

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

I. Basic Information

Date prepared/updated: 03/25/2014

Report No.: 87911

1. Basic Project Data

Country: Ghana	Project ID: P149444	
Project Name: Transport Sector Project Additional Financing		
Task Team Leader: Kavita Sethi		
Estimated Appraisal Date: April 17, 2014	Estimated Board Date: June 24, 2014	
Managing Unit: AFTTR	Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan	
Sector: Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (51%); Urban Transport (36%); Public administration- Transportation (13%)		
Theme: Rural services and infrastructure (50%); City-wide Infrastructure and Service Delivery (50%)		
IBRD Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
IDA Amount (US\$m.):	25.00	
GEF Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
PCF Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
Other financing amounts by source:		
<u>BORROWER/RECIPIENT</u>		<u>0.00</u>
		0.00
Environmental Category: A - Full Assessment		
Simplified Processing	Simple <input type="checkbox"/>	Repeater <input type="checkbox"/>
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. Project Objectives

1. The Project Development Objective is being revised. The revised PDO is *to improve mobility of goods and passengers on selected roads through reductions in travel time, vehicle operating costs and enhanced road safety awareness.*

3. Project Description

2. The Additional Financing of \$25 million will cover cost overruns for the original Project and its original costs at US\$225.0 million equivalent of IDA financing. The Ministry of Roads and Highways (MRH) and the Ministry of Transport (MOT) will continue to lead the implementation of the project.

3. The original project has seven components: (a) Support to Ministry of Roads and Highways (MRH); (b) Support to Road Sector and Educational Entities; (c) Improvement of Trunk Roads; (d) Improvement of Urban Roads and infrastructure; (e) Improvement of

Feeder Roads; (f) Support to Ministry of Transport (MOT) and Other Transport Sector Entities; (g) Project Management.

4. The additional financing is targeted for the completion of Components C and D of the project:

- a. **Component C - Rehabilitation of Ayanfuri-Asawinso Road.** This component focuses mainly on the construction of the 52.2 km Ayanfuri-Asawinso Road which forms a South-North transport corridor western Ghana, linking the timber and mineral rich areas, and neighboring countries located West and North of Ghana to the deep water port of Takoradi. It is a continuation of the EU funded Tarkwa-Bogoso-Ayanfuri stretch currently under construction, and this corridor is a critical section of the national trunk road network which links the Ashanti and Western Regions of Ghana. The design of the Ayanfuri-Asawinso road did not adequately address the issues encountered during actual implementation. This has resulted in a review of drainage and pavement structure, as well as provision for slope stabilization leading to an overall additional cost of US\$7.64 million including contingencies.
- b. **Component D - Construction of Selected Roads in the Accra East Corridor.** About 15 km of roads (dual carriageways) are being constructed under three separate contracts: Giffard Road (Lot 1) and the Burma Camp Roads Phase 1 and Phase 2, i.e. (Lot 2 and 3). The roads which are dual carriageways form part of a network of arterials that link the suburban areas in the eastern part of Accra into the Central Business district, as well as to critical facilities including the Accra Airport and 37 Military Hospital. All three contracts have been awarded (at a total contract price of US\$41.5 million) and are at different stages of implementation since September 2012. However, project implementation has revealed a number of weaknesses and inadequate considerations in the project design. These include the need for a review of the provision for relocation of electricity, water and telecommunications facilities, changes to the alignment in view of the actual positioning of utilities which has been revealed during construction, missing gap of 1.6 km of soft soil, reviews of the railway bridge leading to the Spintex Road. Furthermore, the last 1.2 km of Lot 3 of the design went through a built up area resulting in very high compensation costs and social impacts, as well as review of a 1.2 km section to incorporate the local road network on account of the sheer magnitude of the resettlement costs which was entirely prohibitive to GoG. The Department of Urban Roads has taken action to mitigate the increase in construction costs by rescoping the final section of the Burma Camp Road, Phase 2, from a dual carriageway to a slightly modified route as a single carriageway which is integrated into the local road network of the Teshie area. Other planned improvements to the local road network have also been dropped to free up funds for the main link. An additional amount of US\$17.86 million will be required to address the issues identified. While project implementation will need about nine additional months to be completed. The works are currently at about 65 percent of physical progress overall.

