

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA1045

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 17-Dec-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 17-Dec-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Vietnam	Project ID:	P151946
		Parent Project ID:	P090723
Project Name:	Additional Financing to Livestock Competitiveness and Food Safety Project (P151946)		
Parent Project Name:	Vietnam Livestock Competitiveness and Food Safety (P090723)		
Task Team Leader:	Son Thanh Vo		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	15-Dec-2014	Estimated Board Date:	28-Apr-2015
Managing Unit:	GFADR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Animal production (60%), Health (30%), Agricultural extension and research (10%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (38%), Rural policies and institutions (36%), Other rural development (26%)		
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:	55.00	Total Bank Financing:	45.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			10.00
International Development Association (IDA)			45.00
Total			55.00
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 objectives (PDOs) are to increase the production efficiency of household-based livestock producers, to reduce the environmental impact of livestock production, processing and marketing, and to improve food safety in livestock product supply chains (mainly meat) in selected provinces.

B. Current Project Development Objectives – Parent

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

3. Project Description

1. Component A: Upgrading Household-based Livestock production and Market Integration. In addition to scaling up its support to GAHP households, wet markets and small slaughterhouses in the same Provinces than phase 1, the following interventions are proposed to help the project being even more transformative:

a) Focusing on groups and cooperatives: whilst the first phase of the project has already started advocacy for groups' formation, the concept and its added-value are still only partly understood by both producers and extension services. The project will prioritize the development of these groups and cooperatives during the AF as: (i) an entry point for the GAHP accreditation (for sustainability matter, as the current system is not viable both from the HHS' perspective (too expensive) and the accreditor's (too many HHS to inspect) perspectives), and (ii) a way for better access to inputs, TA, markets and a source of income for the cooperative (selling of animal feed, services providers (e.g. through miller and mixer, etc.). This would mean working on curriculum development, training of HHS and extension staff and providing incentive (matching grant / access to credit). The project could strengthen the current GAHP groups through promoting more collective actions within and among the groups to make them more capable and informed actors in productions, linking with markets as buyers and sellers at the same time. Block grants will be used to finance business proposals developed by the GAHP groups, with support from TA and/or local facilitators. Capable groups, through using effectively the block grants and available TA, will be able to move up the ladder to join the tier of collaborative groups then cooperatives in a stepwise approach.

b) Helping stakeholders all along the value-chains to establish and consolidate “productive alliances” or “partnerships” (contractual relationship), as win-win mechanisms to ensure inputs and markets availability and competitiveness of prices. This would concern maize and animal feeding producers, inputs suppliers, pigs/poultry producers, middlemen/traders, slaughterhouses and markets. Pertinent lessons from the closed Bank-funded Agriculture Competitiveness Project (ACP) will be drawn, in particular to ensure that incremental steps to collective actions are taken, including developing core organizational, management skills and effective governance arrangements first and ensuring that only best organized groups and cooperatives will be involved in building productive alliances with other suppliers' groups or agri-business companies.

c) Strengthening wet markets' management by involving direct beneficiaries, namely the retailers, in the markets' boards. This would allow addressing better retailers' priorities, negotiating more sustainable utilization fees and developing transparent markets' management procedures. In

addition to pork and poultry meat markets, the AF will support the rehabilitation and improved management of the buffaloes U Market in Nghe An Province. This market gathers about 3,000 buffaloes from the entire country, Lao PDR and Myanmar every six days to be sold for meat or breeding and disseminated in all provinces. The current situation poses a real threat to animal health and the control of animal diseases is almost impossible given the non-existing infrastructure. The support to this important market will clearly contribute to the PDO and is an economically viable investment that will bring important local revenues to the commune and province.

2. Finally, it is also important to deal effectively with dead animal and slaughter waste. This is to introduce and make available effective solutions for all hazards along the operation from farm to consumers for safe meat value chains. LIFSAP and the concerned services of MARD (Department of Livestock Production (DLP) and Department of Animal Health (DAH)) have put in place practical solutions for most critical issues (use of antibiotic or hormones by farmers, disease prevention in farms, animal waste treatment, meat inspection, transport hygiene, etc.). However the aspect of how to handle potentially pathogenic waste (e.g. from dead or culled animals, or from condemned animal by-products) during the slaughter process is not managed in a satisfactory manner.

