



Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 08-Apr-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA27844



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country West Bank and Gaza	Project ID P171328	Project Name ADDITIONAL FINANCE :GAZA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT RBF PROJECT	Parent Project ID (if any) P121648
Parent Project Name Gaza Solid Waste Management Project	Region MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 15-Apr-2020	Estimated Board Date 01-Jun-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Urban, Resilience and Land	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Palestine Liberation Organization (for the benefit of the Palestinian Authority)	Implementing Agency Municipal Development and Lending Fund

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The objective of this project is to improve solid waste management services in the Gaza Strip.

Components

- Component 1: Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal Facilities
- Component 2: Institutional Strengthening
- Component 3: Primary Collection and Resource Recovery
- Component 4: Project Management
- Contingencies

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	2.00
Total Financing	2.00
of which IBRD/IDA	0.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS



Non-World Bank Group Financing

Trust Funds	2.00
Global Partnership on Output-based Aid	2.00

Environmental Assessment Category

A-Full Assessment

Decision

The review did not authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Project Background (Parent)

Designed with the main objective of improving solid waste management services in Southern Gaza, the Gaza Solid Waste Management Project (GSWMP) has been under implementation since 2014. The US\$31.5 million project (funded by the World Bank, the French Development Agency, and the European Union) is being implemented in the southern Gaza which covers about 64% of Strip’s total geographic area. At project completion, the new sanitary landfill and transfer stations supported under the Project are expected to serve well over 900,000 residents (about 46%, nearly half the population of Gaza) in three southern governorates in Gaza: Khan Younis, Rafah and Middle area (KRM).

The Project is designed to achieve the objective through constructing environmentally sound sanitary infrastructure facilities and improving the capacities of solid waste management institutions in Southern Gaza through four main components: (i) the construction of solid waste transfer and disposal facilities (Component 1); (ii) targeted institutional strengthening (Component 2); (iii) studies and investments focused on primary collection and resource recovery (Component 3); and (iv) project management support (Component 4). The key infrastructure investments supported under Component 1 are being complemented by a comprehensive capacity building program (component 2) aiming to improve service provision at the different stages of solid waste management and active involvement of local communities.

Additional Financing Context

While the GSWMP succeeded in establishing environmentally sound solid waste management systems and modernized sanitary infrastructures, the improved systems have resulted in increased operational costs. With the effectiveness of the new sanitary landfill and transfer stations, JSC-KRM’s operational cost for delivering improved disposal services have nearly doubled [an incremental cost which amounts to about a 6% increase in total cost of solid waste services]. Currently JSC-KRM’s revenue for operating these



upgraded facilities largely relies on charges to participating municipalities that has been updated to respond to the new transfer station and final disposal services. According to 2018 data, only about 40% of the total bills charged by JSC are collected. In addition, JSC-KRM is tasked with providing container upkeep and maintenance services—currently lacking-- in the areas JSC operates. The municipalities currently do not have adequate capacity to simultaneously pay for JSC's upgraded transfer station and disposal services. Without external assistance to meet the revenue gap, JSC won't be able to fully finance these services.

Further compounding the issue is a lack of resources for proper medical waste management. While the JSC is mandated to provide medical waste treatment and disposal, the medical waste producers (hospitals, clinics, NGO's) are responsible for the proper sorting and separation of hazardous medical waste at the source and pay fee for the JSC for treatment and final disposal. In practice however, the medical waste producers are poorly equipped to carry out proper segregation, nor do they have the capacity, training and designated resource to frequently monitor, regulate and enforce proper handling of hazardous waste. The risk of mixing domestic waste with hazardous medical waste exposes JSC-KRM employees and the general public to serious health risks and puts the entire JSC-KRM waste management operation at risk. Conversely placing solid waste with contaminated medical waste increases costs for medical waste treatment significantly. While medical waste treatment constitutes a very small investment component of the overall services provided by the JSC (USD 50,233/Year) the risk and cost of improper handling infectious medical waste poses major threat to the entire infrastructure investment and JSC-KRM operation supported by GSWMP. It is in the interest of both the medical waste producers and the JSC that proper sorting of medical waste is undertaken through discounts and credits that can be applied towards their medical waste treatment and disposal fees they would pay the JSC. Given JSC-KRM's already constrained finances, some level of subsidy is required to reimburse the JSC for providing such credits/ discounted services.

