

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA1158

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 11-Feb-2016

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 12-Feb-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Guinea-Bissau	Project ID:	P151443
		Parent Project ID:	P090712
Project Name:	Second Add. Fin. to Rural Community-Driven Development Project (P151443)		
Parent Project Name:	Rural Community-Driven Development Project (P090712)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Philippe Auffret		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	12-Dec-2014	Estimated Board Date:	31-May-2016
Managing Unit:	GSP07	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General education sector (30%), Other social services (25%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (30%), Water supply (1 5%)		
Theme(s):	Social Safety Nets/Social Assistance & Social Care Services (60%), Other human development (40%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			Yes
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	13.50	Total Bank Financing:	10.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
IDA Grant			10.00
Africa Catalytic Growth Fund (ACGF)			3.50
Total			13.50
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		

Is this a Repeater project?	No
------------------------------------	----

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

The Project Development Objective is to increase access to priority basic social and economic infrastructures and services in participating communities in at least two regions of Guinea-Bissau.

B. Proposed Project Development Objectives – Additional Financing (AF)

3. Project Description

The proposed Additional Financing (AF) would finance the costs to scale-up the Project’s community-driven development activities, and pilot a Cash Transfer program.

More specifically, the proposed Second AF from IDA would:

- (i) scale up the target number of community-development plans under the Capacity-building for Community Development component (Component 1) and the number of micro-projects under the Community-based Micro-Projects component (Components 2);
- (ii) increase resources for the Project Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation component (Component 3); and
- (iii) pilot a Cash Transfer program to targeted vulnerable households, in poor communities (Component 6 – new).

The proposed ACGF Grant would: (i) scale up the target number of micro-projects under the Community-based Micro-Projects component (Components 2); and (ii) increase resources for the Project Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation component (Component 3).

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

Project location will include both rural and urban areas of Guinea Bissau across all nine regions.

The safeguard arrangements for the activities scaled up under the proposed additional financing would remain identical to those used by the PCU for the implementation of the current Project: the Rural Community-Driven Development Project (P090712) and Rural Community-Driven Development Project – Additional Financing (P146746), and will comply with the measures outlined in the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) prepared, cleared and disclosed in-country and at the WB InfoShop on 03-Mar-2009 and updated and re-disclosed at the InfoShop and in-country for the AF in December 2013 and March 2014, respectively.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Upulee Iresha Dasanayake (AFCF1)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental	Yes	The project will finance community determined sub-

Assessment OP/BP 4.01		projects (micro-projects) that will not be known until implementation. Based on a broad environmental assessment during preparation, an environmental and social management framework (ESMF) was prepared and disclosed both in-country and at the WB InfoShop prior to the appraisal of the parent project. The ESMF was updated (to accommodate changes to the project by the first additional financing in 2013) and re-disclosed at the WB InfoShop and in-country in December 2013 and March 2014, respectively.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The sub-projects are expected to have benign impact on natural habitats. All sub-projects are subjected to approval according to an environmental and social safeguard check list (ESSC), which has been prepared as part of the ESMF during preparation of the parent project and updated to include additional items during the first AF.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Not applicable
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Micro-projects using non-eligible pesticides are on the negative list (list of ineligible micro-projects); the ESMF includes a screening tool and steps to ensure ESMPs are prepared and appropriate mitigating measures are taken prior to the implementation of all sub-projects that involve agricultural activities with potential use of pesticides and mechanisms of pest control.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	Though it is unknown which micro-project sites may contain Physical Cultural Resources (PCR), as a measure of prudence potential impacts on PCR are assessed in the context of the ESMF and mitigation measures commensurate to those impacts, including proper handling of chance finds, are implemented in the design, screening, implementation, monitoring of project activities, in accordance with national and Bank policies and procedures are included in the ESMF.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous peoples in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project interventions will avoid where possible adverse impacts on people, land and other economic resources and livelihoods. In situations where this cannot be avoided, the Borrower has prepared and disclosed in-country and at the Bank InfoShop a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to address the needs of persons who will be affected by loss of economic activities, access to resources, land acquisition and/or involuntary resettlement. The RPF for the parent project was updated

