

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA15519**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 12-Nov-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 20-Nov-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Africa	<b>Project ID:</b>	P153863
<b>Project Name:</b>	Senegal River Basin Integrated Water Resources Management Project (P153863)		
<b>Task Team Leader(s):</b>	Ijeoma Emenanjo, Shelley Mcmillan		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>		<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	14-Dec-2015
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GWA07	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (45%), Public administration- Water, sanitation and flood protection (25%), Health (20%), Irrigation and drainage (10%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Water resource management (40%), Environmental policies and institutions (25%), Other communicable diseases (20%), Regional integration (15%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	15.10	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			0.00
Free-standing TFs AFR COUNTRY DEPARTMENT, West 1			15.10
Total			15.10
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	Yes		

**2. Project Development Objective(s)**

The development objective of the Senegal River Basin Integrated Water Management Project is to strengthen the capacity of OMVS and local water user associations to improve the environmental and

water quality conditions of the Senegal River's water resources.

### 3. Project Description

The proposed Dutch Trust Fund, which is parallel financing to the Senegal River Basin Multi-Purpose Water Resources Development (MWRD2), is intended to address some of the issues identified above (the proliferation of typha, which leads to the clogging of irrigation canals; upstream erosion; and waterborne disease transmission-particularly schistosomiasis). MWRD2 is the second phase of a 10-year Program. Phase 1 of the program (MWRD1) has positively impacted the Basin across the agriculture, health and fisheries sectors. The new activities to be supported under this project will build upon previous Trust Funds and will be complementary to MWRD2 so as to mutually reinforce integrated water resources management and development to improve community livelihoods.

OMVS has previous experience working with the Dutch Government and has successfully implemented projects supported by two previous Dutch trust funds. The previous Dutch Government supported project provided institutional support at the regional, national and community levels and improved knowledge and monitoring and evaluation of water resources. . The previous Dutch Government supported project also supported: (i) the protection of public health through water supply reinforced livelihoods; (ii) capacity building for water user associations and irrigation cooperatives; and, (iii) river and irrigation channel clearance and slope stabilization.

#### Component 1- Upper Basin Sustainable Land Management (US\$5.5 million)

This component aims to address the challenge of degradation in the upper basin through restoration of the main headwaters of the Senegal River, the banks of other rivers in the basin, and the deforested slopes in Guinea and Mali through the sustainable reversal of the process of deforestation and erosion in the Térékolé/Kolimbine/Lac-Magui system (TKLM) north of Kayes. In addition, the river banks protecting Kayes will be restored, continuing work initiated in TF2. This first component will support the following sub-components:

##### Sub-component 1.1: Diagnostic studies on deforestation, erosion and sedimentation in the upper basin (Guinea and Mali)

Diagnostic studies will be designed to: (i) determine the sensitivity of different landscapes, in the upper basin, to deforestation and erosion due to differences in their geomorphological, geological, and vegetation attributes and (ii) identify high erosion and deforestation risk areas in order to plan site-specific management interventions.

##### Sub-component 1.2: Implementation of effective soil and water resource protection strategies

The efficiency of conservation measures may vary depending on the prevailing deforestation and erosion processes and controlling factors determined in sub-component 1.1. This sub-component will support the implementation of the most effective soil, vegetation and water resource protection strategies in the upper basin, including strategies from TF2, such as: (i) slope stabilization works and reforestation of river banks, (ii) agroforestry on slopes adjacent to low-land agricultural areas, and (iii) training to identified communities and community groups on protection strategies.

#### Component 2- Management of Invasive Aquatic Plants in the Delta and the Operationalization of Water User Associations (WUAs) (US\$6.3 million):

This component aims to control and manage the proliferation of Typha to a level where it does not constitute a threat to the ecological balance and to economic activities in the basin. This component also aims to improve access to drinking water and to operationalize WUAs in continuity with the

activities from TF1 and TF2. Specifically, this component will support the following sub-components:

Sub-component 2.1: Completion of a needs assessment on the control of invasive aquatic species in the Delta

The aim of this sub-component is to conduct a needs assessment to understand and synthesize the implications of the harvesting of Typha and other invasive plants. The needs assessment proposed will also include a cost benefit analysis (CBA) that will look at technical options for the control of Typha and cost-recovery plans for Typha management as well as the development of maintenance schedules. This sub-component will also support the annual inventory of the spatial distribution of Typha through remote sensing, which is primarily being funded by MWRD2.

