

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA8763

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 12-Aug-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 15-Aug-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Mexico	Project ID:	P149858
Project Name:	Mexico Reducing Inequality of Educational Opportunity Project (P149858)		
Task Team Leader:	Ciro Avitabile		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	23-Jun-2014	Estimated Board Date:	22-Oct-2014
Managing Unit:	GEDDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Primary education (66%), Pre-primary education (31%), Public administration-Education (3%)		
Theme(s):	Education for all (100%)		
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:	150.00	Total Bank Financing:	150.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			0.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			150.00
Total			150.00
Environmental Category:	C - Not Required		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project's development objective is to improve parental competencies in Early Childhood Development (ECD) in targeted rural communities and increase the transition rate from the primary to the secondary education level in CONAFE-administered schools in target municipalities.

3. Project Description

The Project's objective would be achieved through the re-designing and scaling-up of interventions at the early childhood and basic education levels. These interventions aim at improving parental competencies in early childhood development and increasing the transition rate from primary to secondary education by strengthening the involvement and the collaboration of parents, communities and teachers in the delivery of education services.

The Project would seek to scale up two of the four interventions that were already included under the Mexico Compensatory Education Project (P101369, Ln. 7859-MX): ECD and APIs. The Project would continue following a multi-layered approach that recognizes the importance of multiple actors in improving student outcomes throughout the different education stages. The ECD Intervention would promote the cognitive and non-cognitive development of children ages 0-4 through an improvement of parental competencies in early child development. The API Intervention acknowledges that students, parents, and teachers play a key role in the learning production function of students in basic education and would seek to strengthen the abilities of all of them in order to increase the transition rate from primary to secondary education. Finally, the Project would provide technical assistance to improve the design and the implementation of the FORTALECE program, which tries to improve school outcomes of children in targeted communities by strengthening the role of community and increasing the accountability of the school authorities in the community schools.

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

The Compensatory Education Project (Loan 7859-MX, P101369) targeted the poorest 172 municipalities in Mexico. Following the new social protection priorities defined by the Mexican Government, the proposed Project would target the 405 poor and marginalized municipalities included in the program “Cruzada Nacional Contra el Hambre” (CNCH). Because many of the indigenous communities are marginalized and poor, this new focus would increase coverage of indigenous localities from about 27% in the previous Project to about 44% in the selected municipalities under CNCH; there is an indigenous population of 5.9 million in these localities, representing 53% of the national indigenous population. Coverage for ECD would be nationwide. It is important to note that although the CNCH program may incorporate additional municipalities in the future, it has been agreed with the Borrower that the Project would continue to focus only on the initial 405 municipalities.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	No	The proposed Project seeks to improve education outcomes in the schools of poor communities through activities such as early childhood development and special assistance to students and teachers in these schools. These types of activities do not cause any adverse impact on the environment. The Project has thus been classified as “C” and OP/BP 4.01 is not triggered.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The Project would only conduct activities intended to improve education outcomes in poor

		schools and therefore is not expected to cause any impact on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The Project would not be situated near forests and would not have any impact on forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This Project would not finance any procurement or significant use of pesticides or any activity related to pest management in any way.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	The Project would not include any activity that may affect existing physical cultural resources or works that may result in chance findings of such resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The Project would target the 405 municipalities under the Cruzada contra el Hambre.</p> <p>Approximately 44% of the localities in these municipalities are of indigenous descent; they speak their own language, maintain -at different degrees- their traditional organizations and identify and recognize themselves as indigenous. The indigenous population in these localities is 5.9 million, corresponding to 53% of the national indigenous population. The IPP prepared for the previous Project has been updated using the results of project evaluations and recently conducted consultation. Evaluations conducted from 2009 to 2012 indicate that the Project has adequate targeting and that its activities have widespread acceptance and are well-received by indigenous communities. The majority of the parents (90%) give a positive qualification to ECD, FORTALECE and APIs. Consultation was conducted in selected localities according to the following criteria: (i) localities under the CNCH; (ii) where all Project activities are implemented; (iii) in localities with a high representation of some the major indigenous peoples (nahuas in Puebla, maya varieties in Chiapas). Though the large number (62) of indigenous peoples in the country make it difficult to find a nationally-representative sample, the two entities where consultation was conducted can be considered to properly reflect the common characteristics of indigenous populations in Mexico in terms of factors that can explain the gaps in education attainments. Among these are geographic dispersion, difficult access, and monolingual prevalence. Moreover, Náhutul is the indigenous</p>