3. Component B: Strengthening Central-level Livestock and Veterinary Services. Again, the project has already achieved a lot through this component, through successful capacity building and training program (meat inspectors, decentralized staff from DARD, DLP and DAH, etc.), strengthening of the Centre for Testing Livestock Breeds and feeds, development or improvement of key guidelines related to animal diseases surveillance, food safety and good hygiene practices, surveillance protocols and sampling methods, etc., and monitoring of animal diseases prevalence and pathogens/residues in products and effluents.

4. However, to demonstrate its sustainability and transformative nature, this AF should focus on: (i) fully institutionalize the above-mentioned successes, and (ii) put more emphasize on Policy dialogue and reforms. For the latter, the project would benefit in advocating and supporting MARD in strengthening its collaboration with other line Ministries (Environment, Trade, Technology and Science) but also the civil society: national associations of producers, unions of cooperatives, Veterinary Association, etc. Bringing international expertise on some topics would also benefit a lot the project, the MARD and livestock stakeholders.

5. Areas where this Policy Dialogue could have strong impact on project's achievement include: (i) groups and cooperatives (legal framework, rights and duties, curriculum), (ii) national environmental standards and their applicability to rural livestock-producing areas, (iii) national standards on animal feeding and breeding, including their enforcement through strengthening the related laboratory network for testing, (iv) enforcement of the legal framework against illegal slaughtering, including communication and public awareness, capacity building and cooperation between agencies, (v) institutionalizing Food Safety standards through in particular reviewing the veterinary education curriculum to include Food Safety, and (vi) veterinary services and animal health.

6. On the latter, Vietnam already received the evaluation of the Veterinary Services and the sub-subsequent Gap Analysis, as part of the OIE recognized tool Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) Pathway. Results of these analytical works are available to partners and should be used to identify weakness that should be tackled to achieve the PDO. In particular, Vietnam is currently reviewing its Animal Health Legal Framework to make it compliant with international standards. The OIE has already conducted a mission to start helping the country in this initiative. Similarly, there is

no independent “Veterinary Statutory Body” (VSB) in the country and the relations between the public Veterinary Authority and private veterinarians are limited. The Veterinary Association of Vietnam should play a role to reinforce this area. Such an innovative project would facilitate efforts to establish the VSB and to pilot initiatives aiming at delegating some tasks of public good nature to private veterinarians through the so-called “sanitary mandate”. International expertise from the OIE during the extension phase could help the project undertaking this soundly.

7. With the close of the Viet Nam Avian and Human Influenza (VAHIP) in June 2014, to anticipate any future outbreaks this project will include a new sub-component for an emergency response to any trans-boundary or zoonotic diseases affecting pigs and poultry, therefore threatening the project’s ability to achieve its development objective. It is anticipated that this sub-component will have a zero allocation. Following a disease outbreak’s suspicion or confirmed event that may cause a major threat to public health or drop in livestock competitiveness, the Government of Vietnam may request the WB to re-allocate project funds to support early and rapid mitigation, response, control and recovery from this outbreak. This component would draw resources from the unallocated expenditure category and/or allow the GoV to request the WB to re-categorize and reallocate financing from other components to partially cover emergency response and recovery costs. This component could also be used to channel additional funds, should they become available as a result of an eligible emergency. Detailed operational guidelines acceptable to the WB for the implementation of the Contingency Emergency Response sub-component under LIFSAP will be prepared as a disbursement condition. All expenditures under this sub-component, should it be triggered, will be in accordance with paragraph 11 of OP 10.00 of the Investment Project Financing and will be appraised, reviewed and found to be acceptable to the WB before any disbursement is made.

8. Component C: Project Management. Being such an innovative project in the Vietnamese context, international expertise to bring advice and technologies from elsewhere remains crucial. The possibility of extending the working collaboration with ILRI will be investigated to ensure the project’s success and maintain the current high standard of results monitoring and impacts assessment.

