

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA1005

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 12-Aug-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 13-Aug-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Haiti	Project ID:	P132756
		Parent Project ID:	P124134
Project Name:	AF GPE to Haiti Education for All Project - Phase II (P132756)		
Parent Project Name:	Haiti - Education for All Project - Phase II (P124134)		
Task Team Leader:	Patrick Philippe Ramanant		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	24-Feb-2014	Estimated Board Date:	15-Sep-2014
Managing Unit:	GEDDR	Lending Instrument:	Specific Investment Loan
Sector(s):	Primary education (100%)		
Theme(s):	Education for all (82%), Nutrition and food security (11%), Rural services and infrastructure (7%)		
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:	24.10	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			0.00
Education for All Supervising Entity			24.10
Total			24.10
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

The objective of the Project is to support the Strategy for Rebuilding the Education System through the implementation of sustainable programs to improve: (a) access, particularly of under-served populations, to Primary Education; (b) quality of Primary Education; and (c) the institutional capacity in the Recipient's education sector.

B. Current Project Development Objectives – Parent

The objective of the Project is to support: (i) enrollment of students in select non-public primary schools in disadvantaged areas;(ii) student attendance in select public and non-public primary schools in disadvantaged areas; and (iii) strengthened management of the Recipient's primary education sector.

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

3. Project Description

The AF maintains the restructured parent Project structure, approach and components. It would finance existing and new activities under the existing components, as explained below.

Component 1: Support to Primary Education Enrollment. Under sub-component 1.1 – Enhance the Tuition Waiver Program (TWP), to make up for a financing shortfall from other development partners, the AF would cover about 102,000 students and 39,390 student in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, respectively, to allow them to continue to attend non-public school tuition-free. These numbers were agreed in coordination with other partner financing for the TWP, which combined, would ensure enrollment of students in non-public primary schools for about 129,000 students in 2014-15 and 76,000 students in 2015-16. The AF would also finance training sessions for TWP school directors and School Management Committees (SMCs) to remind these stakeholders of their TWP-related responsibilities. Finally, the AF would cover the cost associated with annual independent verification of TWP schools.

There would be no changes to sub-component 1.2 – Support to Communities. However, a new sub-component 1.3 – Information for Non-Public School Accountability would be added. This sub-component would finance technical assistance and operational costs for the development and implementation of an information campaign to improve financial accountability in TWP schools. The campaign would target School Management Committees (SMCs) and other local-level stakeholders, and would highlight the rights and responsibilities of SMCs, their intended function and minimum operating procedures as a key part of the TWP, as well as of resources at their disposal to monitor schools. Training sessions already planned under Component 1.1 of the parent Project would provide the SMCs with tools and advice to monitor schools. The sub-component would be implemented using a phased approach. In the first year of AF implementation, focus groups would be conducted with TWP stakeholders (SMC members, parents, school directors...) to identify key information gaps and impediments to optimal TWP functioning at the school level. Focus group findings would inform the development of the approach and the campaign content; the tools would be developed in tested in this first year. In the second year of implementation, the campaign would be rolled out to a subset of TWP schools.

Component 2: Support to Improved Student Attendance. There would be no changes to sub-components 2.1 (Pre-Service Teacher Training) and 2.2 (Support to the quality of Reading Instruction). However, for sub-component 2.3 – School Health and Nutrition (SHN), the AF would

finance SHN services for about 34,000 students annually in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, helping to fill a financing gap as other partners reduce their financing to school feeding. Combined with other partner financing, the AF would provide SHN service to about 712,000 beneficiaries. The existing SHN design and eligible budget lines would be maintained. With the availability of a 2013 nutritional map of Haiti, SHN targeting is being revised. The AF could therefore also finance activities to prepare the transition to financing new schools, such as informing existing beneficiary schools about the changes and preparing new participating schools during the 2014-15 school year. Service provision to the revised list of beneficiaries would begin in the 2015-16 school year. In addition, the AF would finance the gradual introduction of improved stoves for cooking in beneficiary schools. The sub-component would use existing arrangements for the verification of service provision, and the AF would therefore also finance firms for verification services.

Component 3: Strengthening Sector Management. Component 3 would be expanded to include support to the development of revised annual education sector action plans from 2014 to 2017. New activities to be financed would also include a complete sector diagnostic and a pilot student-mentoring program for primary schools. To support improved student learning and completion, the pilot would entail the design and organization at the school level of private mentoring sessions outside of school hours for children facing academic difficulties. In addition, the sub-component would include an assessment of the potential for creating a multi-donor trust fund as a future pooled funding mechanism for the sector. The sub-component would finance technical assistance for action plan development, including related analyses or other themes related to sector management as requested by the MENFP; pilot design, monitoring and evaluation; operational costs; and salary top-ups for teachers.