		<p>language with the highest number of speakers in 16 entities. Consultations unanimously corroborated support of the program and the positive effects of ECD and APIs. However, in extreme poverty conditions, language barriers and some traditions (job preference for men, for instance) may be hindering results. The IPP recommends: (a) revising the intervention model, taking into account language barriers, updating and improving educational materials and methods, and developing a true bilingual education model; (b) increasing support to APIs, including better accommodation conditions and incentives to remain in the program; (c) provision of better infrastructure to carry out Project activities; (d) offering concrete incentives to mothers to participate in ECD, taking into account indigenous culture (most women are monolingual) and competition from other social programs offering transfers; (e) strengthening linkages with other programs, such as Oportunidades and PEC, and indigenous education programs in the Secretariat of Public Education. Interventions targeted at addressing points a and d would be piloted in the states of Oaxaca and evaluated through a rigorous impact evaluation. Based on the results of a cost-benefit analysis, they would be scaled-up in the entire country. The team is actively promoting the dialogue between CONAFE and the authorities that manage PEC and Oportunidades, relying on the support of the Bank's teams working on both projects. Conditional on data availability, the take up of the Oportunidades program among CONAFE beneficiaries will be monitored. The Project could also benefit from a gender approach by strengthening the role of the "Promotores Comunitarios" and engaging women that are traditionally responsible for the care of children within indigenous communities. Certifying promotores (as has been done in some states) has proved to be positive. The possibility of increasing the number of female APIs would also help increase women's participation.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The Project would not include any activity that requires land acquisition or major construction that may cause any type of involuntary

		resettlement as defined in the policy.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The proposed Project would not involve any activity related to the construction or rehabilitation of dams and would not depend upon the operations of an existing dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The proposed Project would not affect international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The Project would not be situated in any disputed areas.

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The Project would have a positive social impact in reducing inequality in education by targeting interventions in the country's poorest localities, and especially in the 405 municipalities under the CNCH. In order to ensure that Mexico's indigenous populations benefit equally or disproportionately from Project interventions, an Indigenous People's Plan (IPP) was developed based on the experiences of the previous operation and the new targeting mechanisms defined by CONAFE. The IPP discusses i) the targeting of investments; ii) actions for improving the effectiveness of interventions in indigenous areas; and iii) the associated budget for IPP implementation. For the ECD component, the IPP mentions the importance of the materials to support parental learning. For the APIs, language comes across as the most important issue, and context specific solutions are recommended as there as the needs change according to the geographic location. The Project is classified as category C. It does not include construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure, therefore the OP/BP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment is not triggered.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p> <p>Targeting: The change in focus from 172 poor municipalities in the previous operation to the 405 municipalities in the CNCH would increase the potential benefits for indigenous populations. These municipalities comprise 60,248 localities, of which 44 percent (26,330) include indigenous populations, comprising 53 percent of the total indigenous population in Mexico. This percentage was approximately 25 percent under the previous Project.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p> <p>N/A</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>CONAFE has been implementing the Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) prepared for the previous operation. This institutional knowledge is expected to facilitate implementation of the IPP under the new operation. The proposed technical assistance component would provide information for and support this effort through studies such as the impact evaluation of the API Intervention, which should differentiate an impact assessment of the program on indigenous communities. The strengthened monitoring and evaluation system that would be developed with the technical</p>

<p>assistance can further contribute to assess the implementation of the IPP. CONAFE's institutional capacity could also benefit from a stronger coordination with programs such as Oportunidades, which operates in indigenous localities and supports community organization (Comités de Educación, for instance) and is also developing its own ECD program. The Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas (CDI), while leading the conceptual and analytical work on the identification and characterization of indigenous peoples in Mexico, is not involved in any operational activity.</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>Consultations on the new IPP were held during preparation in various indigenous communities throughout Mexico. In addition to identifying lessons learned for improving design of interventions and operational elements, the consultations served to ground truth the relevance of proposed improvements in the operational manuals of the interventions. The IPP was disclosed on June 20, 2014 on the Bank's website and CONAFE's website on June 19, 2014.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Mexico	19-Jun-2014
<p><i>Comments:</i> The IPP was published on CONAFE's website and can be accessed at http://www.conafe.gob.mx/Documents/2014_Plan_de_Pueblos_Indigenas.pdf.</p>	
<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.</p>	
<p>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</p>	
<p> </p>	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples			
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<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"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Ciro Avitabile	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Practice Manager:	Name: Rafael E. De Hoyos Navarro (PMGR)	Date: 15-Aug-2014