9. In addition, the communication strategy would need to be reviewed, updated and maintained to adapt itself to implementation progress, as well as to targeted beneficiaries (GoV, donors and partners, value-chains’ stakeholders and consumers in particular).

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

The proposed project will be implemented in 12 cities and provinces in four geographical production clusters: Thanh Hoa and Nghe An (Central North); Hanoi, Hai Phong, Thai Binh, Hung Yen, and Hai Duong (North); and Cao Bang (Northern Border); and Ho Chi Minh City, Long An, Dong Nai and Lam Dong (South). Ethnic minority people are present in all provinces, especially in Cao Bang (94.2%), Lam Dong (24.1%), Thanh Hoa (17.6%), Nghe An (14.5%) and Dong Nai (75%).

The project's overall socio-environmental impacts are expected to be positive as the objectives and activities are to promote reduction of environmental impact of livestock production, processing and marketing, and to improve food safety in livestock product supply chains. The project invests in some small-scale infrastructures such as the upgrading of wet markets, small slaughterhouses and pilot LPZ. During project implementation, the project would explore different options of technical designs and construction practices for infrastructure upgrades to avoid land acquisition and minimize

social and environmental impacts. There will be relatively minor impacts such as dust, noise, waste and wastewater generation during construction phase. These impacts are small, localized, temporary and manageable through the environmental safeguard instruments of Environmental Management Plan (EMP) or Environmental Codes of Practice (ECOP) to be implemented during the construction phase.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Thu Thi Le Nguyen (GENDR)

Nghi Quy Nguyen (GSURR)

Khang Van Pham (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The overall socio-environmental impacts are expected to be positive as the objective and activities aim to promote the reduction of adverse environmental impacts from livestock production, processing and selling. As the project invests in small-scale infrastructure such as upgrading access road, power lines, water supply or drainage system, livestock waste treatment facility, renovating wet (meat) market, slaughterhouse, there will be relative small impacts such as dust, noise, waste and wastewater generated during construction phase. These impacts are small, temporary, localized and manageable through EMP or ECOP in accordance with OP4.01 or through EPC in accordance with the national regulation. All subprojects under the parent project were prepared with EMP or ECOP or EPC. Implementation of subprojects was followed the EMP/ ECOP/ EPC. Civil contracts included environmental covenants. Monitoring is implemented by PPMU and local authorities and communities.</p> <p>Waste management and environmental sanitation conditions at wet (meat) markets supported under the parent project have been much improved. It was clear that biogas scheme and composting at GAHP households contribute to management of animal solid waste and wastewater.</p> <p>Since there are no physical investments identified during project appraisal, and as the AF aims to extend the GAHPs to additional groups in an expanded geographical areas, and to institutionalize existing best practices within the</p>

		livestock sector, the Environmental Management Framework (with EMP/ECOPs) was updated from the EMF of the parent project to include new regulations of the Government relevant to the project to guide the screening and mitigation of potential impacts from project activities.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	This policy is not triggered. The environmental screening confirmed that the parent project did not trigger this policy. Activities to be financed by the AF will be implemented in lands that are already being used for agriculture or public facilities. The project will not finance any activities that threaten forests or natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	This policy is not triggered. Activities to be financed by the AF will be implemented on lands that are already being used for agriculture or public facilities. The project will not finance any activities that threaten forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project does not finance procurement of any pesticides. Application of the small amount of chemicals, e.g. Chloramine T to disinfection of breeding facilities at GAHP households is in accordance with GoV regulation. In addition, practice of regular clean-up of breeding facilities and application of biological product, e.g. E.M (Effective Microorganisms) to composting at GAHP households much reduce offensive smell and pests, e.g. flies and mosquitoes, and thus to reduce reliance upon chemicals.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	This policy is not triggered. The environmental screening confirmed that the parent project did not trigger this policy. Activities to be financed by the projects will be implemented in lands that are already being used for agriculture or public facilities. There are no physical cultural properties on these lands.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	This policy remains triggered in this additional financing project. The Ethnic Minority Planning Framework (EMPF) prepared under original project is still applicable. Where relevant, the EMPF will serve as guidance to develop EMDPs for all project activities of which location and impact are identified in project implementation.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	This policy remains triggered in this additional financing project. No major resettlement is anticipated, and only limited land acquisition