Sub-component 2.2: Invasive aquatic plant management

This sub-component will support the removal of Typha from infested areas. The removal mechanism of choice will be determined by the results of the needs assessment (sub-component 2.1).

Sub-component 2.3: Installation of potable water supply stations in project area villages

This sub-component will provide support for the installation of water supply stations in pre-identified villages in the basin, as a continuation of support from TF2.

Sub-component 2.4: Training and support to existing WUAs

This sub-component will provide training and support to WUAs on (i) organizational management, (ii) invasive aquatic plant management, (iii) maintaining hydraulic axes, and (iv) the management of water stations (including water quality monitoring and control).

Component 3- Institutional Support for OMVS and National Agencies (US\$3.3 million)

This component aims to build the capacity and skills of OMVS and National Cellule staff through training and the exchange of lessons learned. The component will support the management and implementation of regional and state level activities. This will primarily target the OMVS bodies responsible for implementing the program. The component will also target national technical services to support the activities of the program based on areas of expertise relevant to this project, such as environment, forestry, water resource management, and public health. This component will support the following sub-components:

Sub-component 3.1: Strengthening of the capacity of OMVS and national agencies to lead invasive species management efforts in the region

This sub-component will support the institutional capacity building of OMVS and national agencies of the member states to improve their management and technical capacities to lead invasive species management efforts in the region.

Sub-component 3.2: Strategic management of TF3.

This final sub-component relates to the management of the Trust Fund by the PCU and mainly relates to the operating costs for the project. In addition, this sub-component covers project wide monitoring and evaluation, including evaluations and also includes additional support to reinforce the monitoring of safeguards.

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

As with MWRD2, the proposed Project involves all the riparian countries (Guinea, Mali, Mauritania

and Senegal) of the Senegal River basin. The Senegal River basin covers a surface area of about 300,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The high plateau in northern Guinea represent 31,000 km<sup>2</sup> (11 percent of the basin), 155,000 km<sup>2</sup> are situated in western Mali (53 percent of the basin), 75,500 km<sup>2</sup> are in southern Mauritania (26 percent of the basin) and 27,500 km<sup>2</sup> are in northern Senegal (10 percent of the basin). The basin has three distinct parts: the upper basin, which is mountainous, the valley (itself divided into high, middle and lower) and the delta, which is a source of biological diversity and wetlands. Topographical, hydrographic and climatic conditions are very different in these three regions and seasonal temperature variations are extensive.

### 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Maman-Sani Issa (GENDR)

Salamata Bal (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project and the parallel financed MWRD2, involves some environmental management activities. The project will rely on MWRD2 evaluations (ESMF, ESIA, RPF and PPMP) with regard to the environmental and social dimensions of the development of navigation on the Senegal River Basin and the development of micro-hydro sites etc. The Trust Fund will also conduct diagnostic studies on the environmental and social dimensions of the implementation of soil and water resource protection strategies.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Riverbank erosion protection (slope stabilization) is one of the Trust Fund sub-project activities. This activity could upset the natural balance in the affected rivers if not done according to ecological principles.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Triggered by the reforestation activities to be carried out in the Upper Basin, a very sensitive ecological area of the Senegal River.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Intensification of irrigated agricultural production might increase the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	OP/BP 4.11 is triggered by the feasibility studies for the the civil works activities in the Upper Basin.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous people in the Senegal River Basin as defined by OP/BP 4.10.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	No physical resettlement is anticipated due to the nature of the intended rehabilitation works to be carried out under the various 4.12 subprojects. There might be a need to compensate for the loss of crops, trees or property caused by the Upper Basin erosion management activities. There may also be a restriction of access to certain fishing grounds or during certain periods of time.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	None of the activities funded by this project are relying on dams.

Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	The governments of the four riparian countries were notified of the International Project through the OMVS, in which all four countries are represented.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not located in a Disputed Area.

## II. 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>The Trust Fund (TF3) is classified as category B in the Environmental Assessment classification of the World Bank. TF3 sub-projects include: the implementation of effective soil and water resource protection strategies, Invasive aquatic plant management which will have very limited environmental and social impacts, similar in nature to the impacts under MWRD2. These impacts and mitigation measures have been described in the ESIA prepared for MWRD2.</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p> <p>N/A</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 capacity of OMVS and the member states for environmental and social management has been strengthened under the Senegal River Basin Water and Environmental Management GEF Project and even more so under the MWRD1 project. This included building a core group of transboundary environmental management expertise.</p> <p>During the preparation of MWRD2, OMVS prepared an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and a Pest and Pesticide Management Plan (PPMP) in compliance with the requirements of the World Bank Safeguard Policies. These instruments have been reviewed and updated for use in TF3. The updated ESIA, PPMP and RPF have been consulted upon and disclosed in-country and at the Infoshop prior to appraisal.</p> <p>MWRD2 has prepared an ESIA, since most sub-projects have already been defined, and updated the RPF and the PPMP from MWRD1. It is not expected that OP 4.12 will be triggered during the implementation of MWRD2, but if there is any involuntary resettlement, a RAP will be prepared, consulted upon, and disclosed in-country and in the World Bank Infoshop. RAPs will need to be cleared by the Bank. Construction can only start after Project Affected People (PAP) have been compensated in compliance with OP/BP 4.12. The ESIA and the RAP were consulted upon by February 2013. The ESIA and PPMP have been disclosed in-country and in the World Bank Infoshop on 26 March 2013. The RPF was finalized and cleared for disclosure on 10 June 2013. These instruments will be implemented and monitored by the Safeguard Specialist at the PCU. Executing agencies will also be responsible for implementing and monitoring safeguards for</p>

specific activities and for oversight of contractors.

There are no other environmental and social risks, which are outside the scope of the World Bank's safeguard policies.

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

The principal stakeholders of this Project are identifiable at three levels-regional, national, and local:

The regional stakeholders are the institutions involved in managing the Senegal River (the OMVS) and its infrastructure (SOGEM and SOGED). These stakeholders have defined the project in discussion with national counterparts.

Nationally, the principal stakeholders are the four national governments and the four national OMVS cellules. Through performance management contracts, four executing agencies: Société d'Aménagement des Terres du Delta (SAED, Senegal), Société Nationale de Développement Rural (SONADER, Mauritania), Direction Nationale du Génie Rural (DNGR, Guinea), and L'Agence de Développement Rural de la Vallée du fleuve Sénégal (ADRS, Mali) will implement the agriculture and related sub-components. It is important to note that all four governments have endorsed the Trust Fund. OMVS has demonstrated a continued interest in applying a participatory approach to the Project design. National Project Planning Committees (NPPCs) were established in each riparian country and these committees have participated actively in Project preparation. National officials also provide continual assistance and participate in national and regional workshops, steering committees and other stakeholder consultations during project preparation.

At the local level, the stakeholders include the local government, local decision-makers, rural communities, women's groups, and schools. Local level consultations were held by OMVS in December 2012 for all locally implemented activities; agroforestry, river bank protection and development or rehabilitation of irrigated areas. Meetings were held in each zone of intervention and facilitated by local committees. Photographs and meeting records were provided by OMVS.

**B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Nov-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Apr-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-May-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Apr-2015



"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	28-Feb-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Apr-2015
"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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input 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 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>OP/BP 4.36 - Forests</b>			
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways</b>			
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" 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"/> ]



**III. APPROVALS**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Ijeoma Emenanjo, Shelley Mcmillan	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 19-Nov-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Alexander E. Bakalian (PMGR)	Date: 20-Nov-2015