



## Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet Appraisal Stage

Appraisal Stage | Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 18-Dec-2017 | Report No: ISDSA23950

Regional Vice President:	Cyril E Muller
Country Director:	Satu Kristiina J. Kahkonen
Senior Global Practice Director:	Michal J. Rutkowski
Practice Manager/Manager:	Cem Mete
Task Team Leader:	Yuliya Smolyar



**Note to Task Teams:** The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

## I. BASIC INFORMATION

### 1. BASIC PROJECT DATA

Project ID	Project Name
P165346	JSDF: Community-based Social Service Delivery Project
Task Team Leader(s)	Country
Yuliya Smolyar	Ukraine
Approval Date	Environmental Category
30-Apr-2018	Partial Assessment
Managing Unit	Is this a Repeater project?
GSP03	No

### PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

#### SUMMARY

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	2.85
<b>Total Financing</b>	2.85
<b>Financing Gap</b>	0.00

#### DETAILS

##### Non-World Bank Group Financing

Trust Funds	2.85
Japan Social Development Fund	2.85

### 2. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

Project Development Objective

To improve access of the vulnerable people to social protection services in selected communities.



**Note to Task Teams:** End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

### 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Component 1. Development of Social Protection Services Delivery Capacity (US\$680,000) would finance technical assistance, provision of training and goods required to develop capacities of community governments and service providers to plan, manage and deliver services. The component would assist the governments in 30 participating communities to carry out participatory needs assessment, to identify access barriers and to develop three-year service development plans to address the coverage gaps. The project would work with the social protection units in the community governments who would receive technical support and basic equipment to develop their institutional capacity to plan and manage service provision. Then the proposed project would train the staff of those units and other relevant stakeholders to prepare applications for social protection services micro-projects drawing on the service development plans. Furthermore, this component would finance training of existing or potential community service providers to enhance their ability to deliver social care services at expected level of standards. Through such a training, potential service providers from among the CSOs would be able to better understand their role in providing services, the accreditation requirements and mechanism of contracting out services from nongovernment actors, the standards of service delivery, reporting, and monitoring, etc.

Component 2. Social Protection Services Micro-projects (US\$1,658,000). This component would invest in community-based social protection services micro-projects to improve coverage by the services of vulnerable groups identified through participatory needs assessments under Component 1 above. Such micro-projects might include home delivery programs for the elderly, youth centers, daycare centers for the disabled or children, nursing etc. Ten communities would be selected to implement the micro-projects.

The project funds of up to UD\$140,000 would be allocated for each micro-project to finance minor civil works, goods, consultants' services, and service-specific training. The local governments would be responsible for implementation of the micro-projects. Under the micro-projects, they would be able to finance improvement of services of the public providers as well as to purchase services from non-public providers. Allocations of funds to specific types of services, service providers and client groups would be guided by social needs assessments and service delivery plans developed under Component 1 above. No contributions are expected from local governments; however, they would be required to cover 100 percent of recurrent cost of the service to operate for at least three years after the micro-project implementation.

Component 3. Project Management and Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Dissemination (US\$512,000) would consist of the following sub-components:

3.1 Project Management and Administration would help to expand the USIF's operational capacity to manage project activities and assist communities and local governments to comply with technical, fiduciary, safeguards and other implementation requirements.

3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). The proposed project would use the existing USIF Management Information System (MIS). In addition, the project would finance beneficiary assessments (baseline, mid-term and final) to inform achievement of project outcomes.



3.3 Knowledge Dissemination would support activities to document examples of successful community initiatives such that they could inform national policies as well as to disseminate them amongst non-participating communities through publications, events, etc.

**Note to Task Teams:** The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

#### 4. PROJECT LOCATION AND SALIENT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS RELEVANT TO THE SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS (IF KNOWN)

The proposed project would be implemented in 30 communities of two oblasts of Ukraine (see lists below). Small-scale civil works might be performed in 10 of these communities to be selected at project implementation. Therefore, the salient physical characteristics of the specific sites relevant to the safeguards analysis are currently unknown. Odesa oblast: Velykomykhailivska village community, Baltska town community, Bilyayivska town community, Rozkvitivska village community, Chervonoarmiyska community, Konoplianska village community, Shyriayevska village community, Yaskivska village community, Berezivska town community, Mayakivska village community, Vylkivska town community, Tzebrykivska village community and Znamjanska village community. Ternopil oblast: Skala – Podilska village community, Melnytse – Podilska village community, Ozerianska village community, Borshchivska town community, Bilche-Zolotetska village community, Kolodnenska village community, Chernykhivetska village community, Vyshnivetska village community, Ozernianska village community, Zalozetska village community, Kozlivska village community, Pochayivska town community, Lopushnenska village community, Shumska town community, Velykodederkalska village community, Zborivska town community and Saranchukivska village community. The above mentioned locations are not close to the conflict area and there is no significant presence of IDPs. Therefore the risk associated with the conflict is not significant.