		(during the first AF in 2013) and re-disclosed at the WB InfoShop and in-country in December 2013 and March 2014, respectively. In addition, where applicable, site-specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) or Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plans (ARAPs) will be prepared and disclosed prior to the implementation of micro-projects.
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

II. 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:

The proposed second Additional Financing (AF) would maintain the Development Objectives (PDO) of the original Project (P090712). All activities under the proposed AF will be governed by the projects existing Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that were prepared, reviewed, approved, and disclosed in-country and at the Bank InfoShop prior to appraisal of the original project. The ESMF and RPF were updated for the project's first AF in 2013 and were re-disclosed at the Bank InfoShop and in-country in December 2013 and March 2014, respectively.

The proposed Additional Financing (AF) would finance the costs to scale-up the Project's community-driven development activities, and pilot a Cash Transfer program. More specifically, the proposed Second AF from IDA would: (i) scale up the target number of community-development plans under the Capacity-building for Community Development component (Component 1) and the number of micro-projects under the Community-based Micro-Projects component (Components 2); (ii) increase resources for the Project Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation component (Component 3); and (iii) pilot a Cash Transfer program to targeted vulnerable households, in poor communities (Component 6 – new).

The environmental and social impacts of the activities under the proposed AF would be identical to those under the original Project and the first AF. Individual micro-projects are small and no large scale, significant or irreversible impacts are expected as a result of their implementation. The Environmental and social safeguard risks of micro-projects are the typical ones for a rural CDD project supporting small scale basic social and economic infrastructures, and might include: (i) localized degradation/encroachment of natural habitats and associated loss of biodiversity; (ii) soil degradation and erosion; (iii) decline in water quality; (iv) improper disposal of waste; (v) cutting of trees; (vi) use of pesticides; and (vii) potential public health concerns. Potential social issues identified include: loss of/damage to cultural properties and involuntary resettlement, including loss of access to resources. The environmental and social impacts of the proposed cash transfer program would not require the preparation of any additional safeguards instruments and will be

subject to the same screening mechanisms currently employed by the PCU for micro-projects. A project level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) was introduced to the project in 2014 to receive, record, sort and respond to stakeholder/beneficiary concerns related to project activities.

The ESMF details the environmental and social screening criteria and the mechanisms to be used during micro-project appraisal. This screening tool includes a checklist designed to detect any potential negative environmental or social impacts linked to individual micro-projects and steps to be taken to ensure that appropriate Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and/or Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) are prepared and appropriate mitigating measures are implemented as necessary. In addition, there is a list of non-eligible micro-projects, which includes inter-alia: (i) micro-project in natural habitats areas including natural parks; (ii) micro-project using large quantities of wood coming from the communities and/or cutting trees to free space for micro-project investments; (iii) micro-projects using non eligible pesticides for agriculture activities; (iv) micro-projects supporting construction of dams more than three meters in height; (v) micro-projects supporting private commercial endeavors, etc. The complete list is included in the ESMF. The ESMF also includes provisions for an annual review for safeguard compliance and to detect potential cumulative environmental impacts that might arise across several micro-projects.

With respect to involuntary resettlement, it should be noted that resettlement due to land acquisition for project activities is expected to be nil or negligible. In the event a micro-project proposal triggers this policy, the community assisted by the project facilitators would try to avoid any involuntary resettlement by exploring all viable alternative locations and designs for micro-projects, and the extent of land acquisition will be kept to a minimum. In the event that land acquisition cannot be avoided, the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), that was prepared for the parent project and updated for the first AF in 2013/4, will address the needs of people who will be affected by loss of economic activities, access to resources and land.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

No long term negative environmental or social impacts are anticipated to arise due to the scaling-up of activities under component 1-3 and the piloting of the new cash transfer program (6). The environmental and social screening procedures that are in place to identify and ensure appropriate mitigation for the current project will apply to the scaled-up components 1-3 and the proposed new pilot cash transfer program under Component 6.

