

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA9650

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 16-Mar-2016

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 17-Mar-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Cambodia	Project ID:	P150631
Project Name:	KH-Land Allocation for Social and Economic Development Project II (P150631)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Mudita Chamroeun		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	15-Jun-2015	Estimated Board Date:	19-May-2016
Managing Unit:	GFA02	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (60%), Sub-national government administration (20%), Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (20%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (60%), Land administration and management (20%), Participation and civic engagement (20%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	26.86	Total Bank Financing:	25.06
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			1.80
International Development Association (IDA)			25.06
Total			26.86
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The project development objective is to help improve the target beneficiaries' access to agriculture resources and selected infrastructure and social services in project communities.

3. Project Description

The project would build on the successful implementation and experiences of the completed LASED Project and associated Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF) funded projects, as well as the good practices in the sector. It would address the remaining priority needs of LASED Project beneficiaries by providing a package of agricultural technology assistance and infrastructure support to make their lands productive and sustainable. The project would have two main components plus a contingent emergency response component, summarized below, and would be implemented over a five-year period. Based on experience, the project duration is the minimum time required to achieve the desired outcomes and results, as well as the sustainability of investments and livelihoods.

Component 1: Infrastructure and Livelihood Systems (total estimated cost US\$22.71 million; to be fully financed by IDA Credit)

Sub-component 1.1: Social Land Concession Investment Planning and Prioritization (total estimated cost US\$3.44 million; to be fully financed by IDA Credit).

This would support the planning and prioritization of investments in selected SLC sites in the project provinces, including: (a) participatory preparation and updating of SLC plans, including land surveying, detailed land use planning, processing of requests for land allocation, sensitization and communication on social land concession (SLC) processes and implementation of participatory review processes by communal authorities, and land allocation and demarcation of and within the selected SLC sites; (b) identification, prioritization and planning of appropriate SLC sub-project technology and infrastructure investments, including the carrying out of a baseline survey, agro-ecosystem analysis, water management planning, assessment of environmental and social safeguards implications, and establishment of SLC-related management information system as input to the SLC planning and prioritization.

Sub-component 1.2: Land Preparation and Infrastructure Development (total estimated cost US \$14.80 million; to be fully financed by IDA Credit).

This would support the provision of technical assistance and community grants to beneficiaries for the implementation of sub-projects for the purposes of land preparation and implementation of prioritized infrastructure investments in the selected SLC sites, including: (a) provision of settling-in assistance to new land recipients; (b) provision of initial land preparation assistance including a first cover crop; and (c) provision of productive and social community infrastructure such as rural roads, small-scale irrigation systems, rural water supply and sanitation, education facilities, health posts and community centers, among others.

Sub-component 1.3: Agriculture and Livelihood Development (total estimated cost US\$4.47 million; to be fully financed by IDA Credit).

This would support the provision of technical assistance and community grants to beneficiaries for the implementation of SLC sub-projects for the purposes of consolidation and improvement of agricultural production systems and improvements in the livelihoods, food security and nutrition status of land recipients, including: (a) conduct of community organizing and development activities; (b) provision of agricultural service and extension support following a pluralistic service provider approach; (c) establishment of farmer-managed demonstration plots and model farms; (d) establishment and/or strengthening of farmers organizations, agriculture cooperatives, production and marketing groups and other community interest groups; and (e) establishment/provision of a

community fund to strengthen successful local initiatives.

Component 2: Project Management (total estimated cost of US\$4.15 million; of which about US \$2.35 million would be financed by IDA Credit)

This component would support the provision of technical and operational assistance for the overall project administration and coordination, including: (a) social and environmental safeguards compliance and monitoring; (b) procurement planning and contracts management; (c) financial management, disbursement and audit; and (d) monitoring and evaluation.