		would result from project investments in small-scale infrastructure (e.g., access roads, electricity, water and sewage systems) in the LPZs. In the original project, for, slaughterhouse construction, the owner generally purchases required land at market price. The upgrading of wet (meat) market mainly occurs in the existing boundaries of proposed market. MARD will update the resettlement policy framework (RPF). Where relevant, this framework will serve as guidance to develop RPs for all project activities of which location and impact are identified in project implementation.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered. The AF does not involve activities relating to dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy is not triggered. The AF does not involve activities relating to international waterways
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	This policy is not triggered. The project is not located in any disputed areas.

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>Environmental safeguards:</p> <p>The project is classified as an “Environment Category B” under OP/BP 4.01. The project’s overall environmental and social impacts are assessed to be positive. The project aims to increase the production efficiency of household-based livestock producers, to reduce the environmental impact of livestock production, processing and marketing, and to improve food safety in livestock product supply. Negative impacts are assessed to be small, temporary, site-specific, and manageable and can be avoided or minimized through proper design and application of mitigation measures.</p> <p>The infrastructure investment activities supported under the Additional Financing (AF) remain the same. There is no change in PDO and project components. The AF remains triggering two environmental safeguard policies, including OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and OP 4.09 (Pest Management). There is no any specific environmental management plan or ECOP/ EPC prepared during the AF preparation since no new LPZ or wet (meat) markets and slaughterhouses were identified prior to appraisal. MARD updated the EMF reflecting recent changes in the national regulation relevant to the projects. MARD consulted and disclosed the updated EMF locally. It was disclosed in the Bank’s InfoShop prior to appraisal.</p> <p>Under the parent project, the training on GAHP and mitigation measures supported by the project for livestock solid waste and wastewater generation from the LPZ, households and slaughterhouses, wastes from wet markets resulted in increased positive environmental impacts.</p>
--

Pest management: The AF will not finance procurement of any pesticides. However, the AF may involve applicability of small amount of chemicals to disinfection of breeding facilities. Thus, proper use of these chemicals is guided in the updated EMF to avoid causing negative impacts on the environment and human health.

Livestock Production Zone: The revised FS Report on LPZ in Dong Nai province supported under the parent project is acceptable to the Bank. The project will carry out consultation activities during the implementation stage, making sure that all surrounding communities will be consulted and informed of the project evolution. EMP for the LPZ was prepared, consulted with stakeholders and disclosed at the project communes.

Wet Market & Slaughter House: No outstanding environmental safeguard issue. No outstanding social safeguard issues identified as all lands required for these activities are either in the existing boundaries (wet market) or purchased at market price (slaughter house) agreed between concerned parties.

Social

Involuntary Resettlement. The project is expected to have marginal adverse impacts with respect to land acquisition and resettlement. Involuntary resettlement could potentially occur as a result of: (i) land acquisition for small-scale infrastructures; and (ii) transfers of land between farmers, on a less than voluntary basis, to form or consolidate a designated LPZ. It was anticipated that limited level of land acquisition will be entailed as the result of the investment in small scale infrastructures (eg. road, electricity, and water and sewage schemes) in the LPZs and for the meat-market upgrading. Each of the small infrastructures is anticipated to have low-intensive impact.

Indigenous People. Ethnic minority people are present in all provinces, especially in Cao Bang (94.2%), Lam Dong (24.1%), Thanh Hoa (17.6%), Nghe An (14.5%) and Dong Nai (75%). While the proposed LIFSAP is anticipated to have positive impacts on the incomes of ethnic minorities through strengthened household-based producer food chain and livestock production, attention is needed to ensure that ethnic minorities are informed and consulted on the project activities and that they participate and benefit from the project.

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

A potential long term indirect impact to be considered in the project is the safety of humans and the environment when dealing with animals or chemicals during daily livestock production practice (in contact with animal, manure handling or using chemicals for fly or pest control). Mitigation measures to address potential issues during design, construction and operation phases have been included in EMF to minimize these impacts.

