

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA1143**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 10-Apr-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 10-Apr-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Uzbekistan	<b>Project ID:</b>	P146334
<b>Project Name:</b>	Regional Roads and Development Project (P146334)		
<b>Task Team Leader(s):</b>	Mustapha Benmaamar		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	25-Mar-2015	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	18-Jun-2015
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GTIDR	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (70%), General transportation sector (10%), Other domestic and international trade (20%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Infrastructure services for private sector development (40%), Trade facilitation and market access (60%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	240.00	Total Bank Financing:	200.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			40.00
International Development Association (IDA)			200.00
Total			240.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**2. Project Development Objective(s)**

The proposed Project Development Objectives (PDOs) are to reduce road user costs on the project roads and develop a sustainable investment program for regional road asset management.

**3. Project Description**

The proposed project would consist of three components totaling US\$240 million:

Component 1. Rehabilitation of Regional Roads (estimated total cost US\$226.0 million, including IDA financing of US\$188.33 million). This component will improve about 300 km of priority regional roads in Tashkent, Ferghana, Andijan and Namangan. Specifically, the component will finance the rehabilitation works of existing regional roads, including structure renewal as well as the rehabilitation of ancillary road connections (i.e. crossroads, access roads, drainage systems). This component will also support integration of road safety considerations into the design of the project's road sections. US\$17 million contingency added to this component and embedded in the financing of the project to cover for contingencies and volume of works.

Component 2. Road Sector Institutional Strengthening (estimated total cost US\$5.0 million, including IDA financing of US\$4.16 million). This component will finance priority road sector institutional strengthening activities, including:

a) Road asset management capacity review: The support under this activity includes (i) the review of existing arrangements for regional road asset management, (ii) assessment of the technical capacity of the key agencies responsible for strategic planning and implementation of road rehabilitation/maintenance programs, (iii) identification of areas for improvement and preparation of priority activities.

b) Support to develop regional roads rehabilitation programs: This will support the development of regional road database (e.g. data collection, relevant software and IT equipment, equipment for traffic and road inventory surveys, trainings...) and preparation of regional road rehabilitation and maintenance programs.

c) Support to road construction industry (road construction contractors, road design institutes, scientific research institute on automobile roads): This includes (i) an assessment of the market structure of the local road construction industry and its capacity and identify measures to promote the development of small and medium size local contractors (ii) review of the regulatory framework and design standards for the road construction industry; (iii) develop technical/implementing regulations to apply new design standards and their harmonization with international standards; (iv) technical capacity building of the scientific research institute on automobile roads (i.e. training, laboratory equipment).

d) Capacity strengthening of Republican Road Fund (RRF): This includes training needs assessment and preparation of manpower development plans for RRF and provision of equipment and devices to conduct road work inspections.

e) Road sector governance and capacity review: This activity will support the overall road sector policy and institutional framework review. This includes road sector public expenditure review and identification of measures to increase accountability and value for money (i.e. validation of road rehabilitation/maintenance programs, management of technical audits...).

Component 3. Project Management (estimated total cost US\$9.0 million, including IDA financing of US\$7.5million). This component will finance relevant activities to support project management and implementation, including: (i) Core Team Consultants (CTC) to provide support to PIU in project contract management, procurement, and environmental and social safeguards; (ii) supervision consultants to support the supervision of all civil works of the entire roads financed under this project; and (iii) operating and incremental costs of PIU, including financial audits.

The main interventions will consist of rehabilitating the existing roads, using the same alignment. The Project will not build new roads - the rehabilitation work will be extended to existing access

roads for safety reasons and structural reasons. It is anticipated that the environmental impacts therefore would be temporary and mitigatable, so the project is categorized as 'B'.

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

The Project will finance part of the priority regional road rehabilitation roads program. The Project will be carried out in four of the thirteen Oblasts (region) of Uzbekistan, namely Ferghana, Tashkent, Namangan and Andijan Oblasts. The Project is expected to cover rehabilitation of around 300 km of regional roads. The first-year program covers 10 road sections in four raions/municipality (UrtaChirchik, Zangiota, Pskent, Yangiul) in the Tashkent region, with total length of approximately 90 km. The next work program will include the rest of the project roads, namely about 210 km located in Ferghana, Andijan and Namangan regions. The prioritization of the road sections will be made based on social and economic feasibility criteria. The project roads are located in rural and semi-urban areas. For the 10 road sections which are planned for the first year, the design studies are ongoing therefore site specific ESMPs will be prepared during implementation, before the bidding process. And the approved ESMPs will be a part of the bidding documents.

#### **5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Esra Arikan (GENDR)

Mark C. Woodward (GSURR)

Rebecca Emilie Anne Lacroix (GSURR)

<b>6. Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>This policy is triggered because civil works to be implemented under the project represent environmental risks which are mainly temporary and limited by the period of construction. However, since it is planned not to build new roads but only rehabilitate the existing roads the impacts are predictable, manageable and mitigatable. The potential impacts may include destabilization of slopes, loss of some land due to rehabilitation or small scale expansion within the ROW, disturbance of drainage systems, extraction of road construction materials, increased dust production and air and noise pollution, disturbance to ecosystem to a certain extent. There will be no need for opening borrow pits due to the scale of works, therefore the simple environmental impacts arising from rehabilitation works could be managed by EMP checklists.</p> <p>The client prepared an environmental and social management framework (ESMF), which outlines the generic impacts, mitigation and monitoring measures. As it is detailed in the ESMF, site specific environmental and social management plans (ESMPs) will be prepared for the road construction works. ESMPs have not been prepared yet, since the final design works of the roads are still ongoing. The ESMP documents will determine site-</p>