Component 3: Contingent Emergency Response (total estimated cost US\$0.00 million; to be fully financed by IDA Credit)

This component, with an initial allocation of zero dollars, is part of IDA's support to an Immediate Response Mechanism (IRM) in Cambodia. The IRM allows reallocation of a portion of undisbursed balances of IDA-financed investment projects for recovery and reconstruction support following a formal Government request in the event of an eligible emergency. With IDA's support, Cambodia is developing its Emergency Response Manual (ERM). The ERM will detail eligible uses, financial management, procurement, safeguard and any other necessary implementation arrangements. The preparation and acceptance of the ERM is a condition prior to disbursement of any funds reallocated to this component. The ERM will also serve as the component's operation manual. In the event that the component is activated, the Project Development Objective and results framework may be amended as needed under a Level Two restructuring to reflect the provision of immediate and effective response to the eligible crisis or emergency.

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

The project would cover a total of 14 SLC sites in the five provinces of Kratie, Tbong Khmum (formerly part of Kampong Cham), Kampong Thom, Kampong Chhnang and Kampong Speu. These sites include the eight (8) sites under the LASED Project, five (5) sites under two (2) projects funded under the Bank-administered JSDF and one (1) new site in Kampong Thom Province. See the map in LASED II PIM and the consolidated map in LASED II PAD for details of SLC sites. The total area to be covered is approximately 17,000 hectares, benefiting some 5,150 families.

Social and environmental safeguard screening reports for a new proposed SLC site in Dong Commune were prepared by the implementing agency and were endorsed by the Bank environmental and social safeguard specialists during the LASED implementation support mission in October 2013. The new proposed SLC site has been verified by the Bank safeguard specialists, with no protected forest or environmental hot spots at the support mission in November 2014. The Bank safeguard specialists verified the safeguard screening reports after checking the provincial hotspots and visited the Dong Commune site. There are no Indigenous Peoples in existing LASED site. The social screening by the World Bank and the implementing agency confirmed no presence of Indigenous Peoples in the new SLC during project preparation.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Bunlong Leng (GEN02)

Jun Zeng (GSU06)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The project investments such as small scale community infrastructure and agricultural and livelihood activities are expected to have minimal environmental and social impacts during works implementation. Typical impacts of small scale civil works include limited land clearance, temporary erosion and sedimentation of water bodies, dust and waste generation, etc. Given the small scale nature of these activities, impacts as experienced under the LASED Project were temporary and irreversible, and should be managed using the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) prepared for small scale infrastructure.</p> <p>In addition, agricultural and livelihood activities although small scale and done manually may have some impacts on land and soil. This would be addressed with the project promoting soil and water conservation, hence impacts are expected to be minor and would be manageable by using these conservation measures together with proper land use planning.</p> <p>There may also be some remnant forests/remaining patches of forests within the new SLC site that maybe affected during the land development. The experiences under the LASED Project would be taken into account by carefully including different land uses in the land use planning and mapping processes and delineate forest patches as communal forests for protection and conservation. These have been proven successful under LASED project and would continue to be adopted under LASED II Project.</p> <p>All the existing LASED and JSDF-funded sites are cleared from unexploded ordinances (UXO). The new proposed SLC site in Dong Commune was screened and confirmed to have no UXO during the implementation support missions in October 2013 and November 2014.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>The land use plan implementation and the small scale infrastructure investments may impact on the natural habitat such as wetlands, natural ponds or remaining forest patches. However the impact of small-scale civil works on natural habitats will be avoided through the Land use planning. The land use planning process will also identify different land uses within the SLC and delineate natural habitats (e.g. forest patches or wetlands or natural ponds) for community protection and preservation, as practiced under LASED. No known</p>

		protected areas during LASED implementation and the new site screening.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The infrastructure investments and the development of new SLC site may impact on remnant forests. However, the practice under the LASED Project of including and delineating different land uses, including the community forest, in land use planning would be continued. Remnant forests, if any would be delineated and reserved for community protection and conservation as per the Land Use Planning and Implementation provided for in the EA-EMP.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	While the project would have a strong focus on agricultural production, it is not expected to lead to increase usage of pesticide. The experience under the LASED Project was that the communities rely solely on crop rotation, inter-cropping and multiple cropping to manage pests and diseases rather than on pesticides because of the prohibitive costs of pesticides and impacts on health. The adoption of sound agricultural practices would continue to be promoted and supported under LASED II Project.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The community infrastructure investments may impact on unknown, buried physical cultural resources. Procedures to address chance find during project implementation are part of the EMP. No issue has been encountered under the LASED Project.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	Ethnic minorities are not present in present SLC sites under LASED. For the new SLC site, ethnic screening was conducted and did not find any IP community (the Khmer Loeu or “hill tribes”) in project areas (including its potential recruited villages). Therefore, the policy is would not triggered.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) used under the LASED project was updated based on the experience gained for use under the LASED II. It was reviewed by the Bank and found to be in line with the Bank's OP 4.12. it provides the process and approach to minimize potential loss of land or assets as a result of SLC processes. Furthermore, The new infrastructure investments might need some land acquisition. However, exact locations of new small scale infrastructure could not be determined during project preparation. The Project would ensure that existing land use patterns would be clearly demarcated so