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

In addition to the matching grant program to support household farms to build bio-digesters for livestock waste and wastewater treatment facilities, the Project would also consider secondary treatment options through lagoons or fishponds. Recycling of manure would also be carried out under the proposed project.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an

assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) prepared an update EMF, EMDF and RPF during AF preparation.

Environmental safeguard

Environmental Management Framework (EMF). As details of sub-projects are not identified during project appraisal, the EMF of the parent project was updated to guide the AF in screening, assessing and mitigating environmental and social impacts of project activities. An EMF forms part of the feasibility study in accordance with the country's environmental regulations and the World Bank OP/BP 4.01. The EMF requires that activities financed under the AF will not create adverse impacts on the local environment and local communities, and the residual and/or unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated. The framework provides guidelines for: (a) safeguard screening, including a negative list of sub-projects that would be excluded from the menu of eligible sub-projects; (b) impacts assessment and preparation and implementation of mitigation measures, including EMP for complex sub-projects or ECOP for simple, small scale subprojects. The sub-project EMP or ECOP will be included in the bidding and contract documents and will be monitored by supervision engineers; (b) safeguard documentation preparation and clearance; and (c) safeguard implementation, supervision, monitoring, and reporting.

Checklists and samples of environmental management plans have been developed for other small infrastructure to be financed by the AF. These checklists and plans shall form parts of the EPC which is required for small-scale infrastructure. The updated EMF also included specific measures for mitigating potential environmental impacts related to non-structural works under the AF. The mitigation measures such as provision of protective equipment or training on safety rules etc. will be applied as needed.

The parent project has included in its design a matching grant program to design and build livestock waste and wastewater treatment facilities for farms in LPZs and slaughterhouses. The AF will continue with this program. There were 479 environmental protection commitments (EPCs) prepared for the parent project during implementation in line with the EMF, of which 355 EPCs were prepared for wet markets and 124 EPCs were prepared for slaughterhouse. All EPCs were disclosed in project communes. Monitoring plans were conducted by PPMUs in collaboration with DONREs (Department of Natural Resources and Environment) ensuring agreed measures were followed. An EMP for a selected pilot LPZ in Dong Nai was prepared, consulted and disclosed at project commune.

Training on GAHP to households has improved farmers' awareness and resulted in their application of safety measures in livestock production and proper waste treatment and management. Waste management system and hygienic conditions in upgraded wet markets are much improved. Trader's awareness of hygiene and food safety was improved and much raised. Planting green trees has been implemented in some upgraded wet markets where land is available. Wastewater treatment systems supported by the parent project in slaughterhouses are operating well and the quality of wastewater after treated meets required national standard under supervision by provincial DONREs. Biogas scheme and composting supported under the parent projects have contributed to improved management of animal waste at households.

LPZs and slaughterhouses are classified into two categories based scope as specified in MONRE's Decree 29/2011/ND-CP dated April 18, 2011 in order to identify environmental impacts and instrument requirements. The EMF provides detailed guidelines on both screening and classification and on the preparation of environmental assessment documents. LPZ with the scale of 500 cows/buffaloes or more; 1,000 other livestock or more is required to prepare an EIA report. The EIA report is subject to approval by the World Bank. Environmental Protection Commitment (EPC) is required for smaller LPZs.

The AF will not finance a slaughterhouse with the scale of 500 livestock per day or more that would require an EIA. Therefore, EPC is required. The AF will not support any new pilot LPZ.

On pest management, as the AF may involve applicability of small amount of chemicals to disinfection of breeding facilities, the updated EMF has included the guidelines on sustainable use of these chemicals in accordance with (i) law on plant protection and quarantine No.41/2013/QH13; (ii) circular 21/2013/TT-BNNPTNT issues by Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; (iii) circular 25/2011/TT-BYT issued by Ministry of Health; and (iv) circular 15/2009/TT-BNNPTNT issued by Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

For the parent project, application of chemicals to disinfection of breeding facilities is in accordance with GoV regulations. In addition, regular clean-up of breeding facilities and application of biological product of E.M (Effective Microorganisms) to composting much reduce offensive smell and pests, e.g. flies and mosquitoes, and thus to reduce reliance upon chemicals at GAHP households. Such practices will continue with the AF.

