

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)  
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA13982

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 27-Oct-2016

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Haiti	<b>Project ID:</b>	P156049
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P120895
<b>Project Name:</b>	Second Additional Financing Infra & Instit Emergency Recovery (P156049)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Infrastructure & Institutions Emergency Recovery (P120895)		
<b>Region:</b>	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	06-Apr-2016	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	10-Nov-2016
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Transport & ICT	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Borrower(s):</b>	Ministry of Finance and Economy		
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications, Unité Centrale d'Exécution		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
	<b>Financing Source</b>		<b>Amount</b>
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT		0.00
	IDA Grant		2.80
	Total Project Cost		2.80
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	A - Full Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**B. Introduction and Context**

## **Country Context**

Haiti's geography, people, and history provide it with many opportunities. The third largest Caribbean nation by area and population (10.4 million), Haiti shares the island of Hispaniola with the Dominican Republic. In addition to an illustrious early history, as the first independent nation in the region and the first nation in the world to be led to independence by former slaves, Haiti benefits from proximity and access to major markets, a young labor force, a dynamic diaspora, and substantial geographic, historical, and cultural assets. The country possesses untapped markets and a pent-up demand for the private sector to explore, including agribusiness, light manufacturing, and tourism.

However, almost 60 percent of Haiti's population, or 6.3 million people, remain poor, and 24 percent or 2.5 million, extremely poor, with poverty highest in rural areas. The poorest regions, which are also the furthest from the capital, show extreme poverty rates exceeding 40 percent and very limited access to basic services. Like poverty, inequality is high with a Gini of 0.6 (highest in the Americas).

On January 12, 2010, a catastrophic earthquake of magnitude 7.0 struck 25 kilometers west of Port-au-Prince, Haiti's capital. The earthquake killed 220,000 people and displaced 1.5 million. It resulted in damages and losses of US\$7.9 billion (120 percent of GDP) and of US\$11.3 billion in estimated reconstruction needs. The disaster compounded Haiti's many preexisting development challenges, increasing poverty and vulnerability, threatening livelihoods, and hampering already weak service delivery and human development outcomes. The disaster also exacerbated Haiti's underlying socio-economic drivers of poverty, such as social divisions and inequity, fragility of political mechanisms, the government's weak capacity, risks of political instability and persistent volatility. Compounding these challenges, cholera broke out in October 2010, sickening over 800,000 people and killing over 9,000 to date.

Though criticized for delays and insufficiency, post-earthquake reconstruction efforts have delivered visible results. In the aftermath of the disaster, Government, Partners and private actors together made considerable headway toward reconstruction, investing approximately US\$3 billion in Official Development Assistance (ODA) and much more from private flows. Over a million people have left tent camps for more permanent housing. Collapsed infrastructure and many affected neighborhoods have been rebuilt, education services have been re-established and extended, deaths from cholera driven down to below 1 percent of cases (though resurgences of the disease remain), numerous safety net programs have been financed, and short-term employment generated for thousands, particularly in the capital. The 2015 Poverty Assessment undertaken jointly by the Government and the World Bank shows that the percentage of extremely poor Haitians (those who cannot fulfill their nutritional needs ) fell from 31 percent to 24 percent between 2000 and 2012, with the drop being mostly urban and the largest drop witnessed in the capital.

## **Sectoral and institutional Context**

The January 2010 earthquake further deepened the existing governance challenges by severely diminishing already weak government capacity. Countries that have experienced major natural disasters need assistance to restore the main functions of the State. Institution building is a gradual and difficult process and a precondition for lasting change in Haiti. It can only be achieved with strong and sustained commitment from Government and donors. Despite demonstrating improvements in economic governance in the last several years, weaknesses in

public sector management remain and hamper sustained economic growth and poverty reduction.

Public Financial Management (PFM) capacity has been severely undermined following the 2010 earthquake. Before the disaster, and with donors' assistance, the country was trying to overcome serious shortcomings in PFM, including lack of transparency and accountability in the management of public resources, and limited institutional and organizational capacity. After the quake, government efforts supplemented by donors support, especially from the Bank, helped in restoring key financial management functions, and thereafter in forging the building blocks for sustained PFM institutional development. In that regard, the government has devised and adopted a Public Financial Management Reforms Action Plan (PFMRAP) in May 2014, which includes six main areas related to budget management, treasury management, external controls, revenue mobilization, financial decentralization, and financial information systems. In December 2014, with Bank support, the government also completed a review of the Public Investment Management (PIM) system, and endorsed a PIM Action Plan (PIMAP) organized around 10 measures to strengthen public investment planning, programming, budgeting, execution and monitoring in the upcoming three years. Implementation of the PFMRAP and PIMAP is underway under the GoH leadership and coordination.