		no one who opt out of or are not eligible for participation in the SCL would lose assets as a result of re-blocking.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	The policy is triggered since the project may finance construction of embankments (i.e., weir or water storage facility) for small scale gravity irrigation in the prioritized communities, which would be identified during project implementation. The exact sites and number of these embankments are not determined yet. Therefore, during the implementation stage, the implementing agencies (e.g. NCDDS) or its consultant will conduct environmental safeguard screening in order to determine if each small-scale irrigation or weir investment will require any additional environmental assessment. A Dam Safety Specialist was also included in the Task Team to support project preparation and monitor the generic dam safety and environmental protection measures during project implementation. Activities would include: (a) review of the TOR and evaluation of the bidding documents to ensure qualified dam engineers are recruited for weirs and embankments design; (b) review of the design and investigation reports and procurement documents; and (c) monitoring of construction activities as required under OP/BP 4.37.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The policy is not triggered since the small upstream embankments or weirs planned for construction are located in small in-land streams, which are far from the Mekong River and its main tributaries.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project would not involve any activity in any known disputed area.

II. 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>a. Social Safeguards. The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) used under the LASED project was updated based on the experience gained for use under the LASED II. It was reviewed by the Bank and found to be in line with the Bank's OP 4.12. it provides the process and approach to minimize potential loss of land or assets as a result of SLC processes. The new SLC site might be impacted by the project's land acquisition. The new small scale infrastructure investment might also need to acquire land. Since all proposed project activities would follow the approved SLC Land Use Plans, the impact from involuntary resettlement is expected to be minor. Other sites are already existing under LASED and LASED II will support further improvements of these sites, including support to livelihoods, thus impacts are deemed to be positive.</p> <p>b. Environmental Safeguards. The project's development activities such as small scale community infrastructure and agricultural and livelihood activities would have minimal environmental and</p>

<p>social impacts during implementation. Typical impacts for small scale civil works include land clearance, erosion and sedimentation of water bodies, dust and waste generation, etc. Given the small scale nature of these activities, impacts as experienced under the completed LASSED Project are temporary, reversible, and manageable through construction management techniques described in the EA-EMP.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>No cumulative or long-term impacts are foreseen. The project activities such as small scale community infrastructure and agricultural and livelihood activities might induce minimal, short-term, direct and indirect environmental and social impacts during the civil work activities.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>No project alternatives are required.</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>
<p>The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) used under the LASSED project was updated based on the experience gained for use under the LASSED II. It was reviewed by the Bank and found to be in line with the Bank's OP 4.12. The Project would use the following approach to minimize potential loss of land or assets as a result of SLC processes: (a) in case a local resident who is a legal owner of land as defined under the Land Law loses fixed assets or access to agricultural land in the planned SLC area, he/she is entitled to receive compensation for land and assets at the replacement value; (b) the planning of SLCs would include practical measures to avoid that poor unauthorized local residents, whose livelihood is dependent on use of land in the planned SLC area, lose fixed assets or access to agricultural land due to the SLC program; (c) land loss within a designated SLC area by any unauthorized poor local resident whose livelihood is dependent on use of land in the planned SLC area, and who began to use this land before the cut-off date, would be eligible to obtain land within the SLC not exceeding the land allocation fixed for regular SLC applicants; (d) land speculators enjoying unauthorized use of land in an SLC area would not be entitled to apply for land within the SLC, and may only receive compensation for investments made on up to 5 hectares of the land illegally occupied within the SLC area; and (e) the project-supported social land concession programs are not used as a form of compensation to mitigate the resettlement impacts from other projects.</p>
<p>The implementing agency has also updated the Environmental Assessment and Environmental Management Plan (EA-EMP) that was prepared under the LASSED Project. This consists of land use planning and implementation procedure for agricultural and livelihood activities and the EMP for small scale civil work. The land use planning procedure was used to delineate natural habitats (e.g., forest patches or wetlands or natural ponds) for community protection and preservation. The EMP was used to manage temporary and reversible impacts caused by small scale civil works. The EMP is aligned with the government Commune/Sangkat Fund Project Implementation Manual (C/S PIM) which includes procedures for monitoring and recording the environment and safety measures for the commune-based infrastructure investments.</p>
<p>The following environmental and social safeguards lessons learned from the original/completed LASSED Project have been taken into account under the LASSED II Project:</p>
<p>For Environmental Safeguards:</p>