5. As part of the processing of the additional financing, the project will also be restructured to modify the following components:

- c. **Component E: Improvement of Feeder Roads.** The implementation of the feeder roads component is in two phases. Implementation of the first phase is completed, and implementation of the second phase, targeted at commercial agriculture is on-going. Funds allocated to the first phase of the works were not fully utilized, and will be allocated to the second phase of the feeder roads implementation. The modified scope will result in a saving of US\$0.5 million, which contributes to the overall mitigation of rising costs under the project.
- d. **Component F: Support to MOT and other Transport Sector Entities.** This component focuses mainly on provision of critical equipment as well as feasibility studies and plans for the transport sector. All the equipment has been procured and 8 out of 10 studies are ongoing. The studies and equipment alone are now at about US\$1.0 million in excess of originally planned costs. GoG has indicated its decision to implement the feasibility study for the dualization of the Tema Meridian Port Road under a different source of funding and therefore this activity (estimated at US\$ 0.5million) has been dropped from the project releasing significant amount of funds to cover cost increases on existing project activities. Detailed design work for Takoradi airport (US\$0.5 million) has also been dropped due to challenges with getting agreement with the military for the needed modifications to the existing infrastructure. The funds for the dropped activities have therefore been reallocated to absorb the additional costs on the studies and equipment procured under this component. These changes are cost neutral with and savings absorbed by the ongoing studies and equipment procured.

4. Project Location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis

6. The trunk road rehabilitation is located in the Western Region, on a 52 km portion of the Ayanfuri-Asawinso road which forms a South-North transport corridor western Ghana, linking the timber and mineral rich areas, and neighboring countries located West and North of Ghana to the deep water port of Takoradi.

7. The urban road rehabilitation is located in the capital city of Accra, particularly along a 5.7 km stretch of the Burma Camp Road Phase 1, 3.66 km of Burma Camp Phase 2 and 5.7 km stretch of the Giffard Road.

8. The feeder road rehabilitation is distributed in throughout the country.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Mr Martin Fodor (AFTN3)

Mr Franklin Gavu (AFTTR)

6. Safeguard Policies Triggered	Yes	No
Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	X	
Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)		X
Forests (OP/BP 4.36)	X	
Pest Management (OP 4.09)		X
Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)	X	
Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)		X
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	X	
Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)		X
Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)		X
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)		X

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:

9. Components C, D and E of the project include major civil works (road rehabilitation and upgrading). These are associated with potential environmental and social impacts typical for upgrading of road surface, widening or the road body and adjusting curves on the trunk and urban roads, and spot repairs and grading of feeder roads. Potential environmental and social impacts include dust, noise, traffic disruption due to movement of machinery, clearing of vegetation, re-opening of borrow areas, health and safety issues, social issues from establishment of workers camps in the vicinity of local communities, land take and resettlement, etc. The works are ongoing with moderately satisfactory safeguards performance with minor shortcomings associated mainly with timeliness of resettlement compensation and lower intensity of safeguards supervision. The project triggers OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and consequently, OP 4.11, Physical Cultural Resources have also been triggered, as the policy applies whenever OP 4.01 applies, i.e. whenever there is likely to be significant civil works. Also Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) has been triggered. Due to potential impacts of a 2 km section of the road on the Anhwiaso Forest Reserve, OP 4.36 on Forests will be applied as well. The original project has been assigned the Environmental Category A which is retained for the Additional Financing as well.

10. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) were prepared for the road sector in 2006, disclosed and applied for this project. They will continue to be used for screening. Site-specific Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), Environmental Management Plans (EMPs), and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) for the ongoing works (Ayanfuri – Asawinso Trunk Road, Teshie – Link Road, Giffard Road, Burma Camp Road), were prepared and disclosed prior to appraisal of the original project, and the mitigation measures contained therein continue to be implemented. Many Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMP) have been prepared during project implementation (84 in the

first year, which were consulted upon, cleared and disclosed in November 2011, and 18 in the second year, which were consulted upon, cleared and disclosed in May 2014). In addition, associated Abbreviated Resettlement Plans have also been prepared for the feeder roads component after the appraisal of the original project. These have been disclosed between November 2012 and March 2013. Updates to the ESIA/ESMP and RAP due to design changes (road alignment) are underway for the Ayanfuri – Asawinso trunk road.

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

11. Potential adverse indirect long term impacts due to the rehabilitation and construction of the roads are hydrological changes and soil erosion from culvert discharges. These are localized.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

12. Two alternatives were considered for the roads to be rehabilitated under the project: the ‘no action’ option and the ‘rehabilitation of road’ option. The ‘no action’ alternative assumes that there will be no rehabilitation of the road implying that the road would be left in its present state of disrepair. This would lead to high vehicular-vehicular and vehicular-pedestrian conflicts and road accidents resulting in loss of life and property and reduction in development opportunities such as easy movement of people and agricultural produce.

13. The ‘rehabilitation of road’ option assumes that the road will be improved to correct the geometric defects so as to improve the standard of road and improve road safety. Even though the initial cost of the construction would be high, the accrued benefits to be derived (socially, culturally and economically) would by far supersede the ‘no-action’ alternative.

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.

14. Project has put in place a full complement of environmental and social safeguards personnel in the various road agencies, on the side of the contractors and on the supervising engineers’ teams, building on the capacity foundations established by predecessor operation RSDP. The intensity and level of supervision, and the agencies’ management attention, however, needs to increase to further upgrade the performance from moderately satisfactory levels. As part of the RSDP initiatives, environmental desks were established at DUR, GHA and DFR. Review of both environment and social safeguards documents, and monitoring of compliance at supervision stage, have been the core tasks of the desks. The environmental desks are constituted of two highway engineers with masters in environmental management (Team leaders), and supported by highway engineers in DUR and three sociologists in GHA. DUR and DFR would benefit

from further strengthening their social safeguards capacity, likewise, DFR. TSP will continue to support the environmental desks of DUR, GHA and DFR with the aim to: a) train more staff, b) strengthen the analytical capacity, and c) facilitate the implementation and monitoring of the EMPs and the RAPs prepared for each of the proposed road projects. In addition, TSP will continue work with other Bank funded infrastructure projects in Ghana, in view of creating synergies and a pool of local experts.

15. Mitigation of adverse environment and social impacts of development projects is supported by national laws. The Land Valuation Board provides the executive instrument for any expropriation of land or property for development projects (private or public), after receiving detailed designs and carrying out its own field inspections. The Land Valuation Board has both the human capacity and the logistic resources requested for the work.

16. Appropriate safeguards instruments have been prepared for each road project. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), was prepared for the road sector in 2006, and re-disclosed for this project. Environmental impact assessments including EMPs for each of the three project roads have also been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed to guide avoidance, minimization and mitigation of potential adverse environmental and social impacts. These safeguards instruments have been reviewed by the environmental desks of DUR and GHA, and cleared by the Bank. The mitigation measures of the EMPs have been costed and included in the civil works contracts. ESMPs for the planned second batch of feeder roads were prepared and submitted to the Bank.

17. Individual Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) have been prepared, for each project road. They have been reviewed by the environmental desks of DUR and GHA and cleared by the Bank. Also, they were disclosed in prior to project appraisal; in Ghana on December 22, 2008 and at Infoshop on December 23, 2008. The RAPs identified 333 households that would be adversely affected by the project, of which 87 by a permanent loss their properties and 244 by partial loss. However, the RAPs have been updated in the course of implementation of the civil works in response to design changes and modifications and ground conditions. These will be disclosed before appraisal of the AF.