The proposed AF would continue to support the implementation of the PFMRAP and PIMAP implementation, building institutional capacity and public financial management systems to improve public expenditures planning, budgeting, tracking, accounting and reporting; public procurement; investment planning; controls in the use of public resources; and by establishing a culture of transparency and accountability that aims to reduce corruption.

## **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

### **Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

The Project Development Objective is to support the Recipient in its early sustainable recovery efforts from the effects of the Emergency, through selected interventions aiming at contributing to rebuilding key institutions and infrastructure

### **Current Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

The Revised PDO is to support the Recipient in its sustainable recovery efforts from the effects of the Emergency, through selected interventions aiming to rebuilding key institutions and infrastructure.

### **Key Results**

The Parent Project and first AF assisted the government in achieving the full re-establishment (through relocation and physical structure rehabilitation), and thereafter operationalization (through provision of goods, equipment and technical assistance) of key government financial institutions. In May 2014, with support from the first AF, the government also prepared and adopted two new Action Plans (Public Financial Management Reforms Action Plan (PFMRAP) and Public Investment Management (PIM) system, and endorsed a PIM Action Plan (PIMAP)) which address Procurement and Financial Management (PFM) reforms in a more strategic and coordinated approach. This AF would ensure the implementation of key PFM reforms activities set out in the Action Plan agreed upon with the government, which are well aligned with the activities identified in the scope of the first AF.

## **D. Project Description**

The achievement of the PDO is supported by the following project components:

Parent Project:

Component 1 – Restoring Key Economic and Financial Functions of the Recipient: Providing support pertinent to: (a) enable the reinstatement of MEF’s basic functions, such as, inter alia, budget formulation, execution and reporting; and (b) carry out activities to assist in fully re-establishing, including through relocation or physical structure rehabilitation, and thereafter operationalizing, through, inter alia, provision of goods and equipment and technical assistance, key financial management, control and expenditure institutions of the Recipient.

Component 2 – Emergency Rehabilitation of Selected Public Infrastructure: Supporting: (a) rehabilitation or reconstruction activities of key institutional and transport infrastructure through the piloting of sound social and environmental practices; and all related studies and supervision activities; (b) strategic studies related, inter alia, to infrastructure reconstruction based on specific infrastructure designs intended to increase the resilience of rebuilt infrastructure.

Component 3 – Institutional Support, Reconstruction Planning and Project Management: Providing support to: (a) restore the functioning capacity of key institutions of the Recipient’s crisis governance framework; (b) carry out planning activities for the short, medium and long-term reconstruction phases; (c) carry out institutional strengthening activities; (d) finance Project management activities; (e) establish and operate an engineering clearinghouse in MTPTEC to manage the technical knowledge deriving from assessments carried out by national and international institutions and thereafter to disseminate good engineering practices and innovative solutions; and (f) assist the Recipient with preliminary basic recovery activities.

First Additional Financing:

The following components represent the expanded and additional activities under the first AF, which were added to the Parent Project:

Component 1 – Restoring Key Economic and Financial Functions of the Recipient: This public sector and governance component would utilize additional financing to provide support pertinent to, inter alia: (i) strengthen accountability and efficiency of the Recipient through the strengthening of public financial management systems, including, inter alia, budget preparation, execution, monitoring and control, revenue mobilization capacity; public accounting; and supporting internal and external audit of government expenditures; (ii); strengthen transparency and participation capacity, including, inter alia, access to information and support for anticorruption activities of the ULCC; (iii) reinforce equity and responsibility, including inter alia, supporting the modernization of the Recipient’s procurement systems and administrative process, and (iv) strengthen the governance and institutional capacity of the Recipient by, inter alia, carrying out studies or conducting training activities on the following areas: public investment, minerals extraction, energy and commerce.

