

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA8841

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 26-Jun-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 27-Jun-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Liberia	Project ID:	P146966
		Parent Project ID:	P115664
Project Name:	Emergency Monrovia Urban Sanitation 2AF (P146966)		
Parent Project Name:	Emergency Monrovia Urban Sanitation Project (EMUS) (P115664)		
Task Team Leader:	Ventura Bengoechea		
Estimated Appraisal Date:		Estimated Board Date:	26-Jun-2014
Managing Unit:	AFTU2	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Solid waste management (100%)		
Theme(s):	Urban services and housing for the poor (50%), City-wide Infrastructure and Service Delivery (50%)		
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:	16.67	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			9.67
Liberia Reconstruction Trust Fund			7.00
Total			16.67
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

B. Current Project Development Objectives – Parent

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

3. Project Description

The project activities represent a continuation of the current ones on a further financial declining basis over a period of two and a half years. This additional period will allow for an orderly phasing out of the Project Implementation Unit, which has provided great support to MCC beyond project implementation. The PIU responsibilities will be transferred to the Waste Management, Finance and other Departments of MCC.

- Component 1: Solid Waste Collection. The additional funds will be used to partially finance solid waste collection and disposal costs in a declining basis over a period of two and a half additional years. EMUS Project has financed these activities as follows: 100% in 2010 and 2011, 80% in 2012, and 60% in 2013. The proposed 2AF will continue this decreasing trend by financing 50% the first year of implementation, 40% the second year and 30% the last year. The balance will be financed by a combination of GOL/MCC funds.
- Component 2: Capacity Building at MCC. Taking into consideration the technical assistance provided by EMUS to MCC to strengthen its capacity to plan, design, and deliver solid waste and other services to its constituencies, MCC will be gradually taking over the responsibilities of the PIU, which will be phased out over the next two years.
- Component 3: Development of new sanitary landfill. Although there is an urgent need to develop a new landfill over the next three years, no funds will be provided for this activity under the proposed second AF, other than preliminary studies. The only activity that will be carried out with regard to landfills is the environmental protection of ground water at the existing one by covering the area where waste was originally dumped on the ground. High Density Poly-Ethylene (HDPE), already imported, will be used to cover that waste.

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

Project activities will be located in Monrovia.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Antoine V. Lema (AFTCS)

Felix Nii Tettey Oku (AFTN3)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The project triggers OP4.01 due to the planned construction and waste management activities associated with two waste transfer stations and landfill site which could have an adverse impact

		on health and the general environment. An ESIA and three EMPs have been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed to manage the potential environmental/social impacts from the facilities.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The waste management activities at the two waste transfer stations and landfill site is not causing direct or indirect significant conversion (loss) or degradation of natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Project activities have no impact on health and quality of forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project activities do not involve procurement of pesticides or pesticide application equipment and do not affect pest management in a way that harm could be done.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	The locations of the two waste transfer stations and landfill site are not within the vicinity of, recognized cultural heritage sites.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	N/A
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The construction of the two waste transfer stations and the buffer around the Whein Town Landfill site had required pieces of land. Two RAPs and one ARAP have been prepared to address resettlement policy concerns.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Project activities do not involve construction of new or renovation of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Project activities have no impact on international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Project activities are not within 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>Environmental: The proposed second AF will partially finance the continuation of secondary solid waste collection, which includes the operation of two existing transfer stations (Fiamah and Stockton Creek Transfer Stations) and operation and maintenance of an existing solid waste sanitary landfill site (Whein Town Landfill).</p> <p>Social: The activities financed under the 2AF do not require any acquisition of land, since they only involve provision of services and operation activities within existing facilities on lands which have been secured by under the parent project. The PIU has satisfactorily complied with the social safeguards obligations under Bank Policy.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities</p>