a. Land use planning and implementation - The participatory land use maps and site development plans of all SLCs have to carefully delineate the different land uses. The land use plan must integrate the remaining patches of forests, bodies of water, and planned green buffers which are all declared for community conservation and protection. The land use plan should also take into account early environmental and agricultural carrying capacity. The participatory land use planning should also identify unauthorized land users and potential land loss within a designated SLC area. Proposed actions to be taken should be in line with the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and through meaningful consultation.

b. EMP for Community Infrastructure investments –The Provincial LASED Team worked closely with the Commune Council to monitor the contractors and ensure safeguards and safety measures at the construction sites. However, recording of the safeguards monitoring results requires more improvement since written monitoring record is limited. Therefore, for other small scale infrastructure investments, the LASED II Provincial Team would work closely with the Commune Councils to monitor the contractors and ensure environmental and safety measures at the construction sites.

c. Commune/Sangkat Fund Project Implementation Manual (C/S Fund PIM) - The EA-EMP is aligned with the overarching guidelines and provisions in the C/S Fund PIM such as the implementation of civil works. The C/S Fund PIM is also consistent with the requirements of the Bank Environmental Assessment Policy (O.P.4.01) and had also been used by the Bank's Rural Infrastructure and Local Governance Project (RILGP). NCDDDS has experience on safeguards implementation. However, the NCDDDS staff need further support in implementing the C/S Fund PIM such as the procedures for monitoring and recording the environment and safety measures for infrastructure investments at the community level.

The NCDDDS staff need further support in capacity development through hands-on training and on-site mentoring on the records of the EMP implication. The NCDDDS would continue to perform this role and also provide further capacity development training and mentoring on the implementation of environmental and social safeguards tools to the implementing staff based at the sub-national level.

For Social Safeguards:

Community Infrastructure investments -The participatory approach of the project requires the participation in rural development activities by commune officials, village officials and land users at all stage. This is the best way to avoid or minimize land acquisition and involuntary resettlement. The participation exercise should also aims to provide (a) special attentions to households headed by disadvantaged women; (b) gender equality in access to information on land distribution and land use, in decision-making in the household/community, and in addressing grievances; (c) gender equality in benefit from rural development and livelihood support services; and (d) gender equality in entitlement for land use and ownership. And also indigenous people's families living in the existing SLC sites would be fully consulted for project activities plans.

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

Community people, Commune Council members, community-based organizations and SLC implementing staff on the ground were consulted on the draft environmental and social safeguard instrument to be used on LASED II, including the RPF and the EA-EMP during technical support mission – appraisal preparations in June 15 to July 3, 2015, and stakeholders' consultation

workshop conducted on June 23-24, 2015. The lessons learned, concerns and views collected at the consultation were incorporated in the RPF and the EA-EMP. The consultation Minutes in Khmer were updated accordingly. The safeguard instruments (i.e. RPF and EA-EMP) were translated into local language (Khmer) and were disclosed in the website of the implementing agency and posted in the information board at the commune, district and provincial offices where the SLC sites are located. Consultations on the updated instruments will continue to be undertaken through Board submission and during implementation.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Jan-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Cambodia	14-Jan-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Jan-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Cambodia	14-Jan-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/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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams	
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Mudita Chamroeun	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (SA)	Date: 16-Mar-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Nathan M. Belete (PMGR)	Date: 17-Mar-2016