

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: 84795

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 8 February 2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	West Bank and Gaza	Project ID:	P121648
Project Name:	Gaza Solid Waste Management Project (P121648)		
Task Team Leader:	Ibrahim Khalil Dajani		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	18 June 2012	Estimated Board Date:	31-March-2014
Managing Unit:	MNSSD	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector:	Solid waste management (92%), Sub-national government administration (8%)		
Theme:	Pollution management and environmental health (69%), Municipal governance and institution building (21%), Other urban development (10%)		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			2.10
France (French Agency for Development)			13.64
European Commission			6.48
Special Financing			10.00
Sweden, Government of			0.64
UNDP-DEEP			1.60
Islamic Development Fund /UNRWA			0.80
Financing Gap			0.00
Total			35.26
Environmental Category:	A - Full Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Objectives

The objective of this Project is to improve solid waste management services in the Gaza Strip.

3. Project Description

A. Project Components

The project would consist of the following components:

- Component 1: Solid Waste Transfer and Disposal Facilities. This component would finance: (a) construction of a new sanitary landfill; (b) construction of two transfer stations; (c) provision of operational equipment for the sanitary landfill and two transfer stations; (d) access roads to landfill and transfer stations; (e) sanitary closure of existing dump site; (f) Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP) implementation; and (g) land acquisition for the first stage development of Al-Fukhari (Sofa) landfill and transfer stations.
- Component 2: Institutional Strengthening. This component would finance: (a) capacity-building for the Joint Services Council for Khan Younis, Rafah and Middle Area Governorates and Technical Operations Unit (TOU); (b)

capacity-building for participating municipalities; and (c) public awareness campaigns. Capacity-building would include infrastructure support (provision of essential office furniture and equipment), as well as capacity-building for board members of the TOU.

3. Component 3: Primary Collection and Resource Recovery. This component would finance: (a) studies to optimize primary collection services in the Gaza Strip; (b) the supply of waste collection equipment; (c) studies for waste recovery; and (d) pilot investments for recycling and composting.

4. Component 4: Project Management. This component would finance: (a) MDLF's administrative fees and establishment of a Project Development and Safeguards Unit (PDSU) to manage project implementation; (b) consultants for construction supervision and contract management; (c) operational and maintenance of the landfill and transfer stations; and (d) other independent consultancies, including independent monitoring of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), Beneficiary Assessments, Landfill Design Review and Value Engineering, etc.

5. A contingency fund of about US\$4.41 million has been allocated from AFD, EU and the WB for project activities.

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

The project will be implemented in the middle and southern Gaza Strip. The specific location of the new sanitary landfill is near Al-Fukhari (Sofa), Rafah Governorate. As for the transfer stations the locations are in Deir El-Balah and in Rafah municipalities.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Dariusz Kobus, Senior Environmental Consultant (MNSSU)

Nina Bhatt, Lead Social Development Specialist (MNSSU)

6.Last modified by		
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project is classified Environmental Category "A" in accordance with World Bank Operational Policy 4.01, "Environmental Assessment," as it is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts that can be adequately mitigated that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented. A full environmental impact assessment has been carried out as part of project preparation to ensure the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of the landfill cells take into account the mitigation measures and adequate budget is included in the capital and operational budgets. The Project will benefit from the experience in the West Bank where a Bank-financed project for the construction of a sanitary landfill facility and a transfer station to service the northern areas of the West Bank (commonly referred to as the Jenin project) which has proven to be a successful operation since project completion and start of operations in July of 2009. The proposed landfill facility would be located in the southern part of Gaza where there is more vacant land that would meet the Bank and EQA siting criteria of more than 500 meters from populated areas and, in the particular case of Gaza, located outside the security zone self-imposed by Israel along its border with the GS. The site is underlain by fresh water aquifers, but the nearest well field is more than 2,000 meters away and it is not under the direct influence of the Sofa aquifer. The ESIA reported that this aquifer is of low vulnerability to pollution. It should be noted, however, that the ground water aquifers constitute the main source of drinking and irrigation water for southern Gaza Strip. Therefore, the project, is being designed for "zero" leachate and drainage discharge into the

		ground and surface water resources. Environmental impact would also result in the vicinity to the proposed landfill site from the increased traffic of solid waste disposal trucks from the various communities in middle and southern GS. The feasibility study, however, did study and recommended improvements to the main access roads that would be used by all vehicular traffic to mitigate the impact on the roads users. The ESIA outlines the environmental impacts of closure and rehabilitation of disposal sites. These include impacts of landfill gas, leachate, and landscape. The ESIA also outlines the monitoring and mitigation procedures for these impacts. It describes a list of monitoring activities necessary for the closure of the sanitary landfill, which is beyond the scope of what is applicable for the closure of a dumpsite. The environmental impacts (also mitigation measures and monitoring) of pilot investments under C3 including physical works associated with recycling and composting are described in the ESIA.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The ESIA reported that there are no natural habitats at and in the vicinity of project sites for LF and TS, and the LF site is devoid of any vegetation.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The contracts will include provisions for chance find. However, during the feasibility study phase, efforts were made to gather information on sites of cultural heritage value and none were identified. A letter has been issued from the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities confirming that the proposed site at Al-Fukhari (Sofa) has no apparent archaeological value therefore the Ministry has no objection to the proposed project being built on this site.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	Based on ESIA results and field site visits, there are no people living on the proposed project site. The Bank's Indigenous Peoples Policy does not apply.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The Bank's Operational Policy OP 4.12 applies to both the direct social impacts pertaining to the waste pickers at the Sofa landfill as well as to the families impacted through the land requirements of the project for Sofa. Specifically, OP 4.12 related impacts are as follows: Waste-Pickers Results from the ESIA and abbreviated resettlement action plan (ARAP) shows that the informal waste pickers identified as working at the Sofa dumpsite will experience significant negative impact on their income streams. Some of the anticipated risks include increased impoverishment, inability to transfer to alternative livelihood streams, and potential strife that could result among these project affected people if appropriate mitigation measures are not in place. The ESIA and ARAP census indicates a total of 18 waste pickers will be impacted of which 11 consider scavenging as their primary source of income. Consultations with the affected waste picker population based on the ESIA and ARAP indicates that the most sustainable and appropriate compensation measure is