<p>in the project area:</p>
<p>Pollution of groundwater receptors from the Whein Town Landfill site has been identified a source of potential long-term impact.</p> <p>As a mitigation measure against this potential long term environmental impact, the landfill cells constructed under the first additional financing were equipped with liners to prevent groundwater contamination. The EMP and operations manual for the Landfill facility include intensive monitoring programs that are subject to periodic independent environmental audits. These monitoring programs include: groundwater quality above and below the landfill; quality of water supply wells in the vicinity, including two deep wells that MCC constructed for the community; and performance of the leachate treatment system. The first environmental auditing of the three MCC's Solid Waste Management facilities at Whein Town Landfill, Fiamah and Stockton Creek Transfer Stations took place in June 2012 and have continued semiannually. The reports indicate that the landfill is not causing any groundwater contamination.</p> <p>When the useful life of the Landfill facility is over, it needs to be closed, capped and monitored as provided for in the closure plan provisioned in the ESIA.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The 2AF will not source project alternative analysis on either location or design of operation as it will focus on the activities which have been initiated by the parent EMUS project.</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>Environmental:</p> <p>The parent project adopted the EMP for solid waste collection that was prepared by the borrower and disclosed under EIP and the ESIA for solid waste disposal at Whein Town that the borrower prepared and has been disclosed under EIPSC. The EMP was disclosed in-country on January 23, 2009 and in the InfoShop on November 2, 2008. The ESIA was disclosed in-country on March 31, 2009 and in the InfoShop on March 11, 2009.</p> <p>In compliance with the safeguard due diligence arrangements put in place for the Parent Project (P115664) secondary collection system component, three EMPs were prepared and approved by the Liberia EPA for the two new waste transfer stations at Fiamah and Stockton Creek and the landfill site at Whein Town on March 2010. All three EMPs were consulted on and publicly disclosed in-country between February 25 to March 24, 2010 and on Bank's Infoshop on September 2010. Biannual Environmental and Social compliance audits have been conducted in all three (Fiamah, Stockton Creek and Whein Town) of the sites since June 2012 to ensure compliance with the requirement of the ESMPs. The December 2013 reports have identified areas for improvement but shown general compliance with the ESMP. The recommendations of the report and the environmental mitigation measures within the EMPs to reduce the environmental impacts at various stages of collection and disposal of waste together with the regular monitoring of the project's activities have proven effective since inception of the parent project. This approach will be will be sustained under this 2 AF.</p> <p>Social.</p> <p>The activities to be financed by the 2AF do not require any acquisition of land, since the activities only involve provision of services and operational activities within the existing three facilities</p>

which have already been secured under the parent project.

The PIU has satisfactorily complied with the social safeguards obligations under Bank Policy. Two Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) have been prepared for the Fiamah and Stockton Creek waste transfer stations. Seven people affected by the construction of the Fiamah and Stockton Creek Transfer Stations received compensations during the last quarter of 2010 and there are no pending issues related to these facilities. With regard to Whein Town, one abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP) was prepared for the necessary land acquisition in September 2011. The ARAP was consulted on and publicly disclosed in country from August 6 to September 5, 2012 and Bank's Infoshop in August 2012. Compensation payments have been made to all but 2 PAPs whose signed cheques are ready to be picked up. Payments to these 2 PAPs will conclude the settlement of all PAPs in the undisputed area as indicated in the ARAP. The other pending matter refers to a small section of buffer zone which is under investigation for multiple ownerships. The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy is collaborating with the courts in investigating the matter and, once there is a conclusion, the rightful owner(s) will be paid the required compensation. Fence construction has proceeded in such a way that the disputed area is being left temporarily outside of the fence until the dispute is resolved. A Grievance Committee with membership drawn from Ministries of Finance and Lands Mines & Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, Monrovia City Corporation, Liberia Refugee Resettlement & Repatriation Agency and the General Auditing Commission, has been constituted in accordance with Bank Policy. Since the PIU will be phased-out over the period of implementation of this project, special attention will be paid to training of the MCC staff who will take over the safeguards obligations, if different than the current staff at the PIU.

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

Residents around the facilities participated in the second audit exercises by observing the processes of samples collection and asking the auditor questions regarding environmental issues in the facilities. Through their participation, residents were informed about mitigation measures included in the project for the three facilities and hence were invited to participate in all subsequent audits. Copies of the reports are sent to the EPA, MCC and the Bank and to the operators of the facilities for their information and records. The reports indicate that the landfill is not causing any groundwater contamination.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Oct-2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Nov-2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Comments:	
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 [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Ventura Bengoechea	
Approved By		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Alexandra C. Bezeredi (RSA)	Date: 26-Jun-2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Alexander E. Bakalian (SM)	Date: 27-Jun-2014