Component 4: Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). This component would be expanded in scope to include the financing of additional Project management and implementation coordination costs, undertaking Project financial audits, as well as additional activities to strengthen MENFP M&E systems. Such activities include, inter alia: the cost of consultancies associated with the PTU, including new staff recruited in association with new activities; workshops and operational costs for joint, semi-annual reviews of PIPE implementation by the MENFP and other education stakeholders; administering two waves of EGRA in coordination with USAID, which finances EGRA in selected cities; and developing and undertaking one wave of an Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA). EGRA would be administered in 2014-15 and 2016-17 to selected Grade 3 cohorts in a nationally and regionally representative sample of Haitian schools, also representative by category of school (public, non-public, etc.) and location in an urban/rural setting. EGMA would be developed and tested in 2014-15, and administered in 2016-17 along with the second wave of EGRA in the same sample of Grade 3 schools. The AF would finance technical assistance for the development and administering of these assessments, as well as the cost of data processing, reproduction of questionnaires and publication of results. Given the proposed Project closing date in June 2017, EGRA and EGMA results for the 2016-17 school year would not be available by Project closing. It is expected that the AF would finance the tests and data collection, while other development partner financing would take over the data processing and publication of results of the 2016-17 EGRA and EGMA.

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

The Project would be implemented nationwide. With respect to the community-based school sub-component, activities would focus on the most remote areas in the country. The geographic access to these parts is typically very difficult, with few roads of any kind. It is not uncommon that footpaths

through the mountains are the only access, requiring several hours of travel. Small-scale construction activities would take place on land that will be donated by communities or municipalities.

With respect to the SHN program, it is expected the AF would finance school health and nutrition activities in four geographical departments already benefiting from the services (Sud, Ouest, Centre, Artibonite). Regardless of location, until improved cooking technology is introduced in all AF-financed schools (introduction expected to begin by mid-2014), there is a risk that cooking practices involving the use of charcoal as cooking fuel may contribute to minor adverse environmental impacts if not adequately managed.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Peter F. B. A. Lafere (GURDR)

Robert H. Montgomery (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The Project will continue to have an environmental risk category of “B”. The team has triggered this safeguard because of the planned and ongoing small-scale infrastructure works for rural education. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was already prepared for the parent Project and focuses on, among other issues, how to address the impacts from construction and ensure community and worker health and safety. Infrastructure incorporates safe building designs, essential safety equipment and adequate sanitary facilities. For each existing construction site, an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was developed and community members will be trained on its implementation. This approach will continue for new sites. Training on EMP implementation is expected to occur for existing sites by October 2014.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The team does not expect to impact natural habitats given the limited scale of the investments and any potential for impact has been screened-out in the ESMF for the parent Project.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	This policy is not triggered given that Project activities will not impact the welfare of forests nor impact forest dependent communities.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This policy is not triggered since the Project will not finance the purchase or significant use of pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/	No	This policy is not triggered given that Project activities are not expected to impact physical

BP 4.11		cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	This policy is not triggered given that Indigenous Peoples as defined by OP 4.10 are not present in the Project's area of influence.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>No involuntary resettlement was expected for the parent Project, as it was assessed that the construction of community schools could be done on public land or with voluntary land donations only without the need to resettle affected people. However, given the scarcity of available land in some of the sub-project locations, OP 4.12 was triggered to allow municipalities to identify terrains where minor resettlement would be required and to ensure the affected people would be provided with the assistance under the policy. The screening criteria within the parent Project's ESMF were adapted from screening out all potential involuntary resettlement impacts to minimize resettlement and ensure mitigation of negative impacts in accordance with the policy. This screening tool will be used for all sites that are yet to be selected. If there is any need to acquire land on sites currently not known or if it is determined that any of the identified sites where sub-projects are yet to be developed require the involuntary taking of land, the Project will apply the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that was prepared as part of the June 2014 Project Restructuring. The RPF requires that land acquisition be carried out in accordance with OP 4.12 and reflects the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prior to the approval of sub-projects, the client will need to ensure that the sites, boundaries and ownerships of the relevant land plots are clearly identified and confirmed using a community-based mapping exercise that goes beyond simply checking for legal title. - In case resettlement is required, agreement on the compensation scheme and its payment or realization will be settled prior to the commencement of that particular sub-project. Sites that were pre-identified using the parent Project's screening criteria will be re-evaluated under the new screening criteria, and if necessary remedial action (inter alia, consultation,