		specific impacts which are likely to occur due to the program implementation, propose adequate mitigation measures, define responsibilities and arrangements for the implementation of those measures, and outline the monitoring mechanism. The supervision of the ESMPs and the compliance with the ESMF during implementation will also be conducted by RRF and WB.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	It is anticipated that the project activities will be conducted on the existing routes and they will not involve large scale new construction. However, the policy is triggered to make sure that the environmental safeguards documents are informed about the definition of natural habitats and the ineligibility criteria about having any impact on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	Road rehabilitation works will not be conducted in a physically or culturally sensitive site. No new roads will be built and due to the scale of the rehabilitation works it is not anticipated that major excavations will be needed. Therefore, the policy is not triggered but in any case the chance find procedures will be applied when needed.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>The policy is triggered because the project will have impacts associated with the loss of assets/land or loss of access to assets/land. Site visits to the 10 roads that have been identified so far indicate impacts are mainly related to clearing of small structures (such as fences, gazebos, flower gardens) that have been informally built within the right of way. Private land acquisition or transfer of land usage rights are not foreseen, as all road sections affected by the project belong to the State or respective municipalities. No physical relocation is envisaged.</p> <p>In addition to small structures, fruit trees may also be affected if these have been planted within the right of way. During the civil works, the project may potentially lead to the loss or disruption of income sources of informal or formal vendors and businesses operating in project affected areas, including encroachments on rights of access and way. The technical designs of the roads are not yet available.</p>

		To manage all social and economic impacts associated with the loss/loss of access to assets or land, the client has prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). The draft was disclosed and consulted on in country on March 24-25 2015. The final version will be redisclosed in country and InfoShop. The RPF will guide the preparation of Resettlement Action Plans, commensurate with the extent of impact, once the detailed designs become known. RAPs will be prepared, consulted upon and disclosed in country and in InfoShop. They will be reviewed and cleared by the Bank. All compensations will have to be paid prior to the commencement of civil works.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>The main interventions will consist of rehabilitating the existing roads, using the same alignment. The Project will not build new roads - the rehabilitation work will be extended to access roads for safety reasons and structural reasons. It is anticipated that the environmental impacts therefore would be temporary and mitigatable, so the project is categorized as 'B'. The environmental and social management framework document has been prepared by the client to serve as a guideline for the preparation of site specific environmental documents since not all the project locations are determined by appraisal. The road sections will be identified during project implementation based on road data analysis as well as economic criteria (pre-feasibility screening). ESMPs/checklists will also be prepared for these sections and will be reviewed and cleared by the Bank as well as disclosed prior to commencing any displacement or civil works on the sub-projects. The site specific ESMPs will be enclosed in the bidding documents for the road construction works.</p> <p>Impacts covered under OP 4.12 are mainly related to clearing of small structures (such as fences, gazebos or flower gardens) that have been informally built within the right of way. Client has prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to manage these impacts and guide the preparation of site-specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAP) that will be prepared once detailed design becomes known, commensurate with the extent of impacts.</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p> <p>No long term adverse environmental impacts are foreseen for the project.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p> <p>The road rehabilitation works are straightforward and will be conducted on the already existing</p>

routes, so alternative analysis is not sought.
<b>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.</b>
<p>The borrower, RRF, hired consultants who have prepared the ESMF and they will prepare the site specific ESMP documents as soon as the final designs are ready. The borrower, via its consultants will be continuously supervising the construction works and reporting to the Bank.</p> <p>The Project will be implemented through the existing Project Management Unit (PIU), within Republican Road Fund (RRF). A social consultant has been contracted by the PIU to prepare the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and will also be involved in the preparation of the RAP needed for the first 10 road sections. The consultant has also been tasked with reviewing the social and economic impacts under OP 4.12 and prepare and support monitoring of subsequent RAP. The PIU team has gained good experience working with the Asian Development Bank and bilateral donors on the Uzbekistan sections (404 km) of the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Road Investment Program (CAREC) since 2006.</p>
<b>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</b>
<p>The key project stakeholders are the PIU/RRF, local municipalities, and other Government bodies. Their respective roles and responsibilities are clearly spelt out in the ESMF and RPF. Local communities and road users are direct beneficiaries of the Project. A wider range of the population of Uzbekistan will benefit in a longer term from the expected increased access to economic and social opportunities as well as improved road safety.</p> <p>Consultations on the ESMF and RPF were held on March 24 and 25 at districts Hokimiyats in each of the four raions affected by the first phase of the project (UrtaChirchik, Zangiota, Pskent, Yangiul). The key stakeholders identified in the ESMF and RPF were invited. In addition to Project Affected People, representatives of relevant state organizations, khokimiyats, makhalla committees, cadastral service and other local authorities took part in these consultations.</p> <p>The project will monitor beneficiary feedback through road user satisfaction surveys and grievance redress mechanisms. The survey will capture on the annual basis public opinion on quality, safety and reliability of the project roads. The survey will be complemented by a robust system of grievance redress mechanisms that will monitor the implementation of RPF/RAPS/EMF and also communicate systematic information on the objectives and progress of the project.</p>

### **B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Mar-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	31-Mar-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	////
"In country" Disclosure	
Uzbekistan	10-Apr-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Mar-2015

Date of submission to InfoShop	31-Mar-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Uzbekistan	10-Apr-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
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: Mustapha Benmaamar	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Juan Gaviria (PMGR)	Date: 10-Apr-2015