Underpinning the modernization of solid waste infrastructure and service delivery improvements, there is also a greater need for establishing operational standards for landfills. Although there have been several investment projects focused on the construction of sanitary landfills (mostly in the West Bank), the sector still suffers from lack of established landfill operational standards, for instance on landfill leachate management and odor, which is a pervasive problem in almost all landfills constructed in West Bank and Gaza in the last two decades. The current project (GSWMP) is tackling this issue in Gaza by establishing a practical and sustainable operational standard for the newly constructed landfill. This landfill operational management improvement effort will be further strengthened by the proposed Additional Financing, which may have wider applicability across the West Bank and Gaza.

To address the aforementioned operational needs, the Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) requested the World Bank for additional financial assistance. An implementation support mission conducted in June 2019 confirmed the need for an additional financing in the amount of US\$2 million to cover the increased operational and administrative costs associated with the upgraded transfer station and disposal services



of JSC-KRM as well as provide funding for JSC's expanded container maintenance and medical waste services for the first two years of operation.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

The objective of this project is to improve solid waste management services in the Gaza Strip.

Current PDO

The objective of this project is to improve solid waste management services in the Gaza Strip

Key Results (GPRBA Additional Financing)

Two key outcomes are supported by the result-based financing: (i) improvement in solid waste service delivery and; (ii) strengthening the financial sustainability of JSC-KRM through improved cost recovery.

Each of the outcomes will be measured through the achievement of pre-defined performance targets that will be independently monitored and verified to trigger the payments.

D. Project Description

The GPRBA grant scheme is sought to provide complementary operational funds in the form of additional financing to the infrastructure investment supported under GSWMP. The results-based financing employs a mechanism where by the service provider, JSC-KRM, receive payments in the form of a subsidy from GPRBA, upon confirmation of independently verified achieved targets for service quality and cost recovery. This grant is provided to the service provider for two years to offset the increased operational costs while incentivizing the JSC to improve its service quality and delivery. The US\$ 2M additional funds acquired from GPRBA is primarily targeted for operational improvements and to support two key outcomes: (i) improvement in solid waste service delivery and; (ii) strengthening the financial sustainability of JSC-KRM through improved cost recovery.

E. Implementation

The Municipal Development Fund (MDLF) would continue to be fully responsible for all project implementation, safeguards, fiduciary, monitoring and reporting arrangements, while the JSC-KRM (service provider) would be responsible for operating the landfill and the two transfer stations.



F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The project will be implemented in the middle and southern Gaza Strip, specifically in Khan Younis, Rafah and Middle (KRM)Area governorates.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Amal Nabil Faltas Bastorous, Social Specialist
Shafick Hoossein, Environmental Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project is classified Environmental Category "A" in accordance with World Bank Operational Policy 4.01, "Environmental Assessment," as it is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented. As part of the AF preparation the ESIA for the parent project has been updated through developing an addenda to cover the operation phase of the project. As part of the ESIA update, series of consultations were conducted with different related stakeholders and the views collected through consultations were incorporated in the ESIA addenda. The functionality of the GRM was also assessed as part of the addenda. Environmental and social management plan was developed as part of the addenda to cover the operation phase of the different facilities. The full environmental impact assessment that was prepared has been reviewed by the Environmental and Social specialists and the comments provided have been incorporated into the final version of the ESIA for disclosure. The disclosure date for the draft ESIA is April 1. The next round of consultation is planned on April 9 via webex in adherence to the COVID-19 guidelines for consultations. The updated ESIA addresses project preparation to ensure the design, construction, operation and



