappropriate use of fertilizer and pesticide; (f) expropriation of land; (f)</p>

potential conflicts arising from appropriation of rehabilitated areas. None of these risks/impacts are expected to be significant or irreversible.
2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
The residue of chemical compounds in crops and water resources, as a result of the inappropriate use of fertilizer and pesticide, is a risk though manageable. The sensitization activities and supports to be implemented through the Pesticide Management Plan (PMP) will help prevent or lower the occurrence of this type of indirect impact/risk.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
Not applicable.
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>The Borrower has prepared an ESMF, a PMP and an RPF to address any potential adverse effects of the project activities. These safeguard documents (ESMF, PMP and RPF) have been disclosed in country (February 1, 2016) and in the Bank's Infoshop (March 22, 2016).</p> <p>The approved Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) entails specific measures aiming at preventing the risks and impacts. These are: (i) screening subprojects and preparing specific ESIA's and /or RAPs as needed, prior to their implementation; (ii) no category A subproject will be funded under the project; (iii) capacity building of the main concerned institutions (NCU, Ministry of Decentralization, Prefectures, Ministry of Environment, CR, etc.) for the implementation, monitoring and reporting of the environmental and social mitigation measures.</p> <p>The screening of proposed subprojects will be conducted by qualified part-time safeguard consultant. This process is designed to: (i) identify any activity/subproject that would have negative environmental and social impacts; (ii) determine appropriate mitigation measures to prevent harmful impacts including the upfront preparation and approval of ESIA, standalone ESMP, RAP, or Audit before the commencement of works; (iii) describe the institutional responsibilities for ensuring a standardized environmental and social monitoring during the implementation. In addition, the RPF document outlines the principles and procedures for resettlement and or compensation of subproject-affected people, and establishes standards for identifying, assessing and mitigating negative impacts of program supported activities. In addition, the RPF will guide the preparation and implementation of resettlement action plans (RAPs) for each individual sub project that triggers the involuntary resettlement policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, the safeguard documents (ESMF, PMP, and RPF) provide guidance in terms of capacity building of institutional stakeholders (BGEEE, DNSV, CNOP-G, (SC, DND, DNDL, ERA, ADL, ANPROCA, DNSV, CR technical staff) and beneficiaries (farmers, communities, etc.), through training and sensitization. A total amount of US\$ 715,000 has been approved to support the estimated cost of the implementation of the safeguard measures but the compensation costs. This amount has been budgeted in the overall project cost and earmarked accordingly.</p> <p>A review of the institutional capacities of the implementing institutions revealed that there are substantial concerns about the regulatory framework for environmental and social management at national and local levels. The capacities of the national institution responsible for the enforcement</p>

<p>of the safeguard procedures and the oversight of the implementation of environmental and social management plans (the "Bureau Guinéen des Etudes et Evaluations Environnementales" – BGEEEE) are very weak; significant institutional and technical capacity for environmental and social management still needs to be strengthened at all levels. Though, the National Coordination Unit (NCU) has a certain experience of implementing Bank funded projects, a qualified environmental and social safeguard specialist will be recruited to handle the implementation of the safeguard instruments, namely the screening of subprojects and the implementation and follow up of the approved mitigation measures.</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>The key stakeholders are the national actors (BGEEEE, DNSV, CNOP-G, (SC, DND, DNDL, ERA, ADL, ANPROCA, DNSV, Prefectures and NGO) and the local governments (Communes Rurales). During the preparation of the safeguards instruments, they have been consulted and updated on the requirements of both the Bank safeguard policies and the National legislation on environmental management as well as on their own responsibilities in the implementation related recommendations and measures. Furthermore, a national workshop comprising these key stakeholders and other actors (NGO, public institutions, etc.) was organized (February 1, 2016) to share the findings and approve the recommendations before the Minister in charge of Environment issued the permits (Certificat de Conformité Environnementale). Accurate concerns and recommendations have been reflected in the final design of the projects activities. Final report of the instruments (ESMF, RPF, PMP) has been disclosed on February 1, 2016, through media Journal des Appels d'Offres no. 253 of March 7, 2016</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Mar-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea	01-Feb-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Mar-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea	01-Feb-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Feb-2016

Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Mar-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea	01-Feb-2016
<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 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"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	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: Amadou Alassane
 Title: Sr Agricultural Spec.

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Finance
 Contact: S.E.M. Malado Kaba
 Title: Ministre de l'Economie et des Finances
 Email: malado.kaba@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Decentralization and Territorial Administration
 Contact: Yamory Conde
 Title: General Secretary
 Email: fallodebaro@gmail.com

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: Amadou Alassane
----------------------	-----------------------

<i>Approved By</i>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Jan Weetjens (PMGR)	Date: 11-Apr-2016
Country Director:	Name: Pierre Frank Laporte (CD)	Date: 11-Apr-2016