		<p>the provision of an alternative and sustainable source of income. Towards seeking tested and sustainable solutions for maintaining, if not augmenting, the livelihoods of the waste pickers, the Bank identified collaboration with the UNDP sponsored Deprived families Economic Empowerment Program (DEEP) which has long standing experience with developing livelihoods programs for vulnerable populations, including in the Gaza Strip. The DEEP Program would focus on the 18 waste pickers and their families as their unit of analysis for developing livelihoods approaches that benefit the household as a whole and which draws on the skills mix of various household members – beyond the individual waste pickers. A commitment letter has been made available by the UNDP Special Representative to support the waste pickers at the Sofa dumpsite who have been identified in the waste picker ARAP.</p> <p>Sofa Land Acquisition The second major impact under OP 4.12 pertains to the land requirements for the Sofa landfill. The current landfill area is approx. 26.64 dunums and is owned by the Rafah municipality. The Feasibility Study recommended an extension of 472 dunums to the existing landfill but since some of the cells (4 and 5) will not be implemented before year 2027, it is expected that the land acquisition needs for this stage of the project is 215 dunums.</p> <p>ESIA and ARAP findings during early project preparation indicate that the affected lands are not of high value due to a number of factors including: a) proximity of these lands to the Israeli border (heightened security threat and restricted land use – within the 1,000 meter security buffer zone unilaterally declared by Israel); b) the land is not particularly arable; c) a key source of income (olive groves) got destroyed during the 2008 conflict; and d) the land is adjacent to a 17 year old dumpsite owned and used by the Rafah Municipality and is also adjacent to a planned wastewater treatment site to be financed by the Islamic Development Bank. There are no households, structures or any other form of asset on site.</p> <p>To address the impact of land acquisition, an ARAP has been prepared covering a total of 70 landowners belonging to five main families. ESIA and ARAP consultations indicated that some of landowners would voluntarily engage in a willing-buyer, willing-seller transaction thus the preparation of the ARAP does not preclude such transaction.</p> <p>The mechanisms for addressing project level grievances are defined in both the waste picker and land owner ARAPs which were translated and disclosed initially in February and March 2012 with subsequent updates and re-disclosures.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	
---------------------------------------	----	--

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>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>The main environmental safeguards issue would be the potential pollution of ground water resources from landfill leachate. However, the landfill is being designed for “zero” discharge as the cells will be provided with sealing base and under drainage system for collection of leachate and disposal at an on-site evaporation pond also designed for “zero” discharge and leakage. Monitoring wells will also be built around land fill cells to enable periodic monitoring of the ground water quality and to verify whether there are any leaks from the cells for immediate location and repair. For impacts under OP 4.12, the proposed Sofa landfill will need to acquire lands using either the principle of eminent domain or through a willing-buyer, willing-seller transaction. An ARAP has been prepared to meet the requirements under the Bank’s policy. In addition, a total of 18 waste pickers have been identified as operating in the Sofa landfill site. A separate ARAP has been prepared to address the livelihoods’ impacts experienced by the waste pickers. While the magnitude of the social impacts are not large or irreversible, attention to potential sensitivities around land acquisition as well as ensuring waste pickers have sustainable livelihoods options have been issues that merited attention.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p> <p>The ESIA identified indirect socio-economic impacts resulting from the proposed project because of the increased cost of managing disposal of municipal refuse, which may be above what most people in the GS may be able to afford due to the high incidence of poverty and unemployment.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p> <p>The feasibility study and the ESIA reported that there are no other viable alternatives to minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>The Municipal Development and Lending Fund (MDLF), the project implementing agency, has experience in managing Bank and donor funded programs in the West Bank and Gaza and will also employ qualified staff for the Project Development Support Unit (PDSU) based in Gaza. Also, the JSC-KRM TOU that would assume ownership of the new facilities would be strengthened with qualified staff to manage safeguard policy issues associated with the operation and decommissioning of facilities constructed under the proposed project.</p>
<p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p> <p>The ESIA identified community representatives, local and central governments representatives, NGOs, private sector enterprises, universities and professional associations, as well as land owners and waste pickers for public and focused groups and individual consultations to discuss the proposed project and the potential impacts. Consultations with directly affected parties (land owners and waste pickers) as well as the broader beneficiary population were carried out during the ESIA, ARAP preparation process. Consultations addressed issues of project benefits, land requirements, compensation amounts, and options for alternative livelihoods programs. There has been extensive dialogue between the JSC-KRM and landowners. JSC has made notable outreach to the affected population which has been documented and has also been attentive to wide outreach with CSOs including also meeting with human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the Gaza Strip to discuss project objectives.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	19-Jan-2012
Date of "in-country" disclosure	19-Jan-2012
Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Jan-2012
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	26-Feb-2012
Date of "in-country" disclosure	01-Mar-2012
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Feb-2012
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:	
N/A	

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?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) 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/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement			
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
All Safeguard Policies			
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Ibrahim Khalil Dajani	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Name: Maged Hamed	Date: January 16, 2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Franck Bousquet	Date: February 13, 2014