#### 5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SPECIALISTS ON THE TEAM

Arcadii Capcelea, Environmental Safeguards Specialist  
Mariia Nikitova, Social Safeguards Specialist

#### 6. SAFEGUARD POLICIES TRIGGERED

Safeguard Policies	Triggered	Explanation
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed project does not envisage extensive civil works involving new constructions and thus does not raise any significant adverse environment concerns. The potentially adverse environmental impacts are mainly associated with civil works during micro-projects` implementation, and include, inter alia, dust, noise, small-scale soil and



water pollution, generation of waste materials, waste disposal, and damage to soil and vegetation by excavation works. The impacts are minor and can be prevented or minimized through appropriate preventive actions and mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed project is classified as Environmental Category 'B', requiring a partial environmental assessment. Since micro-projects are not pre-identified and would be determined in course of project implementation by applicant communities through intensive participatory process, a project-level Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) would apply that would establish screening mechanisms and govern the process of development and implementation of specific mitigation plans. The ESMF have been discussed with stakeholders and publicly disclosed and consulted in April 2018. Site-specific ESMP/ ESMP Checklists (ESMP/ESMP-CLs) would be prepared for micro-projects as needed. Requirements of the project-level ESMF and site-specific ESMP/ESMP-CLs would be part of USIF Operational Manual.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project does not involve activities related to conversion or degradation of natural habitats. No potential adverse impacts on natural habitats are expected.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project does not consider any changes to forests or any works in forests as defined by the policy.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project does not involve pest management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project is not expected to have impacts on physical cultural resources. No activities are planned in the vicinity of a physical cultural resources sites.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no groups in Ukraine who display characteristics of indigenous peoples.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	Any sub-projects that may require land acquisition, physical displacement, or result in any issues associated with involuntary resettlement (that would require application of the World Bank Operational Policy (OP) 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement) will not be eligible for financing under the scope of this project. The implementing entity will be screening the sub-projects accordingly. The ESMP and OM will detail how sub-



		projects will be screened to ensure these aspects are reflected. Project will not seek any forms of voluntary donations of land from the community.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance the construction of new, or rehabilitation of existing dams. No project investments will rely on the performance of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project will not support activities that affect international waterways, as defined by the policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project will not be implemented in disputed areas as defined in the policy.

## II. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

### A. SUMMARY OF KEY SAFEGUARD ISSUES

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the Restructured project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts.

The proposed project does not raise any significant adverse environment concerns. The potentially adverse environmental impacts are mainly associated with small-scale civil works during micro-projects` implementation. These potential negative environmental impacts trigger the Operational Policy OP 4.01. The impacts are minor and can be prevented or minimized through appropriate preventive actions and mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed project is classified as Environmental Category `B`, requiring a partial environmental assessment. Since micro-projects are not pre-identified and would be determined in course of project implementation by communities through intensive participatory process, a project-level Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) would apply that would establish screening mechanisms and govern the process of development and implementation of specific mitigation plans.

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

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

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.

At appraisal, the World Bank team discussed and agreed with USIF the ESMF document. After public discussions and finalization, the ESMF would be included into USIF OM to guide micro-project activities. Once micro-projects are identified, they would be screened by the USIF and ESMP/ESMP-CL would be developed for them. These documents would be consulted in local communities. Final versions of these documents would become an integral part of civil contracts for micro-projects.



The USIF built some capacity for applying environmental safeguards under the previous Bank-funded project. However, the safeguards practices of the agency have been outdated. USIF would engage a Safeguards Consultant to deliver training and to support its staff working in the field. Moreover, since community governments are likely to have low safeguards capacity, USIF’s Environmental Consultant and field staff would work with the governments in the communities who will implement micro-projects to help manage their safeguards responsibilities under ESMF. The safeguards staff in the World Bank’s task team would support USIF via training and continuous consultations. The team would carry out supervision of environmental and social impacts and adequacy of mitigation activities.

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

**B. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS**

**Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other**

Date of receipt by the Bank  
13-Apr-2018

Date of submission for disclosure  
16-Apr-2018

For Category ‘A’ projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors

“In country” Disclosure

Country  
Ukraine

Date of Disclosure  
30-Mar-2018

Comments

The ESMF document has been disclosed through the web-sites of USIF and Odesa and Ternopil regional administrations for public discussions. The document has been finalized upon completion of the discussions.

**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?

No



Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?	Yes
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

**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

**III. APPROVALS**

Task Team Leader(s)	Yuliya Smolyar	
<b>Approved By</b>		
Safeguards Advisor		
Practice Manager/Manager	Cem Mete	01-May-2018

**Note to Task Teams:** End of system generated content