Component 2 – Emergency Rehabilitation of Selected Public Infrastructure: Additional financing under this component would be used to provide support pertinent to, inter alia: (i) the acquisition

of aviation safety equipment and the provision of related trainings and installation works at the Port-au-Prince Toussaint Louverture International Airport, including, inter alia, communications, air navigation, and lighting equipments; (ii) finance the operation of the debris processing facility located in Truitier, Port-au-Prince, to ensure continuity of ongoing debris removal activities and finance selected works (such as installing weight truck station, solar lighting, and offices) and the acquisition of equipment to improve management of the site, including inter alia, preparation works to install a truck weigh station, solar lighting, fences, safety equipment, and construction of new offices, and; and (iii) rehabilitate the following existing roads : (a) the road between Cap Haitien and Labadie, and (b) the road between Milot and Cap Haitien.

Component 3: Institutional Support, Reconstruction Planning and Project Management. The proposed additional financing would involve the provision of support to the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (MTPTEC) to continue, inter alia: (i) restore the functioning capacity of key institutions of the Recipient's crisis governance framework; (ii) carry out planning activities for the short, medium and long-term reconstruction phases; (iii) carry out institutional strengthening activities to include, inter alia: finance training, reconstruction urban planning, capacity building in project management, construction supervision, quality assurance, monitoring and reporting, procurement support, and safeguards compliance and streamlining; (iv) finance Project management activities; (v) establish and operate an engineering clearinghouse in MTPTEC to manage the technical knowledge deriving from assessments carried out in the Recipient's territory by national and international institutions and thereafter to disseminate good engineering practices and innovative solutions; (vi) assist the Recipient with preliminary basic recovery activities essential to mitigate the Emergency and prepare for restoration activities considered under this Financing; (vii) finance the provision of technical assistance, the rehabilitation and construction of the MTPTEC offices, and the acquisition of equipment and software for MTPTEC key services; and (viii) provide technical assistance, training and equipment to manage the Recipient's geographic information system and database.

#### Second Additional Financing and Restructuring:

The following components represent the expanded and revised activities under the proposed second AF, which would be added to the Parent Project and first AF:

Component 1 – Restoring Key Economic and Financial Functions of the Recipient: Under this component, some activities initiated with the parent project, including the WIMAX backup of the Central Bank payment network set-up activity and the EDH financial statements preparation and audit, would be dropped. The available resources released from these discontinued activities (around US\$2 million) and the residual envelope from the first AF (US\$1.6 million) would be mobilized to finance activities related to the implementation of the PFM RAP and PIMAP. In addition to supplementing funding for cost overruns for the customs building contract, and ongoing project activities that are already well aligned with the six priority areas set out in the PFM RAP, the proposed second AF and restructuring will enable the project to finance additional PFM RAP and PIMAP reform needs, such as: (i) public investment management planning, programming, budgeting, execution and monitoring; (ii) progressive introduction of an updated and more integrated financial management information system in line with the IT Roadmap adopted by the government in 2013 and supported by various donors (United States Agency for International Development (USAID); European Union (EU); and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB); and (iii) PFM RAP and PIMAP reforms coordination and management. Annex 3

details how these new activities were selected and how all project activities are re-aligned to support PFM RAP and PIMAP implementation moving forward.

Component 2 – Emergency Rehabilitation of Selected Public Infrastructure: The proposed restructuring would also involve changes to activities under Component 2. Activities under Sub-Component 2.1 – Rehabilitation of Aviation Safety Equipment of the first AF would be dropped from the project due to shifting government priorities and use of national funding for these activities. Additionally, in subcomponent 2.3, the remaining funds would be used to finance the ongoing rehabilitation of the Road from Cap Haitian to Labadie, as originally planned. The works for the rehabilitation of the road between Milot and Cap Haitian would be limited to spot interventions in the urban area of Milot instead of a full rehabilitation, as the rehabilitation of the main segment of the road would be performed by the GoH with national budget resources.

Component 3 – Institutional Support, Reconstruction Planning and Project Management: No change.

**Component Name**

Component 1: Restoring Key Economic and Financial Functions of the Recipient

**Comments (optional)**

**Component Name**

Component 2: Emergency Rehabilitation of Selected Public Infrastructure:

**Comments (optional)**

**Component Name**

Component 3: Institutional Support, Reconstruction Planning and Project Management

**Comments (optional)**

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

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Asli Gurkan (GSU04)

Felipe Jacome (GWA04)

**II. Implementation**

**Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

The proposed second AF and Restructuring would not entail any change to the project development objective or its institutional and implementation arrangements. It would require an extension to the closing date of both the Parent Project and first AF of 18 months from June 30, 2016 to December 31, 2017.

The general financial management, procurement and disbursement arrangements of the Parent Project and first AF are appropriate to absorb additional funds, and will continue under the proposed second AF and restructuring.