decommissioning of the landfill cells take into account the mitigation measures and adequate budget is included in the capital and operational budgets. The Project will benefit from the experience in the West Bank where a Bank-financed project for the construction of a sanitary landfill facility and a transfer station to service the northern areas of the West Bank (commonly referred to as the Jenin project) which has proven to be a successful operation since project completion and start of operations in July of 2009. The proposed landfill facility would be located in the southern part of Gaza where there is more vacant land that would meet the Bank and EQA siting criteria of more than 500 meters from populated areas and, in the particular case of Gaza, located outside the security zone self-imposed by Israel along its border with the GS. The site is underlain by fresh water aquifers, but the nearest well field is more than 2,000 meters away and it is not under the direct influence of the Sofa aquifer. The ESIA reported that this aquifer is of low vulnerability to pollution. It should be noted, however, that the ground water aquifers constitute the main source of drinking and irrigation water for southern Gaza Strip. Therefore, the project, is being designed for "zero" leachate and drainage discharge into the ground and surface water resources. Environmental impact would also result in the vicinity to the proposed landfill site from the increased traffic of solid waste disposal trucks from the various communities in middle and southern GS. The feasibility study, however, did study and recommended improvements to the main access roads that would be used by all vehicular traffic to mitigate the impact on the roads users.

Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	Not Applicable
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The ESIA reported that there are no natural habitats at and in the vicinity of project sites for LF and TS, and the LF site is devoid of any vegetation. There is no agricultural activity in the LF site and the nearby areas.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Not Applicable
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Pest Management is triggered for the additional finance given the need for pesticides in landfill



		operations. An appropriate Pest Management Plan is provided in Annex 6 of the updated and reviewed ESIA and identifies the types of pests, their potential locations and the relevant legally compliant and approved pesticides that should be used to control the pests.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The contracts will include provisions for chance find. However, during the feasibility study efforts were made to gather information on sites of cultural heritage value and none were identified.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The ESIA does not report that there are indigenous people in the project area.
		The proposed project activities under the additional financing are purely operational and would not require new land acquisitions nor affect livelihoods. However, this policy continues to be triggered per the parent project requirement, as detailed below.
		The Bank’s Operational Policy OP 4.12 applies to both the direct social impacts pertaining to the waste pickers at the Sofa landfill as well as to the families impacted through the land requirements of the project for Sofa. Specifically, OP 4.12 related impacts are as follows:
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Waste-Pickers Results from the ESIA and abbreviated resettlement action plan (ARAP) shows that the informal waste pickers identified as working at the Sofa dumpsite will experience significant negative impact on their income streams. Some of the anticipated risks include increased impoverishment, inability to transfer to alternative livelihood streams, and potential strife that could result among these project affected people if appropriate mitigation measures are not in place. The ESIA and ARAP census indicates a total of 18 waste pickers will be impacted of which 11 consider scavenging as their primary source of income. Consultations with the affected waste picker population based on the ESIA and ARAP indicates



that the most sustainable and appropriate compensation measure is the provision of an alternative and sustainable source of income. Towards seeking tested and sustainable solutions for maintaining, if not augmenting, the livelihoods of the waste pickers, the Bank identified collaboration with the UNDP sponsored Deprived families Economic Empowerment Program (DEEP) which has long standing experience with developing livelihoods programs for vulnerable populations, including in the Gaza Strip. The DEEP Program would focus on the 18 waste pickers and their families as their unit of analysis for developing livelihoods approaches that benefit the household as a whole and which draws on the skills mix of various household members – beyond the individual waste pickers. A commitment letter has been made available by the UNDP Special Representative to support the waste pickers at the Sofa dumpsite who have been identified in the waste picker ARAP.

Sofa Land Acquisition

The second major impact under OP 4.12 pertains to the land requirements for the Sofa landfill. The current landfill area is approx. 26.64 dunums and is owned by the Rafah municipality. The Feasibility Study recommended an extension of 472 dunums to the existing landfill but since some of the cells (4 and 5) will not be implemented before year 2027, it is expected that the land acquisition needs for this stage of the project is 215 dunums.

ESIA and ARAP findings during early project preparation indicate that the affected lands are not of high value due to a number of factors including: a) proximity of these lands to the Israeli border (heightened security threat and restricted land use – within the 1,000 meter security buffer zone unilaterally declared by Israel); b) the land is not particularly arable; c) a key source of income (olive groves) got destroyed during the 2008 conflict; and d) the land is adjacent to a 17 year old dumpsite owned and used by the Rafah Municipality and is also adjacent to a



planned wastewater treatment site to be financed by the Islamic Development Bank. There are no households, structures or any other form of asset on site.