18. The EIA and SIA teams included both social scientists and environmentalists. The socioeconomic data collected through review of existing documentation, public consultations, and field studies, covered issues related to land tenure, land acquisition, involuntary resettlement, road safety, HIV/AIDS, vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples and cultural property.

19. The following specific safeguards instruments were prepared and disclosed for the Project: (a) Environmental and Social Management Plans (84 for the Year 1 Projects) for Wet Semi-Equatorial Zone, Department of Feeder Roads, August 2011; (b) Environmental and Social Management Plans (Year 1 Projects) for South Western Equatorial Zone, Department of Feeder Roads, August 2011; (c) Environmental and Social Management Plans Year 1 Projects) for Tropical Continental Zone, Department of

Feeder Roads, August 2011; (d) ESMPs for Year 2 projects (18); (e) Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (Year 1 Projects), Department of Feeder Roads, July 2012; and (f) Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (Year 2 Projects), Department of Feeder Roads, November 2012.

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

20. The design of the Project has been participatory at several levels: at national level, at regional level, at district level and at donor community level. At the level of districts, public consultations were held in local communities along the selected road projects throughout the environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and social impact assessments (SIAs) processes. Based on the Bank supervision mission to Ayanfuri – Asawinso construction site, a grievance mechanism is in place utilizing to a high degree established local structures, although log keeping needs to improve and separate from other records of the safeguards specialist on the supervising consultant team.

21. Key stakeholders in the disclosure of the safeguards instruments are the Environment Protection Authority (EPA), the Ministry of Transportation, DUR and GHA. Pursuant internal clearance of the EIAs (including EMPs) and the RAPs, the safeguards instruments were sent to the EPA for national clearance. Subsequently, they are sent from the Ministry of Roads and Highways to the Bank for clearance. Once cleared by the Bank, they were disclosed in country and at the InfoShop, the process is explicitly explained in the ESMF, the RPF, the EIAs, the EMPs and the RAPs prepared by the client.

B. Disclosure Requirements Date

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/AUDIT/MANAGEMENT PLAN/:

Environmental and Social Framework for the Transport Sector Development Program by Center for Environment and Health Research & Training (January 2007)

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009

Environmental Impact Assessment for Ayanfuri – Asawinso Road by Ghana Highway Authority (August 2008)

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009

Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for Accra East Corridor by Municipal Development Collaboration Ltd (June

2008)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009
Environmental and Social Management Plans for Feeder Roads - Year 1 Projects (August 2011)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	11/14/2011
Date of "in-country" disclosure	11/15/2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	11/23/2011
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN/Framework/POLICY PROCESS: Resettlement Policy Framework for Transport Sector Development Program by the Ministry of Transportation (January 2007)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009
Resettlement Action Plan for Rehabilitation of Ayanfuri – Asawinso Road by Ghana Highway Authority (December 2008)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009
Resettlement Action Plan for Accra East Corridor by Municipal Development Collaboration Ltd (December 2008)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12/23/2008
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/23/2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/23/2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	04/01/2009
Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (Year 1 Projects) by Department of Feeder Roads (July 2012)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	11/26/2012
Date of "in-country" disclosure	12/05/2012
Date of submission to InfoShop	12/06/2012
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	N/A
Environmental and Social Management Plans for Feeder Roads	

- Year 2 Projects (February 2013)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	02/28/2013
Date of "in-country" disclosure	11/29/2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	05/05/2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	N/A
Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (Year 2 Projects) by Department of Feeder Roads (November 2012)	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	02/07/2013
Date of "in-country" disclosure	02/27/2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	03/06/2013
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	N/A
Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	
Pest Management Plan:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	
* If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources, 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)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	No
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report?	No
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	No
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	No
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan? No

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop? No

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? No

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

D. Approvals

<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
Task Team Leader:	Kavita Sethi	
Environmental Specialist:	Martin Fodor	
Social Development Specialist	Franklin Gavu	
Additional Environmental and/or Social Development Specialist(s):		
<i>Approved by:</i>		
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Alexandra Bezeredi	
Comments:		
Sector Manager:	Supee Teravaninthorn	
Comments:		