### III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

<b>Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The OP/BP 4.01 was triggered due to the project activities that included debris processing, canal cleaning and construction of transportation infrastructure. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was prepared and disclosed and Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) for debris processing, canal cleaning, bridge, and road works were prepared and cleared by the Bank for the subprojects financed under the original project. The documents are currently disclosed on the Infoshop website and locally on the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (MTPTEC). Specifically, the EMPs and the Rapid Social Assessment will continue to apply under the AF. The same procedures and principles that were used to prepare the EMPs and RAPs for the roads projects under the original project will be used to generate new EMPs, and as necessary, RAPs, for the new road works financed under the AF.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04) policy was also triggered under the original project as a precautionary measure. Although it remains triggered for the AF, it is unlikely that the project will have any impact on the natural habitat given that the road works under the AF will focus on the rehabilitation of the existing road and there will be no sub-surface excavation, or extension or widening of the roadway.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project activities will not affect Forests, as defined by the policy.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09) was triggered under the original project as a precaution because of the project's involvement in the landfill at Trutier, but no Pest Management Plan was prepared. No activities financed through this AF would trigger the Pest Management policy.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11) policy was triggered under the original project as a result of

		<p>the earthquake rubble which was being collected from around Port au Prince and processed at Trutier Debris Processing Facility. Given that this rubble could contain materials of cultural significance, it was important to trigger this OP. However, to date, no material of cultural significance has been found. Beyond Trutier, the Physical Cultural Resources policy is not expected to be relevant in other additional activities because there will be no sub-surface excavation during the road works, nor any activities to expand the road that could potentially unearth material of cultural significance.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the EMPs will provide provisions and guidelines for handling chance finds of cultural significance, in the event that anything is discovered.</p>
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous peoples, as defined by the policy, present in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	<p>This policy was triggered by the original project as project activities might cause temporary or permanent involuntary resettlement or land acquisition. This policy continues to be relevant under the AF at hand due to road and infrastructure works planned under Component 2.</p> <p>The original project prepared a RPF to guide RAPs for a number of works. The AF will not require the elaboration of additional RAPs as the instruments for the construction of the Cap-Labadie road has already been prepared, consulted, and disclosed.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered because the project will not finance the construction of dams nor will rely on the activities of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project activities will not affect international waterways, as defined by the policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	The project is not in a disputed area, as defined by the policy.

#### IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

##### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p>
<p>Parent Project</p> <p>Haiti has an extremely fragile environment, and the damage caused by the earthquake to the physical and social environment has been extensive. Following the earthquake, immediate environmental concerns included debris management including hazardous waste and release of</p>



polluting substances. These continue to remain issues of concern as debris removal activities are still underway in the country, and are expected to continue for the next 8-12 months. There is hardly any forest cover left in the country, and the terrain is steep with unstable slopes. The need for fuel may lead to further deforestation as people cut down the remaining trees, and the potential damage to aquifers and groundwater is high. Given the need for urgent siting and construction of new infrastructure, there is also a risk of inadequate capacity or time to undertake the required environmental and impact assessments.

On the environment side, the safeguard issues are related to waste and debris management, air pollution control issues from debris processing at Trutier, worker safety issues, and issues related to erosion control.

On the social side, the injuries and loss of life, as well as destroyed housing and economic assets, have affected poor and rich alike. The poor are however particularly vulnerable, and many are still dependent on assistance are likely to remain so for a considerable time. Their vulnerability to further shocks, whether economic or physical such as rains or hurricanes, speak to the continued need of the reconstruction effort.

While the overall project is Category A, the additional activities have little or no additional safeguards implications. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) guiding principles was prepared and disclosed and Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) for debris processing, canal cleaning, bridge, and road works were prepared and cleared by the Bank for the subprojects financed under the original project. Table 1 outlines the safeguards management instruments in detail. The documents are currently disclosed on the Infoshop website and locally on the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (MTPTEC). Specifically, the EMPs and the Rapid Social Assessment will continue to apply under the AF. The same procedures and principles that were used to prepare the EMPs for the roads projects under the original project will be used to generate new EMPs, for the new road works financed under the AF.

#### Safeguard Implementation under the Original Project

At the Trutier Debris Processing Facility, the project recruited an operator to operate the day-to-day activities of the landfill. Environmental supervision was undertaken by an internationally recruited firm, while social supervision is undertaken by a social specialist in the Unit d'Exécution (Project Coordination Unit) within the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (UCE-MTPTEC). For the other works supported under the project, the UCE-MTPTEC, provided both environmental and social supervision. Currently one social specialist and one environmental specialist support this project.