Social safeguard

Ethnic Minority Planning Framework (EMPF). The EMPF that was developed in the original project will be updated and applied to AF phase. The updated EMPF will be applied and where ethnic minorities are present, subprojects social assessments will be undertaken and EMDPs prepared. This instrument will be conformed to the OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples, ensuring that the development of subprojects fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and culture of affected ethnic minority peoples. The implementing agencies must be able to demonstrate that it has obtained broad community support for the subproject through a process of free, prior, and informed consultations with the affected ethnic minority communities. In this regard, the EMPF sets out guidelines to: (a) ensure that the ethnic minority peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate; (b) avoid potentially adverse effects on the ethnic minority communities; and (c) when such adverse impacts cannot be avoided, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects. The framework covers guidance on (i) preliminary screening; (ii) social assessment; (iii) preparation of EMDP; (iv) implementing arrangement; (v) Estimated budget; and (vi) Monitoring and Evaluation. In original project, PCU and PPMUs have done a good performance in implementing OP 4.10 Indigenous People. Supporting activities to ethnic minorities communities have been developed and/or mainstreamed in project activities in Cao Bang, Lam Dong and Dong Nai. The objective is to ensure an equitable access to project benefits among ethnic minority groups compared to others. Specific activities may include additional training on GAHP; support for upgrading farms and equipment, consultation with ethnic minority people.

Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). The RPF that was developed in the original project will be updated and applied to AF phase. This updated RPF, in accordance to OP 4.12 Involuntary

Resettlement, lays down the principles and objectives, eligibility criteria of displaced persons, modes of compensation and rehabilitation, participation features and grievance procedures that will guide the compensation and potential resettlement of these persons. It further describes the planning and documentation requirements for such activities under the project. Under original project, as the project's activities involves no land acquisition, so there is no Resettlement Plan prepared in implementation. First, the upgrading of 331 wet markets occurred in its existing boundaries. PCU and PPMUs have developed transitional plan to minimize impact/disturbance over existing sellers in the market. Regarding the pilot LPZ in Dong Nai where the project may finance some small rural infrastructure (electricity, rural road...), affected people have decided to donate their land given the impact is minor and the potential benefit of these small infrastructures. Second, in the list of 51 slaughterhouses supported by the project, none of them requires additional land acquisition. In some case, the owner has to buy the new land for their new slaughterhouse. The transaction was made based on the agreement between land owner and slaughterhouse owner. The transaction cost was generally reflected the market level.

Borrower capacity. Form the environmental and social perspective, the current arrangement at PCU of MARD is adequate with dedicated consultant covering all environmental and social issues under this project (including environmental and social safeguard). Assigned staff of PCU and PPMUs have relatively good understanding about the WB environmental and social safeguard policies through the experience gained in original credit, as well as other Bank funded projects. The implementing agencies were able to establish a well-defined social safeguard M&E system that will continuously be the main pattern for tracking, documenting, and reporting performance of environmental and social safeguard in AF project. A full guideline on M&E was included in the included in the Project Operation Manual.

At provincial level, technical staff at DONRE/DARD has been assigned to take part in environmental capacity building, monitoring and management activities. Adequate budget has been allocated for the implementation of the environmental activities, mitigation measures and monitoring.

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

In addition to PCU of MARD, PPMUs in project provinces, local authorities, local communities, and concerned households are responsible to comply with the project's frameworks. Public consultationson and disclosure of these instruments were carried during project preparation, especially during October 2014. Consultation with people and households affected by the project, local authorities, and mass organizations will be been conducted at the subproject level. Prior to project appraisal, all safeguard documents have been disclosed in Vietnamese at the Vietnam Development Information Center, project provinces, and at the Bank's InfoShop (in English) in Washington, DC.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Nov-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	

"In country" Disclosure	
Vietnam	28-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Nov-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Vietnam	28-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Nov-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Vietnam	28-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Nov-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Vietnam	28-Nov-2014
<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 4.09 - Pest Management		
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

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 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	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 []
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 [X] No [] NA []
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [X] No [] NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Son Thanh Vo	
Approved By		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Nathan M. Belete (PMGR)	Date: 17-Dec-2014