	<p>compensation, and development of Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plans) in accordance with the policy and national legislation will be taken. For one of the 10 pilot communities for community school construction, a site was identified that required resettlement of six families who had lived on public land. The community, the municipality of Rosier, and the affected families came to an agreement to resettle the families to plots adjacent to the site where they originally occupied (that will now be used for the school construction) and agreed on a number of compensation measures using the consultative mechanisms the Project had put in place. After this agreement was reached, a Remedial Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (RARAP) was developed, consulted and published in accordance with the Resettlement Policy Framework to ensure that all negative impacts of resettlement were mitigated and that the affected persons are able to enjoy the full protection of the safeguards accorded to them under Bank policy. Additional supervision arrangements, including the recruitment of a social and environmental specialist within the PTU will ensure that this RARAP will be fully implemented and reported on. Due diligence spot checks will also be carried out to ensure that other cases of land acquisition are not required for the other sites already identified.</p> <p>None of the activities under the AF are expected to have additional resettlement impacts. Under component 2.3 of the project, the AF would finance the gradual introduction of improved cooking stoves in selected School Health and Nutrition Program beneficiary schools. These schools will be selected based on recommendations of a feasibility study, which will help to identify schools with the appropriate infrastructure, land/space, and other conditions to most readily receive these stoves. In addition, under the same component, additional schools are expected to receive a daily morning snack and hot meal during school days in the SHN Program. These additional schools will have already been receiving school services previously financed by</p>
--	--

		other development partners, and are therefore expected to have the infrastructure in place to participate in the SHN Program without requiring additional works or land acquisition.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered given that the Project will not finance the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will rely on the operations of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy is not triggered since the Project will not finance any activities that impact international waterways as defined by the policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	This policy is not triggered as the Project will not finance activities in disputed areas as defined by the policy.

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>No large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts are associated with the project.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>No indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities are expected.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The project considered continuing screening out any potential project sites that might involve resettlement and relying on voluntary donation of land where necessary. Given the expansion of the community based school program from 10 to 80 and the availability of such suitable sites, it was necessary to adapt the screening criteria to minimize rather than exclude involuntary resettlement to ensure sites could be identified in all communities of the project. Any involuntary resettlement associated with the project will be minimized, compensated and consulted in according with OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement.</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 MENFP has undertaken several measures to date to implement the ESMF. These include: informing communities where schools are being built of the of the ESMF, its contents and its application, including through face to face sessions and written supports in Haitian Creole; and supporting the communities in hiring and supervising construction supervisors who ensure school construction firms are managing minor environmental impacts in accordance with the ESMF. The MENFP has also applied a social and environmental screening tool (defined in the ESMF) in the selection of each site chosen to participate in the Project. This tool includes screening criteria to help ensure that Project-financed schools are located in areas safe from natural risks.</p> <p>Under the June 2014 Restructuring and AF, based on lessons learned from community-based school component implementation, the borrower updated the ESMF, and prepared and disclosed</p>

<p>an RPF. A social and environmental safeguard specialist is currently being recruited to ensure closer implementation of the environmental and social safeguard policy frameworks, and is expected to begin working in mid-August 2014. This specialist will be responsible for training communities in the implementation of the EMPs, and supporting the MENFP in supervising their implementation.</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 key stakeholders are the local community members, the Directorate for School Construction (DGS) at the MENFP, the National School Feeding Program (PNCS) at the MENFP and the Ministry of Environment. For the preparation of the ESMF, the PTU organized a workshop in order to discuss the document with the DGS, the PNCS, the Ministry of Environment and representatives of the main local NGOs working in the SHN Program. For the preparation of the RPF, the MENFP discussed with local communities and decentralized education and territorial administration in selected communes. Both the ESMF and the RPF were published on the website of the MENFP.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	10-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	10-Jun-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	10-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The disclosure dates refer to the updated Environmental and Social Management Framework.	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-Mar-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Apr-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	31-Mar-2014
<p><i>Comments:</i> A Resettlement Policy Framework was produced and published in-country and by the Bank.</p> <p>There was also a Remedial Resettlement Action Plan published. The dates for the RAP are as follows: Date of Receipt by the Bank: 31 March 2014 Date of submission to InfoShop: 11 April 2014 In-country Disclosure: 10 April 2014</p>	
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 [] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA []
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 [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
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 [] 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 [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] 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 [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [] NA []
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 [] NA []
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 [] NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Patrick Philippe Ramanant	
Approved By		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Glenn S. Morgan (RSA)	Date: 13-Aug-2014
Practice Manager:	Name: Barbara Bruns (PMGR)	Date: 13-Aug-2014