The implementation of environmental safeguards under the original project has been satisfactory. There are several reasons for this which could serve as a positive lesson for other projects: (i) the environment supervision team had a highly competent and technical team; (ii) the team operated from the Trutier Debris Processing Facility and therefore was in hourly contact with the landfill operator; (iii) issues regarding on-site air pollution, worker safety, etc, were therefore immediately flagged and the Bank's intervention, where needed, was quickly requested. Each morning, the supervision team provided safety drills for the operators and workers since this poses the highest risk. In addition, several times a day, air quality was monitored for a range of pollutants and particulates. While some pollutants were evaluated on site, more complex analyses were done in

Canada each week and returned to Haiti, at which point mitigation measures were put in place. The Bank's supervision of environmental issues and assessment of the air quality at Trutier demonstrated that the health risk from the earthquake rubble was minimal. The supervision team was supervised by the UCE-MTPTC, but that level of supervision was relatively weak, and the UCE-MTPTC environment specialist depended largely on the internationally recruited environment firm to provide technical expertise. This was largely because the environmental specialist was also supervising a large number of IDB projects in addition to the Bank projects. While this did not affect the supervision at Trutier because of the international expertise already in place, this posed more of an issue for the road works, which relied on the UCE-MTPTC to provide the necessary environmental supervision. To resolve this issue, the project recruited another environment specialist to work at the UCE-MTPTC.

The implementation and supervision of the social safeguards under the Parent Project was satisfactory. The implementation of the RAPs for the Canal de Bois de Chaine (Canal Cleaning) and Route Nationale 4 (RN4) were completed and were well received by the affected population. Under the Canal subproject, 83 internally displaced people who were living in tents needed to be temporarily moved in order to allow for the urgent canal cleaning works to take place. These people were offered either an opportunity to participate in a cash for work program or were offered compensation to leave the site temporarily. Under RN4, 44 people were affected and offered compensation under the RAP.

The implementation of the RAPs for Route Nationale 2 (RN2) and Rivere Fauché Bridge were also completed and implemented in a timely fashion.

At the Trutier Debris Processing Facility, the rapid social assessment carried out for the site analyzed the socio-economic profile of the surrounding communities. No physical resettlement was necessary and the project investments did not limit access to ongoing waste-picking activities. Furthermore, the company, per the bidding document requirements, hired local community members to assist in the site operation and has financed a range of community outreach activities.

All subprojects resulted in temporary labor opportunities for the local population – both for men and women. Upon completion of all RAPs, an ex-post evaluation of project affected people is carried out by a third party monitor.

Implementation was carried out by a social specialist within the UCE-MTPTC. An additional social specialist was hired and trained to support the additional workload. These social specialists were specifically tasked with the preparation, coordination of the implementation and supervision of all RAPs required by the Project. Lessons to continually improve safeguards management have been raised and addressed through ongoing project implementation support.

#### Safeguards under the First Additional Financing

For the first AF, the supervision established under the Parent Project continued. For the other activities supported under the first AF, specifically the road rehabilitation works, the UCE-MTPTC continued to provide supervision support for environmental and social safeguards. The UCE-MTPTC recruited two additional specialists, one social and one environmental, to supplement the existing team, given the expanded activities.

#### Trutier Debris Processing Facility

The activities at the Trutier Debris Processing Facility remained inside the existing fenced perimeter and did not introduce any additional environmental or social impacts in terms of resettlement, access or land acquisition, and therefore no additional mitigation measures or instruments were required. The environmental management and social programs continued to be operationally supported under the first AF and supervised under the existing framework and with the existing safeguards instruments until the completion of those activities.

#### Road Rehabilitation Works

For the road rehabilitation investments, there was thorough community consultations, as well as a site-specific assessment of the social and environmental impact of the road rehabilitation works. EMPs and RAPs were prepared prior to the start of the works.

Labadie to Cap Haitien: The road from Labadie to Cap Haitien involves surface rehabilitation (paving, sidewalk, road safety equipment) under the first AF for which an EMP was prepared. To date, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) exists for the road between Cap Haitien and Labadie, and has been updated according to Bank Safeguards policies in advance of the commencement of works. Social impacts related to road safety and the influx of construction workers may exist but are expected to be limited given the low-density population along the road corridor. These impacts will also be addressed through the EMP that was developed along the same principles of the EMPs of activities under the Parent Project. A RAP was developed to address land acquisition and involuntary resettlement caused by the road construction. The RAP was disclosed on 2/2/2016.