To address the impact of land acquisition, an ARAP has been prepared covering a total of 70 landowners belonging to five main families. ESIA and ARAP consultations indicated that some of landowners would voluntarily engage in a willing-buyer, willing-seller transaction thus the preparation of the ARAP does not preclude such transaction.

The mechanisms for addressing project level grievances are defined in both the waste picker and land owner ARAPs which were translated and disclosed initially in February and March 2012 with subsequent updates and re-disclosures.

Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Not Applicable
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Not Applicable
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Not Applicable

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:

As part of the AF preparation the ESIA for the parent project has been updated through developing an addenda to cover the operation phase of the project. As part of the ESIA update, series of consultations were conducted with different related stakeholders and the views collected through consultations were incorporated in the ESIA addenda. The functionality of the GRM was also assessed as part of the addenda. Environmental and social management plan was developed as part of the addenda to cover the operation phase of the different facilities. The main environmental safeguards issue would be the potential pollution of ground water resources from landfill leachate; however, the landfill is being designed for “zero” discharge as the cells will be provided with sealing base and under drainage system for collection of leachate and disposal at an on-site evaporation pond also designed for “zero” discharge. Monitoring wells will also be built around land fill cells to monitor periodically the ground water quality to identify whether there are any leaks from the cells for immediate location and repair. A detailed pest management plan was prepared as part of the ESIA and considers the type of pesticide for relevant pests as well as the roles and responsibility of the various parties involved in managing the plan. For impacts under OP 4.12, the proposed Sofa landfill will need to acquire lands using either the principal of eminent domain or through a willing-buyer, willing-seller



principle. A draft ARAP has been prepared to meet the requirements under the Bank’s policy. In addition, a total of 18 waste pickers have been identified as operating in the Sofa landfill site. A separate draft ARAP has been prepared to address the livelihoods impacts experienced by the waste pickers. While the magnitude of the social impacts are not large or irreversible, attention to sensitive land issues (including attaining clarity on ownership) as well as ensuring waste pickers have sustainable livelihoods options are some anticipated challenges.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: The ESIA identified indirect socio-economic impacts resulting from the proposed project associated with the increased cost of managing disposal of municipal refuse, which may be above what most people in the GS may be able to afford due to the high incidence of poverty and unemployment.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The feasibility study and the ESIA reported that there are no other viable alternatives to minimize adverse impacts.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described. The Municipal Development and Lending Fund (MDLF), the project implementing agency, has experience in managing Bank and donor funded programs in the West Bank and Gaza and will also employ qualified staff for the PDSU based in Gaza. Also, the JSC-DBR TOU that would assume ownership of the new facilities would be strengthened with qualified staff to manage safeguard policy issues identified for the operation and decommissioning of facilities constructed under the proposed project.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. The ESIA identified community representatives, local and central governments representatives, NGOs, private sector enterprises, universities and professional associations, as well as land owners and waste pickers for public and focused groups and individual consultations to discuss the proposed project and the potential impacts, and the findings and recommendations of these consultations have been reflected in the ESMP and ARAPs.

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank 19-Jan-2012	Date of submission for disclosure 23-Jan-2012	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
--	--	--

"In country" Disclosure

West Bank and Gaza
19-Jan-2012

Comments



Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank

26-Feb-2012

Date of submission for disclosure

22-Feb-2012

"In country" Disclosure

West Bank and Gaza

01-Mar-2012

Comments

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

Yes

Date of receipt by the Bank

07-Apr-2020

Date of submission for disclosure

07-Apr-2020

"In country" Disclosure

West Bank and Gaza

01-Apr-2020

Comments

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 (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?

NA

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?



Yes

OP 4.09 - Pest Management

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

Yes

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

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Is physical displacement/relocation expected?

Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?

NA

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?

NA



All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

John Morton
Senior Urban Environment Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Palestine Liberation Organization (for the benefit of the Palestinian Authority)
Laila Sbaih
Acting Director General

Implementing Agencies

Municipal Development and Lending Fund
Dr. Tawfiq Albudairi
Director General



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	John Morton
----------------------	-------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Nina Chee	07-Apr-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Jaafar Sadok Friaa	07-Apr-2020
Country Director:	Ranjana Mukherjee	08-Apr-2020