Implementation will be closely monitored to ensure that these are effective.

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.

During preparation of the original Project (P090712), the Government prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to govern the project. These instruments were updated for the first additional financing in 2013/4 and were re-disclosed both at the World Bank InfoShop and in-country in December 2013 and March 2014, respectively. The processes and procedures defined within the ESMF and the RPF are an integral part of the Project Implementation Manual (PIM). The PCU has the institutional capacity

to manage the safeguard aspects brought about by the proposed scaling up of Components 1-3 and the introduction of the new cash transfer pilot. The PCU ensures that micro-projects and LIPWs activities are fully compliant with safeguard policies and that mitigation measures are implemented during the micro-projects cycle. These measures include: (i) completion of a checklist of possible environmental and social impacts prior to the implementation of each micro-project; (ii) detailed Safeguards Procedures for inclusion in the technical specifications of contracts; and (iii) specific environmental and social mitigation measures. The specific environmental mitigation measures for each sub-project would be systematically integrated in all bidding documents, including the preparation of ESMPs and RAPs.

For this second AF, safeguard compliance would continue to be assured through a three tiered process. First, at the micro-project preparation stage, beneficiary communities assisted by trained Facilitators would be required to complete an Environmental and Social Safeguards Checklist (ESSC) as part of the micro-project funding application. This would help them identify any safeguard issues of concern, and prompt the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures into the micro-project design. Provision exists under the Project to contract specialized technical assistance to support the preparation of environmental and social management plans and resettlement action plans when deemed necessary. Second, at the micro-project appraisal stage, the Regional Advisors (RA) together with relevant regional technical representatives would conduct a desk and field review of the proposal prior to its approval. The RA's role explicitly includes verification of the appropriate identification and mitigation of safeguard concerns. Third, at the Project level, a full-time Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist forms part of the PCU team, and, working together with the RA and Facilitators in the field is responsible, inter alia, for tracking safeguard compliance across the Project as a whole and identifying and addressing any issues that arise during micro-project implementation.

The parent and first AF projects compliance with environmental and social safeguards policies has consistently been rated as Satisfactory. In addition, recognizing the weaknesses of public institutions to ensure Project compliance with the environmental and social safeguards, PCU staff as well as central and local government representatives will continue to be sensitized and trained on safeguard policies. Training would continue to be organized during Project implementation. Furthermore, general sensitization of beneficiaries forms part of the formal project communication strategy.

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

Key stakeholders include: (i) beneficiary communities, which would continue to identify, prepare and implement the micro-projects and the LIPWs; (ii) local authorities (regional and sectoral government, traditional authorities and civil society organizations), which would be participating in the identification and definition of the LDP; (iii) technical sectoral ministries implicated in the implementation and ongoing operation of the selected micro-projects, as appropriate, (iv) teachers and health workers, and (v) hospitals, clinics, patients, care givers and health care works affected by the Ebola epidemic. Development partners (donors, NGOs, religious organizations, etc.) active at the local level are also considered important stakeholders. Preparation of the ESMF and RPF included consultation with representatives of each of these stakeholder groups and discussion of the safeguard processes and procedures. Particular attention was paid to identifying vulnerable groups and potentially affected people (based upon the expected micro-project and cash transfer program).

As part of the preparation of the Additional Financing for the project in 2013, both the ESMF and the RPF prepared for the parent project were updated (following comprehensive public consultations) and disclosed in the World Bank InfoShop and in country in December 2013 and March 2014, Respectively.

In addition, during the December 2014 implementation support mission, a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) for the project was developed to receive, document and respond to feedback from project beneficiaries and stakeholders.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Dec-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Dec-2013
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea-Bissau	13-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Dec-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Dec-2013
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea-Bissau	13-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	

Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
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 [X] No [] NA []
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
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 [] No [] NA [X]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [] No [X] TBD []
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [] No [] TBD [X]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [X] No [] 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?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [X] No [] NA []

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: Philippe Auffret	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (RSA)	Date: 12-Feb-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Stefano Paternostro (PMGR)	Date: 12-Feb-2016