Urban Area of Milot: The road from Cap Haitien to Milot which was initially planned under the first AF was dropped as the main segment of the road will be financed by the GoH using national budget resources. The project would instead finance spot interventions in the urban area of Milot in lieu of a full road rehabilitation. An EMP is under-preparation and the design studies for the proposed works are on going. This area was screened for potential resettlement impacts when the road rehabilitation was planned, and it was determined that there would be no resettlement given the small scope the works, where all rehabilitation activities will remain within the existing paved area and no realignment activities will occur.

#### Aviation Safety Equipment

These activities were dropped from the project due to shifting government priorities and use of national budget resources in lieu of Bank financing.

#### Second Additional Financing

The proposed second AF will not entail any new activities or works. Therefore the existing ESMF and RAPs will continue to apply to the activities that remain. The supervision established under the Parent Project and first AF will continue.

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

The rehabilitation works under the first AF are restoring and improving the situation that prevailed before the disaster, as well as contributing to job creation and economic growth in conjunction

<p>with further planned investments in the North Growth pole. Activities included in both the Parent Project and both AF are contributing to improving resilience to disasters and reducing vulnerability.</p> <p>No long term negative impacts are anticipated; however, relevant screening and assessment procedures will be used to guide the identification and mitigation of short-term potential adverse impacts.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p>
<p>Under the Parent Project an analysis of alternatives was undertaken as part of the process for creating the Trutier Debris Processing Facility EIA to ensure that all options were considered to identify and minimize adverse impacts. In particular, the project examined different sites for rubble removal and processing. Under the first AF, the works continued at the Trutier Debris Processing Facility, but are since complete. The road rehabilitation works under the first and second AFs were selected to complement the investment that will take place under the Cultural Heritage Preservation and Tourism Sector Support Project (P144614), which both focuses on increasing tourism in the North Department, with the proposed roads serving as a catalytic investment.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>
<p>The current safeguard rating for the IIERP is Moderately Satisfactory. An ESMF, a Resettlement Policy Framework and a Cultural Resources Plan exist for the original project, including Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) for specific works. The second AF will not trigger any additional safeguards. While the AF at hand remains Category A in accordance with the Parent Project, the additional activities have little or no additional safeguards implications.</p>
<p><b>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</b></p>
<p>The key stakeholders in this project continue to include the Ministry of Finance receiving the technical assistance, the general population of Port-Au-Prince that benefits from the ongoing use of the rehabilitated infrastructure, and local communities and governments in the vicinity of the infrastructure works and receiving the technical assistance. The IDB and the World Bank continue to have discussions agreeing to coordinate safeguards aspects, and several workshops to strengthen local environmental and social capacity have occurred. This collaboration will continue, with a concerted effort to coordinate and consult among key stakeholder agencies and local populations. The original project and first AF established, as part of each Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), a grievance redress mechanism to address outstanding issues or claims by affected peoples. These good practices will continue under the second AF. Additionally, communities and individuals who believe that they are adversely affected by a World Bank (WB) supported project may submit complaints to existing project-level grievance redress mechanisms or the WB's Grievance Redress Service (GRS). The GRS ensures that complaints received are promptly reviewed in order to address project-related concerns.</p>

***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Apr-2010

Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Apr-2010
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	23-Apr-2010
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Apr-2010
Date of submission to InfoShop	23-Apr-2010
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	23-Apr-2010
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### *C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level*

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]

<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>			
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 [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>			
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>			
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 Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>			
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>			
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"/> ]

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact: Pierre Xavier Bonneau  
Title: Program Leader

Contact: Mamadou Lamarane Deme  
Title: Program Manager

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Finance and Economy  
Contact: M. Wilson Laleau  
Title: Minister of Finance  
Email:

### Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications  
Contact: Lys Faucher  
Title: Head of UCP  
Email:

Name: Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Communications, Unité Centrale d'Exécution  
Contact: Garry Jean  
Title: Coordonnateur UCE  
Email:

## VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-1000  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

## VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Pierre Xavier Bonneau, Mamadou Lamarane Deme	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Francis V. Fragano (SA)	Date: 10-Mar-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Aurelio Menendez (PMGR)	Date: 10-Mar-2016
Country Director:	Name: Michelle C. Keane (CD)	Date: 27-Oct-2016